

Schiller Instituttet tager på det kraftigste afstand fra Men in Black

Schiller Instituttet pressemeddelelse den 25. januar 2021

25. januar 2021 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark tager på det kraftigste afstand fra de holdninger, demonstrationer og aktiviteter, der er foregået under betegnelsen "Men in Black".

Schiller Instituttet har været meget aktive for at sikre en effektiv bekæmpelse af COVID-19-pandemien (se udtalelsen Operation virus ud af skindpelsen fra den 30. marts 2020, og for at sikre, at vi både i Danmark og internationalt kan få oprustet sundhedssystemerne – både med henblik på at få nedkæmpet COVID-19-pandemien og forhindre andre pandemier som måtte true menneskeheden i fremtiden.

Schiller Instituttet har støttet den internationale indsats for at få udviklet vacciner imod COVID-19 og ønsker dem udbredt hurtigst muligt i Danmark og i resten af verden.

Vi beklager, at et tidligere medlem i Schiller Instituttet og kandidat for Schiller Instituttets Venner, Christian B. Olesen, har valgt at være aktiv i Men in Black, som det blandt andet kunne læses i dagbladet Politiken den 24. januar 2021. Christian var medlem i Schiller Instituttet indtil november 2020, men har aldrig diskuteret Men in Black med Schiller Instituttet. Så længe han fortsat er aktiv i og deler holdninger med Men in Black er han ikke velkommen igen i Schiller Instituttet.

Tom Gillesberg

Formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Kontakt formand Tom Gillesberg: mobil: +45 24 48 29 97

Eller mobil: +45 53 57 00 51

Fusionskraft og Kina. Interview med Dr. Luo DeLong, direktør for ITER Kina foretog af Michelle Rasmussen i København.

Den følgende artikel blev udgivet i EIR tidsskrift den 21. januar 2021:

The following interview was conducted on February 27, 2018, at the Big Science Business Forum 2018 in Copenhagen, by Michelle Rasmussen of EIR Copenhagen. It was published in Europe at that time, but never published in the United States. The video of the interview can be seen [here](#), and an interview with the Communications Director of Fusion For Energy, the European section of ITER, can be seen [here](#).

EIR: Hello. We're reporting from the Big Science Business Forum 2018 in Copenhagen, Denmark. I'm very happy that Dr. Luo DeLong, who is China's director for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER China), has been kind enough to speak to us about the Chinese fusion energy program. Dr. Luo, could you say something about China's involvement generally, why China thinks it's important to develop fusion energy, and also, about China's involvement in the ITER project, and any other projects?...

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 if 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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUCHE: 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.

**Video: Lederskab i
krisetider:
Lyndon LaRouche, 2004 –
Martin Luther Kings udødelige
talent**

Se videoen via YouTube her, hvis den ikke vises her på siden.

I kølvandet på begivenhederne den 6. januar 2021 er Lyndon LaRouches virkelig inspirerede og overraskende 2004-præsentation den 19. januar 2004 endnu vigtigere.

Vil vi reagere med frygt eller vrede, eller endnu værre, ligegyldighed, eller vil vi lade os inspirere af den fælles vision af ledere, der er så spredt ud i tid og rum som Frankrigs Jeanne d'Arc og Amerikas Martin Luther King? Vil vi høre vores fælles Guds stemme, i hvis billede vi er blevet skabt, som Martin og Jeanne gjorde?

Lyndon LaRouche udfordrer os til "at udnytte denne magt", så kan man agere med "en fornemmelse af, hvad dit liv betyder. Man har en følelse af forpligtelse, en mission i livet til at opløfte nationen ved at opløfte" sit lands folk.

Lyndon LaRouche introduceres af Amelia Boynton Robinson, som selv er en heltinde og en tidligere næstformand for Schiller Instituttet.

En militariseret nation, eller et inkluderende globalt nyt paradigme

Den 19. januar 2021 (EIRNS) – Det skue der finder sted den 20. januar i nationens hovedstad, når den 46. præsident for USA indsættes for et "publikum" på 26.000 væbnede soldater, stiller nationens og verdens borgere over for et eksistentielt spørgsmål: Vil USA bevare sin suverænitet – som Ben Franklin sagde, "en republik, hvis I kan beholde den" – eller vil briterne endelig være i stand til at realisere deres 245-årige intention om at knuse den oprindelige republik og returnere

den "nye verden" til imperiets gamle verden?

Briterne er afhængige af tilskyndelsen til massekaos inden for republikken, svarende til en borgerkrig mellem hyperdemokraterne og de hyperkonservative, der begge definerer frihed og demokrati som at enhver autonom person har den 'demokratiske' ret til at ødelægge samfundet, hvad enten det er anarkistiske oprørere, der plyndrer og brænder byer over hele nationen for at protestere mod "institutionel racisme" eller et angreb på landets kongres-bygning for at protestere mod et stjålet valg. Hvad der historisk er kendt som 'gang-countergang' imperialistiske metoder til at dele og herske, ses for fuld udblæsning i nationen i dag. Mens denne tragiske afledning finder sted, har City of London og Wall Street allerede påbegyndt indførelsen af et nyt fascistisk diktatur, der erstatter en valgt regerings beslutninger om økonomisk politik baseret på samtykke fra de styrede, sådan som forfatningen definerer, med et netværk af centralbankfolk og finansinstitutioner, 'too big to fail', med absolutte beføjelser til helt at omgå regeringen og lede kredit væk fra realøkonomien og over i en ny 'grøn boble'. Alt hvad der kræves er, at den falske præsident bekendtgør den grønne nye plan, 'the Green New Deal', og at bankfolkene simpelthen tager over.

Det Verdensøkonomiske Forum har planlagt en kæmpe stor konference den 25.-29. januar kaldet "The Davos Agenda" for at udrulle "Initiativet for den store Nulstilling", "The Great Reset Initiative", og for at fejre den grønne finans' overtagelse af den amerikanske økonomi og den vestlige verden, som det er blevet forberedt igennem de sidste årtier af prins Charles, Mark Carney, tidligere nationalbankchef for Bank of England, BlackRocks administrerende direktør, Larry Fink, Michael Bloomberg og deres oligarkiske venner. BlackRock, der styrer næsten 8 billioner \$ af rige folks penge, har allerede påbegyndt processen og beordret energivirksomheder i Sydkorea, Australien, Sydafrika, Filippinerne med flere til at ophøre

med at fremstille kulfyrede kraftværker eller gå konkurs ved en pludselig tilbagetrækning af deres investorers egenkapital.

Er dette for at "redde planeten", som de britiske baroner og baronesser insisterer på, som de falske nyhedsmedier fastholder, som Joe Bidens kontrollører insisterer på? Eventyr for de godtroende! Blev vores borgere ikke berøvet skønhed, udsat for Lady Gaga snarere end Marion Anderson, for rockmusik og rap snarere end Beethoven og Schiller, ville de ikke så nemt blive narret af falsk videnskab. De ville heller ikke tolerere, at nogle få teknologivirksomheder, der er underlagt "overvågningsstaten" under NSA og CIA, til bogstavelig talt at erklære sig for 'herrer over information', at de 88 millioner amerikanere, der ønsker at vide hvad præsidenten for USA har at sige, kan rende og hoppe – eller, som Hillary Clinton fortalte Nancy Pelosi i dag, at præsident Trumps "kultiske følgere" burde undersøges af en ny '11. september-kommission'. Blot at diskutere stemmesvindler er nu blevet erklæret *verboten* af Big Brother.

Fascisme – ikke alene i denne politiske censur eller i truslen om en politistat eller i den militariserede nation, som vi ser i Washington i dag. Dette er de sociale strukturer, der kræves for at håndhæve fascisme, som i det væsentlige er fascistisk økonomi, som i Great Reset, Green Finance.

Nationen og verden vil nu blive udsat for denne nye fascisme. Men den vil snart afsløre sig selv. Helga Zepp-LaRouche bemærkede i dag, at ideologi i sidste ende rammer ind i virkeligheden. I det han talte om en kombination af kriser som vi oplever i dag, sagde digteren Percy Shelley: "I sådanne perioder er der en ophobning af evner til at modtage og formidle dybe og lidenskabelige forestillinger om mennesket og naturen". Verden er chokeret over denne udvikling i USA. Det er et øjeblik, hvor sjæle må opløftes med skønhed, håb og mod til at bryde splittelserne, skabe enhed om menneskets kreative ånd, forene de store nationer i verden for visionen om et nyt paradigme, sådan som Lyndon LaRouche præsenterede denne idé og

midlerne til at opnå det.

Billede: Joe Biden – Rights: Eric Haynes, CC BY-NC-ND 3.0

Video: En mere perfekt union gennem modsætningernes sammenfald: Martin Luther King og det amerikanske præsidentskab (opdateret 20/1)

De tragiske begivenheder den 6. januar 2021 ved Capitol, Kongres-bygningen, i USA har overskygget de omstændigheder, der gik forud herfor – et langvarigt sammenbrud af offentlighedens tillid til regeringens institutioner, herunder valgprocessen. Denne mistillid er epidemisk i hele den transatlantiske sektor, og har skabt en strategisk ustabilitet der bekymrer hele verden. Den fortsatte manglende evne til at samarbejde med Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre nationer – nationer der er styret af ideer, som på forskellige måder afviger fra vores egne – for at vende de tåbelige økonomiske betingelser og mislykkede politik, der gjorde Covid-19-truslen til en global pandemi, vil, hvis ikke situationen vendes, snart vælte hver eneste regering i den transatlantiske verden.

Når man står over for en eksistentiel trussel, er det enhver borgers pligt i en fri republik at gøre som Benjamin Franklin og Martin Luther King – at skabe en mere perfekt union.

Denne begivenhed, den 18. januar, finder sted i weekenden, årsdagene, til minde om to fødselsdage. Grundlæggende fader, Benjamin Franklin, den førende videnskabsmand i det attende århundrede og den intellektuelle leder af Den amerikanske Uafhængighedskrig, formanede sin eftertid, at de havde fået “en republik, hvis I kan bevare den”. Præsten Dr. Martin Luther King, Amerikas førende talsmand i det 20. århundrede for opfyldelsen af USA’s forfatning gennem ikkevoldelig direkte handling, forsøgte at gøre dette og lykkedes med det.

Nu er det vores tur. Lad os benytte denne dobbelt betydningsfulde lejlighed til at afvise giftig partipolitik til fordel for en afmålt, nøgtern undersøgelse af de alvorlige krænkelser af den nationale tillid, der ikke alene er blevet påstået, men også dokumenteret af dem i vores nation, der ofte ikke har en stemme.

Introduktion:

“Uretfærdighed ét sted er en trussel mod retfærdigheden overalt” – Martin Luther King & dagens krise for det amerikanske præsidentembede

Dennis Speed – Schiller Instituttet, New York, New Jersey

Skønhed frem for vold: Beethoven, Schiller og ideen om det sublime Helga Zepp-LaRouche – grundlægger og formand for Schiller Instituttet

Kærlighed besejrer had: En Schiller Institut-konference i 1995 om kreativ, Ikke-voldelig direkte handling (videoudrag med borgerrettighedslederne pastor James Bevel og pastor Wade

Watts)

Dialog: "Du har ikke omvendt en mand, bare fordi du har lukket munden på ham" – Den dybere betydning af det digitale oligarkis undertrykkelse af tanker Medlemmer af Schiller Instituttets Internationale undersøgelseskommission om sandfærdighed i forbindelse med valg

Panel debat:

"Sandhed og forsoning: For et borgerudvalg om sandfærdige valg"

Deltagerne vil diskutere de sidste to årtiers utilfredshed med og dysfunktion i den amerikanske valgproces, der kulminerede i krisen i 2020.

Spørgsmålet fra Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "Hvor går vi hen herfra: Kaos eller samfund"? er diskussionens udgangspunkt.

Spørgerunde

Hvornår:

18. januar 2021

Ude og hjemme: Den eneste gennemførlige strategi for undgåelse af krig er hurtig økonomisk udvikling

Den 14. januar (EIRNS) – Pave Paul VI havde ret, da han i sin rundskrivelse 'Populorum Progressio' fra 1967 skrev: "Udvikling er det nye navn for fred".

Den systemiske sammenbrudskrise i hele det transatlantiske økonomiske system, som Lyndon LaRouche advarede om helt tilbage i 1971, er nu i fuld gang og bringer USA og verden til randen af fascistiske politikker, både økonomisk og politisk, nøjagtig som LaRouche forudså ville ske, hvis hans politik for global økonomisk udvikling ikke blev vedtaget.

I Europa er den vanvittige politik, styret fra London, for afvikling af atomkraft og kuldioxid nået til det punkt, hvor den truer eksistensen af hele kontinentets elnet. Hvis Tyskland får lov til at fortsætte, vil det i år nedlægge tre af sine sidste seks atomkraftværker og reducere landets elforsyning med chokerende 6-7%, uden anden grund end forsætlig afindustrialisering og malthusiansk affolkning.

I Kina er USA's afgående udenrigsminister, Mike Pompeo, kommet inden for en millimeter til at anerkende Taiwan som en suveræn nation, hvilket forsætligt ville overskride Kinas røde linje og sandsynligvis udløse en åben militær reaktion.

I Rusland tikker uret ned til 5. februar 2021, hvor den nye START-traktat mellem USA og Rusland udløber, hvilket ville efterlade verden med, siger og skriver, nul våbenkontrolaftaler mellem de to supermagter, på et tidspunkt med skarpe og voksende spændinger.

Og i USA har angrebet på 'Capitol' den 6. januar – en moderne orkestreret provokation i stil med 'Rigsdagsbranden' – åbnet sluseportene for at rive præsidentskabet som institutionen og forfatningen i stykker, i særdeleshed ytringsfriheden, og tilskyndelse til jakobinsk vold (både venstre- og højreorienteret), hvilken er beregnet på at nedbryde nationen – det britiske imperiums mangeårige feberagtige drøm. Rapporterne om planlagt vold på indsættelsesdagen den 20. januar, både i Washington, D.C. og i mange delstats-hovedstæder over hele landet, truer med at optrappe krisen til et helt nyt niveau.

Præsident Trumps gentagne fordømmelse af angrebet på Capitol, hvor han distancerer sig selv og hans bevægelse fra "den pøbelagtige vold" og siger, at "jeg opfordrer til at der ikke må være nogen vold", er prisværdigt – men det er på ingen måde tilstrækkeligt til at besejre den globale strategi fra det britiske imperium, City of London og Wall Street.

"Det er meget tydeligt, at USA befinder sig i en dyb, dyb polarisering", sagde Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, i sin ugentlige webcast den 13. januar. "Nogle mennesker taler endda om faren for en borgerkrig. Jeg vil ikke forudsige det ene eller det andet, men det står meget klart, at hvis ikke man finder en måde at overvinde denne nuværende ekstreme polarisering, kan man ikke gå ind til det og sige: 'Vi vil bekæmpe dette til døden.' Dette kan kun føre til en fuldstændig tragedie eller føre til en situation som i Weimar-Tyskland, hvor nationalsocialisterne og bolsjevikkerne kæmpede frem og tilbage i slutfasen; og vi ved hvordan dette sluttede".

Zepp-LaRouche fortsatte: "Hvad jeg mener der må gøres, er en helt anden tilgang. Det er idéen om 'modsætningernes sammenfald', der blev udviklet af Nicholas Cusanus; forestillingen om at det menneskelige sind kan definere et niveau for løsninger, der ligger på et højere plan end der, hvor konflikten opstod. Hvad det konkret betyder i en situation som denne er, at folk fra alle sektorer af det politiske spektrum skulle arbejde sammen for at løse de virkelige problemer, som hungersnød, som pandemi, og derved give unge mennesker et perspektiv".

Zepp-LaRouche henviste derefter til den tænkning og organiserende tilgang fra ledere som Mahatma Gandhi og Martin Luther King, som personligt blev stærkt inspireret af Gandhi: "Jeg tror, at en sådan fornuftens stemme, som eksempelvis Martin Luther King, hvis fødselsdag vi fejrer om få dage, bør introduceres i den stærkt polariserede amerikanske situation. Jeg tror, at vi er nødt til at introducere et sådan element af

samarbejde om at løse problemer og genopbygge USA. Vi er virkelig nødt til at give et perspektiv til de ganske almindelige mennesker, der har mistet håbet om den amerikanske drøm, hvis de nogensinde har haft det. Og jeg tror, at det kun kan gøres ved at bevæge relationer mellem nationer til et helt andet paradigme... Verden har desperat behov for et nyt paradigme, et 'New Bretton Woods-system, som min afdøde mand havde udarbejdet i mange årtier. Og jeg tror, det er denne tænkning af Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, og Lyndon LaRouche, som nu er nødvendig".

Hun konkluderede: "Jeg synes, at dette er et meget alvorligt øjeblik i amerikansk historie, det er et alvorligt øjeblik for hele verden. Men jeg tror, at der er nok af kræfter med god vilje rundt om i verden til, at vi forhåbentlig kan sætte en alliance og et partnerskab sammen for at redde civilisationen, for det er hvad der i virkeligheden står på spil".

**Vi sider på en krudttønde:
Det drejer sig ikke bare om
valgsvindel.**

**Schiller Instituttets
internationale webcast med
Helga Zepp- LaRouche den 13.
januar 2021**

I sin ugentlige dialog kiggede Helga Zepp-LaRouche på begivenhederne den 6. januar (angrebet på kongresbygningen in

USA) ovenfra og ned og gav seerne et strategisk overblik, der aldrig vil komme frem i de almindelige medier eller fra de såkaldte eksperter. Hun kritiserede skånselsløst påstanden om, at begivenhederne den dag var resultatet af, at Trump slap en "fascistisk pøbel" løs, og sagde i stedet at det var en "Rigsdagsbrand", et påskud for et fascistisk kup for at påtvinge den "store nulstilling" (centralbankernes Great Reset). Udover at tjene som en begrundelse for sociale mediers/internet-giganternes censur af præsidenten og hans tilhængere, blev Kongressens efterforskning om valgsvindelse lukket ned, og der er et pres for at kriminalisere enhver, der taler imod den kommende Biden-administrations hensigter.

I mellemtiden har de optrapninger, der blev bekendtgjort af udenrigsminister Pompeo, til formål at øge faren for krig, som involverer fire brandpunkter, Yemen, Cuba, Iran og Taiwan, der låser Vesten i geopolitiske konfrontationer. Verden sidder på en krudttønde og står over for et accelererende finansielt sammenbrud, som kun kan vendes ved kreativ tænkning, der anskuer det fra et højere niveau, hvorfra de nuværende kriser er blevet skabt. Dette er metoden bag oprettelsen af Komitéen for modsætningernes Sammenfald, som hun startede med en forpligtelse til at skabe et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden.

Engelsk Afskrift:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger. Welcome to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Today is January 13, 2021. We're coming off a stream of extremely eventful and tense and turbulent weeks. Today, a bill of impeachment will be introduced in the House of Representatives against Donald Trump, when they failed to get Pence to go with the 25th Amendment. This is really unprecedented, what they're doing at the end of a presidential term, isn't it Helga?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. It is something quite unbelievable what is happening, and I think we should look at both the events as they were unfolding and then try to get a view from

above, so to speak. Because, what happened on Jan. 6 is in my view not what meets the eye. The way this has been portrayed around the world is that this was a fascist mob which stormed the Capitol, and this was all instigated by Trump who refused to admit that he lost the election, and that he keeps saying there was vote fraud.

Now, this is not what happened. What happened was, and we investigated that in detail with a whole bunch of international legal experts, with lawmakers from different countries, and there is no question that there was massive irregularity [in the vote]. That was not allowed to be investigated; the media always said that Trump would not have produced a single shred of evidence. But there are so many witnesses, hundreds, if not thousands of eyewitnesses, who reported that they saw unbelievable things happening in these six swing states, and Jan. 6 was the day when all of this was supposed to be presented before the joint session of Congress, and that would have probably have been the only chance to shed some light on what happened.

Now, Trump had organized his supporters, and he did say something wild will happen, Jan. 6 is the big day; but he did not they should commit violence, and when he made the speech before the White House, I listened to it, and I did not think that it really had a vision. I thought he sounded bitter, he just repeated the many incidents where he is convinced that it was vote fraud. And then he said, why don't we walk down Pennsylvania Avenue, which is the route to the Capitol. He did say all of this. But then, what happened with the event on—before people started to gather before the Capitol, and then there was the breach, I think there is now many, many questions which have to be answered: Why was there no adequate security? There were ample indications that it would be a big demonstration, that it could have violent elements in it. Normally, when you have such events, all or most of the major government buildings in Washington are closed, museums are

closed—nothing of this happened.

And it is now very clear that there were, from eyewitness reports, from video, handi/smart phone videos and others, that there were some provocateurs, some instigators, who then caused this breach and unbelievable event in the Capitol, which was absolutely horrible. And the whole world correctly said this is something happening in the United States, what normally only happened in banana republics or countries which were the target of color revolution, by a certain apparatus which we have identified many times in the past.

So I think the most likely thing which has happened is that this was another September 11th, another Reichstagsbrand [Reichstag Fire]. In other words, when something happens, where this is just the pretext to implement something else. And what is the something else? Namely, it became very clear immediately afterwards, that the giant tech firm from Silicon Valley started to continue the censorship of Trump and all his Trump supporters, or many of them, what had already started after the election: when Trump would give a press conference, the executives of the big TV stations would blend in, sort of overrule the press conference, and say “this is fake news, don’t believe what he is saying.” It was already incredible. But then, this was a step beyond. They started to kick him out of Twitter, Facebook, and even now there were incidents where the sound was turned off when he gave a press conference.

Now, many people were confused, and reacted—because they have some dislike of Trump, so there were many people who said “oh, this is very good, this person should finally be shut off.” But there were a few people—not enough, but some few important people who recognized what this is. Most outstanding the President of Mexico López Obrador, who immediately in a press conference said, this is an absolute, unprecedented effort to implement mind-control censorship; he talked about the “Holy Inquisition,” he said this is very dangerous, we must think about an alternative. Also extremely important, Edward

Snowden, who after all was the first whistleblower to really show what this apparatus is all about, the global surveillance which they have produced, he also warned and said, this is a very dangerous precedent. And then even some Europeans woke up, like Chancellor Merkel said this is absolutely not acceptable, and even better, the French Finance Minister Bruno Le Maire said, this is a "digital oligarchy," and this must be absolutely condemned.

So what is at stake here? What is at stake is that they want to suppress not only that vote fraud can be investigated, and there is no question that there were incredible irregularities and all the media—normally if you would say there is a charge, a violation of the election in Hungary or in Italy or some other country, there would be immediately an outcry and say, "OK, we have to have investigative journalists, they have to go and find out." I have not seen one incident of a so-called mainstream journalist from the trans-Atlantic world who would have reacted that way. There was nobody who said, "I'm going to interview the senators from Georgia, the state representatives from Pennsylvania"—I have seen nothing of that! There was a unisono, lockstep reaction by the mainstream media that this is completely outrageous; and now, the social media are all basically banning anybody who uses the term "vote fraud" or "stop the steal," or any of the other words which they want to suppress.

Now, this is really incredible! And I think that the underlying reasons must be investigated and people have to wake up, because this is the effort to not only silence Trump with the impeachment proceedings, to prevent him from running again as a presidential candidate in 2024, to outlaw his entire movement, which after all was 75 million Americans who voted for him, and I think all of this is increasing the danger of violence, it makes people more angry.

And if you then look at the enormous amount of disinformation and craziness which is being fueled, you know, people who

still say to the present day, that Trump has everything under control, that he will deploy the National Guard and arrest Pelosi and Biden, this all is steered to make people completely crazy. Nothing of this sort will happen. Trump repeatedly said after the storm on the Capitol, that he is condemning the violence, that he is calling for healing, for peace. So there is an enormous amount of orchestration in this whole affair. But people should really wake up and understand that this is not what people think, or what people are supposed to think, but something quite different and extraordinary is going on here.

SCHLANGER: Well, you mentioned the similarity to what we've seen over and over, to U.S.-inspired and British-inspired regime change in other countries. Clearly you can't separate what happened on Jan. 6 from the four-year campaign of vilification and slander against Trump, the fabrication of the Russiagate story. But I think also, as you just mentioned, it's a pretext to criminalize anyone who would oppose the agenda of the trans-Atlantic establishment, and I think that's really what this is all about. And you mentioned earlier the Great Reset, that's what they're trying to do, is to silence anyone, aren't they?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, also now, the big banks and big corporations are cutting off the Republicans who voted to have this debate in the Congress—I think these were 130 or 170 congressmen—cutting them off from all funding. And there is a motion, also by the Democrats that they should be prevented from politics based on the 14th Amendment. Now, the 14th Amendment was introduced in the context of the Civil War against leaders of the Confederacy, that they would not be allowed to become Congressmen. Obviously, this is incredible. The Congressmen who dared to demand an investigation of the vote fraud, are being put on the same level as the insurrectionists of the Confederacy! This is unbelievable! And it just shows you how absolutely wrong this whole question is.

Now, you mentioned the Great Reset: I think that the same banks and the same big corporations, especially including Silicon Valley, Wall Street, but also the City of London, what these people are aware of is that their system is completely bankrupt, and they're now preparing for what they call the "Great Reset": This is supposed to be featured big time with a virtual seminar starting on Jan. 25-29, and it's supposed reorganize the entire financing so that only Green projects will be allowed to be financed, and that's already started to happen with the major banks.

What people don't know, they think, this has to do with CO₂ emission or climate—it's nothing of this sort. If you put the entire financing on the basis of Green technology, of decarbonization of the economy, this is the old scheme of the neo-Malthusian oligarchy, the combination of the finance sector and the Green ideologues. This is something we have been identifying and warning against since the beginning of the 1970s, at least, because this was when the Club of Rome came out with their fraudulent thesis for the first time, that there are limits to growth, that there are only limited resources, and that the world has developed up to that point, the beginning of the '70s, and now these resources are being exhausted, and therefore you have to asymptotically somehow stop industrial investment, because we are in a closed system.

So this has been the origin of the Green movement. The Green movement was the result of this propaganda of the Club of Rome. It started to panic generations after generations of especially young people. This propaganda was spread with an enormous amount of money by British Petroleum which distributed free games into the schools so that students would learn to think this way. And the whole, entire Green movement was really groomed and it was changed—at one time, it was the acid rain, then it was the ozone hole, so they changed their focus and now it's naturally the climate change; climate change does happen, but the science of climate change has been

discussed by many scientists from many countries. Thousands of scientists have made the argument that climate change is the result of galactic changes, and it's been going on for millions of years, with changes from warm periods, ice ages, and that the anthropogenic component of climate change is negligible.

So obviously, if there's climate change, you have to make adjustments, where you do have some real problems, you do have to make changes, sometimes evacuate the people if the sea level is increasing; but these are things which have nothing to do with the kind of fascist scheme which is being implemented right now. People have to think this through: Because what we are really looking at is a new fascism. A new fascism, where all financing and all economic activity would be controlled in the interest of big finance, big tech, Silicon Valley: And the result would be a massive depopulation, because you cannot maintain the presently existing number of people living on the planet, with the kind low energy flux-density that the Green policies prescribe.

So this is the danger of fascism. And if they go for that kind of censorship, this is a prescription for disaster, because it will go against the interests of survival of so many people, that I only can say we need a completely different policy, and it may still be time to change it.

SCHLANGER: One other aspect of the drive for fascism and a dictatorship is the proliferation of new wars. And unfortunately, we see that even though President Trump is still trying to get troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan and he campaigned to do that, his Secretary of State Pompeo is travelling around the world pushing new wars, targetting Yemen, Cuban, Iran, Taiwan, even North Korea. This is really one of the dangers people are not facing right now.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No, I think Pompeo is really trying to almost create a scorched earth behind him. He just accused Iran of

protecting al-Qaeda, which is Iran has completely denied, and we know what General Flynn said about who is backing al-Qaeda—that was his whole argument against Obama in 2012, namely the United States, itself. Well, then, what Pompeo did by putting the Houthis in Yemen on a terrorist list is an absolute crime! This means that the aid to a country which is already starving in the biggest famine, will be decreased, and it will cause the deaths of many millions of people: I think this is a human rights violation of the most unbelievable dimensions, and it should call all the other governments to action, to increase food aid to Yemen on a short-term emergency basis.

Then to put Cuba on the terrorist list, when Cuba is one of the countries that have been going out of their way to help other countries in the COVID crisis, by sending medical teams to Africa and other places, Latin America. And naturally, the biggest danger, maybe even his decision to basically declare Taiwan to be an ordinary country, and in that way violating the One China policy of China, to which the China has reacted extremely harshly. They said they, under no circumstances, will tolerate this, that we may be looking at the ten most dangerous days in the history of U.S.-China relations; they said this two days ago, so we are talking about eight days now. They also said that they will absolutely react with all means necessary, including the possibility of military reaction, if there would be such a provocation.

So we are sitting in the last days of the Trump Administration on a complete powder keg. And that is not the doing of Trump, that is the doing of the apparatus which is really behind Russiagate, and which is the establishment which goes above parties and it's not limited to either the Republicans or the Democrats. But it is the British Empire, with its dependencies in Silicon Valley, in Wall Street, naturally the City of London itself. So people better wake up that this is something absolutely unprecedented, or going beyond the precedence of

the Reichstag's Fire and even beyond September 11th, in its potential strategic implications.

SCHLANGER: While Pompeo is pushing for confrontation with China, the idea of containment or encirclement, new sanctions against China, the Chinese are continuing to move in a very interesting direction in Africa, working with African countries; and also you had Xi Jinping with a very significant perspective on China's domestic economy, none of which is really being reported in the United States. Instead, we're getting an anti-China landslide coming from the same people behind Russiagate.

What is the policy of China, really, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, we don't know yet what Biden's policy on China will be, but if you read an article he wrote in Foreign Affairs in March/April, it does not forebode too good. Because he said, now it's time to "get tough with China." I mean, what we have seen in the last years was a total deterioration in the relationship between the United States and China, and if he thinks that that is not "tough" enough, that does not sound good. And he repeats in this article, the same untrue assertion that China is trying to take over the world, and the typical lines we know already—this is not what is happening. ["Why America Must Lead Again: Rescuing U.S. Foreign Policy after Trump" <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-01-23/why-america-must-lead-again>]

Wang Yi, the Chinese foreign minister, was just on a five country trip in Africa, and basically in many speeches, but also through their actions, said that China is committed to help Africa to leapfrog to modern technologies and modern industrial development.

Now, I do not know of anybody in the West saying that—nobody in Europe, not in the United States, but China is doing

things, and all the Africans I have every talked with are extremely grateful and happy, and say, we do not want Sunday sermons about human rights and democracy. We want to have real industrial help to get out of our problems. So I think this is quite different from what people think. The Chinese also published a on Jan. 10 a new White Paper on their relationship to the developing sector, where they reiterate the commitment to help these countries to overcome their underdevelopment. And I think this is extremely important; it has nothing to do with taking over the world. It has everything to do with the fact that these countries are in a horrible crisis, faced with a pandemic, with famine of "biblical dimensions," and it's the only way how you can overcome that. And people should cooperate with China on that, rather than having this horrible view. ["China's International Development Cooperation in the New Era," http://english.www.gov.cn/archive/whitepaper/202101/10/content_WS5ffa6bbbc6d0f72576943922.html]

And the speech Xi Jinping gave before the Party school, was also very interesting, because he said that has obviously everything to do with the anti-China campaign: He said that China will concentrate on building up the domestic economy, the increase of consumption, the increase in living standards of the Chinese people, to increase the focus of innovation on science and technology as the motor to improve the productivity of the economy. So if you look at these different aspects of Chinese policy, it would be in the fundamental interest of the United States to say, let's stop this anti-China campaign and cooperate!

I mean, the problems of the world are so many, that if the largest countries of this planet are not cooperating to solve them, I mean, that is the test of our morality, it is the test of our human identity as a creative species, and we are not somehow pigs that fight for the best place at the trough; but we are a species of creative reason, and if we sponsor and

encourage the creativity of the other, the other human being, the other nation, it comes back a zillion times to us and it makes our own life and perspective better. So we have to change the thinking about these questions in a fundamental way.

SCHLANGER: One of the ironies about this is the people who are accusing China of preparing to take over the world, are the same people who are setting up this global bankers' dictatorship, called the Great Reset. And the ones who are accusing China of loading up Africa on debt, are precisely the ones who have been doing that for the last 50, 60 years.

Helga, when you talk about a "new method," you've created a committee, in cooperation with a number of other people, the Committee of the Coincidence of Opposites, that actually is oriented around this method you were just discussing. How is this organizing process going?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It is going very well. We are now in the process of applying that method to both try to get young people involved in being productive in the health sector in the United States; there are many medical associations that are very interested in this approach. We are trying to get actual food shipments into Africa, medical shipments, talking to countries in Africa who are extremely in need for such an approach.

But I want to say something about it more from the standpoint of method: It's very clear that the United States is in a deep, deep polarization. Some people even talk about the danger of a civil war. I'm not going to predict one thing or the other, but it's very clear that if you don't find a way to overcome this present extreme polarization, you cannot go into this and say, "we are going to fight this to the death,"—this can only lead to an absolute tragedy or lead to a situation like Weimar Germany, where in the end-phase between the National Socialists and the Bolsheviks you had the fight going

back and forth, and we know how that ended.

What I think needs to be done is a completely different approach. It is the approach of the "coincidence of opposites," an idea which was developed by Nicolaus of Cusa, the idea that the human mind can define a level of solution which is on a higher plateau than that where the conflict arose. What that means concretely, in a situation like that, that people from a sectors of the political spectrum should work together to address the real problems, like the famine, like the pandemic, like giving a perspective to the young people, and that is, in a certain sense a method which was emphatically used by Mahatma Gandhi. And those people say "Oh, Mahatma Gandhi..."—well, he defeated the British Empire and nobody can deny that; and it's also an established fact that the work and life's work of Mahatma Gandhi inspired Martin Luther King. He even travelled for five weeks to India, and met with the family of Gandhi, and the whole civil rights movement in the United States was based exactly on this approach.

And I think such a voice of reason right now, that which Martin Luther King whose birthday we celebrate in two days, and then the holiday is on Monday [Jan. 18], that is something to reflect upon. When we worked very closely with many civil rights leaders in the past, Amelia Boynton Robinson, with Rev. James Bevel, who was the assistant of King, and many, many others. And I think we need to introduce that kind of an element of working together on solving the problems, rebuilding the United States. I mean, we have to really give a perspective to the ordinary people who have fallen out of the American Dream, if they were ever in it, and I think that that can only be done by moving the relations among nations to completely different paradigm.

I mean, you have to make up your mind: Do you want to have war with Russia and China, and blow up the whole world in a nuclear war, leading to a complete annihilation of the human

species? Or do you want to have an approach of a new paradigm, solving problems together? And I think that that difference, either you go for an all-out war, all-out confrontation is the same methodologically if you apply it in the United States or if you apply in the realm of the strategic situation.

So I think we need to have a different approach, and say, the world needs urgently a new paradigm, a New Bretton Woods system as my late husband had developed for many decades; and I think it is that thinking of Mahatma Gandhi, of Martin Luther King, of Lyndon LaRouche, which is now needed, and not some hoola-hoola, let's go to war.

I think this is a very serious moment in American history, it's a grave moment for the whole world. But I think there are enough forces of good will around the world that we can hopefully put an alliance and a partnership together to save civilization, because that's what's really at stake.

SCHLANGER: Well, we have some events coming up this weekend: The Schiller Institute and The LaRouche Organization. You can check out the website of the Schiller Institute and The LaRouche Organization for details. And Helga, I want to thank you for joining us today. These are momentous times, and we really do need to elevate our thinking and not just fall into the traps that are being set. So, see you next week!

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

Hvis præsidenten bringes til

tavshed: Hvornår går IT-baronerne efter dig?

11. januar (EIRNS) – Umiddelbart har flere fremtrædende personer i det politiske liv og journalistik den 7-8. Januar, under ledelse af Edward Snowden, Mexicos præsident Andrés Manuel López Obrador og Michael Gorbatjov, angrebet forsøget på total censur af præsident Donald Trump, fra IT-milliardærerne i Silicon Valley, der, til at begynde med, prøver at påtvinge total kontrol over den politiske diskussion i USA.

I dag “torpederede” (i Reuters-beskrivelse) den tyske kansler Angela Merkel Facebooks og Twitters censur af Trump. “Retten til meningsfrihed er af grundlæggende betydning”, sagde Steffen Seibert, Merkels cheftalsmand, mandag til reportere i Berlin ifølge Reuters”. I betragtning heraf anser kansleren det for problematisk, at præsidentens konti er blevet permanent suspenderet”. Det første forfatningstillæg (retten til ytrings-, religions- og pressefrihed –red.) “kan gradbøjes”, udtalte Merkels talsmand, “men inden for loven og de rammer, der er defineret af lovgivningsmagten – ikke i henhold til en virksomheds beslutning”. Bruno Le Maire, den franske økonomiminister, kaldte “det digitale oligarki” en trussel mod demokratiet; den franske udenrigsminister, Clément Beaune, udtrykte “chok” over Facebooks og Twitters overgreb og sagde: “Dette skal besluttet af borgerne, ikke af en administrerende direktør”.

Den britiske liberale avis, Guardian, udviste betydelig hånlighed i omtalen af den australske fungerende premierminister Michael McCormacks erklæring, der fordømte censureringen af Trump – men det var Snowdens advarsel: De der tror, at de kan lide at se Trump tavs, vil indse, at dette er et “vendepunkt”, og at hvis IT-giganterne kan bringe en amerikansk præsident til tavshed, vil de forsøge at bruge den

magt til at lukke munden på enhver. Milliardær Mark Zuckerbergs Facebook pegede i den retning i dag i en erklæring, der antyder, at ingen yderligere diskussion af valget den 3. november er tilladt for nogen som helst – ikke alene for Donald Trump. "Vi fjerner nu indhold, der indeholder sætningen "Stop the steal" fra Facebook og Instagram under vores koordinerede skadespolitik. Vi fjernede den oprindelige 'Stop the Steal'-gruppe i november og er fortsat med at fjerne sider, grupper og begivenheder, der overtræder nogen af vores politikker".

Undersøgende journalist Glenn Greenwald, der hjalp Snowden med at løfte sløret for overvågningsstaten, gjorde det samme i en række tweets i dag: "Tekniske monopoler – FB, Google, Apple, Amazon – har mere koncentreret rigdom og magt end nogen anden i historien. De har brugt brutal kraft tre gange på 3 måneder til at manipulere amerikansk politik: censurere NY Post, forbyde Trump, ødelægge Parler. Og de liberale bakker op på overvældende vis". Senest erklærede han: "Disse Silicon Valley-monopoler er alvorlige trusler mod politisk frihed og økonomisk velfærd". Og forud for rækken af tweets: "Autoritære personer tror aldrig på, at de er autoritære, uanset hvor meget censur, overvågning, chauvinisme og fængsling de forlanger. De fortæller sig selv, at deres fjender er så enestående onde og farlige – terrorister – at alt, hvad der gøres for at bekæmpe dem, er ædelt".

Denne indskrænkning af ytringsfriheden er nu rettet mod Trump og hans mest højlydte og aktive tilhængere. Som Ed Snowden bemærkede – som et ekko af Martin Niemöller om nazisterne – kunne man sige: "Jeg er ingen aktiv Trump-tilhænger, det er OK med mig." Er det til støtte for Biden? Det var Joe Biden, der ifølge sit eget praleri skrev 'Patriot Act i 1994' og 'Omnibus Counterterrorism Act fra 1995'. Den blev ikke vedtaget, men i 2002, da justitsminister John Ashcroft selv skrev Patriot Act', ringede han til Biden, fortæller Caitlin Johnstone og fortsætter: "Jeg introducerer dit lovforslag fra 1994".

Så hvis overvågningsstaten er blevet den forfatningsstridige virkelighed siden 11. september – herunder at skabe et uheldigt partnerskab mellem det militære efterretningskompleks og IT-milliardærerne i Silicon Valley – havde Joe Biden allerede planlagt den fremtid for Amerika efter Oklahoma City-bombningen i 1995.

Og nu modsætter Biden sig enhver ændring af paragraf 230 i den føderale ytringslov, Federal Communications Act, der giver disse IT-giganter mulighed for at give sig ud som “neutrale platforme” og samtidig giver dem magten til hidtil uset censur. Eksperter indser pludselig, hvad Trump mente med hensyn til paragraf 230. Dekanen for Fletcher School under Tufts University, Bhaskar Chakravorti, sagde for eksempel den 10. januar: “Den 6. jan. burde forme fremtiden for teknologien, som vi kender den. Den eneste måde, hvorpå sociale medier ikke fortsat skal blive våben for at underminere demokratiet, er ved at genoverveje dette kritiske afsnit [paragraf 230], der gav anledning til internettet, som det er i dag, og som er roden til megen af dets ondskab”.

Senator Elizabeth Warren har tilsyneladende glemt, at hun under præsidentkampagnen lovede en antitrustlov for at bryde de digitale oligarkers virksomheder op – “Glass-Steagall for tech.” De skal brydes op. Præsidenten må ikke blive bragt til tavshed. Det amerikanske forfatningsmæssige selvstyre står på spil.

Billede. Jack Dorsey, CEO hos Twitter. Credits: JD Lasica from Pleasanton, CA, US, CC BY 2.0, via Wikimedia Commons

Stormen på den amerikanske kongresbygning: Farverevolution eller 11. september?

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

9. januar 2020 (Neue Solidarität) – Videoreportagen af flere hundrede demonstranternes indtrængen i kongresbygningen i Washington den 6. januar viser foruroligende scener. Under den direkte udsendelse fra mødet i Kongressen, som handlede om at bekræfte Valgmandskollegiets beslutning om at vælge den næste præsident, så man hvordan kameraføringen skiftede fra mødet til bygningens indgang, til en gruppe af indtrængende, der kom ind relativt let og uden at blive blokeret af de tilstedeværende politibetjente. De havde ubegribeligt to timer til at rode gennem kongresmedlemmernes kontorer uden indgriben fra sikkerhedsstyrkernes side. I alt mistede fem personer livet i forbindelse med hændelserne.

Den kommende nye flertalsleder i Senatet, New Yorks senator Chuck Schumer, hvis tætte forbindelser til efterretningstjenesterne er legendarisk (og som bekendt advarede Trump på MSNBC om, at efterretningstjenesterne har "mange måder at slå tilbage", hvis de blev trodsede), talte straks om en "vanhelligelse af demokratiets tempel" og karakteriserede hændelserne, som et oprør mod USA, som præsidenten havde opildnet til. Præsidenten burde ikke tillades én dag længere i embedet og må straks fjernes af vicepræsidenten og kabinettet på grundlag af den 25.

forfatningsændring, og i tilfældet af at de nægter, må Kongressen mødes for at indlede en rigsretssag. Et kor af pro-atlantiske politikere og medierepræsentanter istemte uden tøven denne vurdering, forstærket af et andet kor af

demokrater, som formanden for Repræsentanternes Hus, Nancy Pelosi, Ben Rhodes (tidligere rådgiver til Obama), Michael McFaul (forhenværende amerikansk ambassadør i Moskva), der straks beskyldte Putin for at være ansvarlig for begivenhederne. Hændelserne er absolut uhyrlige, de potentielle konsekvenser kunne blive afgørende for spørgsmålet om krig eller fred.

Med alt hysteri og spænding er det presserende at stille spørgsmålet om cui bono [hvem gavner det?]: Hvad blev der opnået ved optøjerne i kongresbygningen?

Først og fremmest blev den første, og indtil da eneste, chance for, at de to kamre i Kongressen, det amerikanske folk og verdens offentlighed kunne få omfattende oplysninger om de mangfoldige uregelmæssigheder og manipulationer ved præsidentvalget den 3. november i mindste seks "swingstater" ødelagt. Der er mere end 1.000 øjenvidner til valgsvindelen, og det har været genstand for høringer i de respektive delstatslovgivende forsamlinger, hvilket dog ikke forhindrer det politiske etablisement og de internationale medier i at gentage til hudløshed, at der i modsætning til Trumps påstande ikke er de mindste beviser for denne valgsvindel.

Relativ kort tid efter starten på debatten i Kongressens to kamre, hvor resultaterne og indsigelser vedrørende valget i staterne skulle drøftes i alfabetisk orden – nemlig i diskussionen om resultaterne i Arizona – brød oprørerne igennem barriererne og begyndte deres felttog gennem Kongressens kontorer og sale. Mødet blev afbrudt, regeringsrepræsentanter og kongresmedlemmer blev bragt i sikkerhed, og da mødet fortsatte få timer senere, kom der ikke den tilsigtede debat om valgets uregelmæssigheder. [Der blev kun en kort debat om resultaterne i Pennsylvania -red.].

I stedet er den officielle fortælling blevet udbredt på begge sider af Atlanten, at Trump er ansvarlig for angrebet på Kongressen, fordi han insisterede på, at der var valgsvindel.

Og det er netop der bedraget ligger. For det er helt rigtigt, at Trump siden 3. november har fremsat utallige udtalelser, med påstand om valgsvindel. Det er også rigtigt, at han forsøgte at mobilisere sine tilhængere ved at sige, at 6. januar ville være den store dag, hvor dette bedrag skulle imødegås med hjælp fra repræsentanter for Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet. Og det er også rigtigt, at han i sin tale til mængden opremsede de forskellige eksempler på valgsvindel, og i slutningen af sin tale opfordrede demonstranterne: "Lad os gå ned ad Pennsylvania Avenue!" Men herfra at udlede, at han skulle være ansvarlig for angrebet på Capitol er absolut forkert – og det peger på et helt andet forfatterskab.

Selvom efterforskningen på ingen måde kan være afsluttet endnu, giver en undersøgelse af video-optagelserne og øjenvidneberetninger fra deltagerne på demonstrationen samt en betragtning af den absolut forbløffende mangel på sikkerhedsforanstaltninger et helt andet billede:

– Nogle formentlig autentiske videoptagelser viser tydeligt, at sortklædte mennesker udenfor kongresbygningens ydre areal med magt forsøgte at få adgang, og at en anden gruppe mennesker afskærmede disse uromagere, således at "normale" demonstranter ikke kunne trænge sig frem til dem.

– Ydermere, er der talrige øjenvidner der fortæller, hvor pludseligt mærkelige minibusser med sortklædte mennesker, men også personer iført Trump-Maga-kasketter ("Make America Great Again") deltog i demonstrationen, der skilte sig klart ud fra de fredelige demonstranter.

– Andre deltagere i demonstrationen fortæller, at en gruppe på 12-15 mænd på et tidspunkt rykkede frem igennem mængden og råbte: "Lad os brænde stedet ned", men kun få demonstranter blev grebet af det, mens de der tog afstand fra det, blev angrebet.

Alt tyder på, at der med disse professionelt agerende

provokatører er tale om det samme fænomen, som Nelson Mandela i Sydafrika kaldte den "tredje styrke" i stammestridigheder, med henblik på at miskreditere ANC. Det er den samme modus operandi, som under kuppet i Kiev i februar 2014, hvor snigskytterne fra besatte bygninger skød på folk fra begge sider, imod både demonstranterne og politiet.

Forskellige kommentarer i blandt andet kinesiske og russiske medier påpegede, at USA nu havde modtaget en mild form for den samme medicin, som USA tidligere havde iscenesat og hilst velkommen i lignende opstande i Serbien i 2000, i Ukraine i 2004 og 2014 samt i Georgien, Moldova, Hviderusland eller i 2011 med det arabiske forår. Den kinesiske presse understregede Pelosis dobbeltmoral, fordi hun havde beskrevet opstandene i Hongkong som et "smuk syn".

Disse vurderinger overser dog det væsentlige punkt, den virkelige karakter af dette drama. Måske har Mikhail Gorbatsjov en bedre idé, da han fortalte Interfax, at disse optøjer "tilsyneladende var planlagt i forvejen", og at deres bagmænd var "åbenlyse". De officielle organer der er ansvarlige for, at sikkerhedsforanstaltningerne, i lyset af den forventede storstilede demonstration, var direkte indbydende slappe, hører i hvert fald til blandt den første række af mistænkte.

Der er al mulig grund til at tro, at stormen på kongresbygningen er en direkte fortsættelse af angrebene den 11. september, hvis virkelige bagmænd aldrig rigtig er blevet navngivet. Lyndon LaRouche havde forudsagt denne terrorhandling ni måneder tidligere, den 3. januar 2001, da han forudså, at Bush-administrationen, der ville tiltræde tre uger senere, på grund af dets manglende evne til at håndtere det kommende økonomiske sammenbrud, ville iscenesætte en "Rigsdagsbrand" for at kunne gennemføre diktatoriske foranstaltninger. Det var præcis det der skete med indførelsen af Patriot Act, som i vid udstrækning indskrænkede ikke blot amerikanernes borgerrettigheder, og satte den verdensomspændende masseovervågning i gang gennem NSA (USA's

Nationale Sikkerhedsagentur), GCHQ (den britiske regerings Kommunikationshovedkvarter), osv.

På samme måde, er optøjerne på Capitol Hill beregnet til at give et påskud til at eliminere enhver uenighed over for det neoliberale etablissemments politik. Det er betegnende, at Michele Obama straks derefter opfordrede Silicon Valleys IT-giganter, der er en integreret del af det militær-industrielle kompleks, til at forbyde Trump og alle tilhængere af oprøret fra sociale medier. Alarmklokkerne bør ringe for alle de mennesker, der hylder retsstaten, ytringsfriheden og borgerrettigheder.

Hvad dette handler om er et totalt meningsdiktatur og eliminering af enhver politisk modstand imod den transatlantiske finanselites politik. Det finansielle system, domineret af Wall Street og City of London, har været håbløst bankerot siden 2008 og har siden kun været opretholdt af en kraftig stigning i likviditet og en gigantisk omfordeling af rigdomme til fordel for spekulanterne. Den sidste fase af denne megasvindel på bekostning af det almene vel skal nu igangsættes med den såkaldte "Great Reset" (den store nulstilling), hvor alle finansielle strømme, under påskud af at genoprette økonomien efter Covid-19 pandemien, udelukkende skal kanaliseres ind i "Green New Deal", hvilket vil føre til en hidtil uset afindustrialisering og en dermed forbundet befolkningsreduktion. Mediernes ensretning og censur af sociale medier har til formål at fjerne enhver modstand mod dette tilsigtede diktatur i Hjalmar Schachts tradition. [Schacht var Hitlers økonomiminister 1934-1937, og direktør for Det tredje Riges Reichsbank, 1939-1943 -red. Verden ved bedre: Vi er i akut fare for en ny fascisme!

Det eneste alternativ til dette diktatur, som ville føre til økonomisk ødelæggelse af Vesten, og dermed risikere en krig mod Rusland og Kina, er en omfattende reorganisering af det finansielle system gennem oprettelsen af et nyt Bretton Woods-system, gennemførelse af Lyndon LaRouches "Fire økonomiske

love", såvel som samarbejde med Rusland og Kina i udbygningen af Den nye Silkevej i Latinamerika, Asien og Afrika. Borgere i alle nationer, der forstår situationens alvor, opfordres til at gennemføre denne løsning.

Webcast den 9. januar 2020 med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, m.fl.: om angrebet på kongresbygningen: Hvordan skal man tænke på menneskeheden i en krisetid.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale:

Hele programmet med taler af bl.a. Harley Schlanger:

As with September 11, 2001, the strategic realities of world politics were suddenly altered by the violent suppression of the challenge to the results of the United States Presidential elections on January 6.

However the attack on the Capitol actually occurred, the response to the attack, in the form of new draft bills calling for the re-impeachment of President Trump (despite the fact that Trump's term ends in only twelve days;) the statement by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi that "Trump gave Putin the greatest gift" through the lethal attack; and Pelosi's letter imploring the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen Mark Milley, to, in

effect, illegally assume the powers of the Presidency with respect to thermonuclear war, have worsened everything, and only further alarmed all responsible world leaders. A higher concept of humanity, and therefore a higher concept of self-government, must now guide the American Republic, and the world. These concepts exist, and were often discussed by the late economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche. Today, Schiller Institute founder and chairman Helga Zepp-LaRouche, joined by Harley Schlanger and Diane Sare, will discuss how any citizen, anywhere in the world, who seeks to reverse the impending doom being brought about by the failed trans-Atlantic "world order," should one think in this time of crisis.

Hvorfor 2021 er endnu et 'Beethovens år'

10. januar (EIRNS) – Hold op med at se YouTube-videoerne om hvad der angiveligt virkelig skete ved USA's Kongres, Capitol, den 6. januar!

For at forstå og succesrigt reagere på begivenhederne i sidste uge, må man starte med det store billede. Hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er i en sammenbrudskrise, og den eneste måde, hvorpå det fra London styrede imperium kan overleve, er ved at lykkes med at gennemføre, hvad de eufemistisk omtaler som deres "store omstilling", hvilket egentlig betyder en fascistisk reorganisering af deres aldeles bankerotte finanssystem til en overnational "digital valuta"-fidus og drastisk afindustrialisering og affolkning af nationer på planeten. Stormen på US Capitol, Kongressen, den 6. januar var designet til at indlede et sådant kup i USA og til at konsolidere det med jakobinsk censur af alle og enhver

oppositionel stemme.

Det er ikke første gang, at sådan noget sker. I 1933 var det Rigsdagsbranden: 'Agents provocateurs' skabte hændelsen; fjernelse af sikkerhedsforanstaltninger muliggjorde det; og den tilsigtede effekt opstod: Hitlers statskup blev konsolideret. Tilsvarende med den 11. september 2001: London-kontrollerede saudiske terrorister blev indsat; sikkerheden svigtede på forunderlig vis; og den tilsigtede effekt blev gennemtruffet: 'Patriot Act', lovpakken, efterfulgt af to årtier med udenlandske krige og en uforsonlig 'overvågningsstat'.

Og nu Kongressen den 6. januar 2021: Provokatører førte an i angrebet; der var ingen sikkerhedsforanstaltninger af betydning; og den tilsigtede effekt er blevet igangsat: Den 'store nulstilling' med en fjællig Joe Biden i Det Hvide Hus og al modstand i færd med at få mundkurv på af de sociale medier.

Med dette in mente, er der tre brede synspunkter, der må understreges for rigtigt at vurdere den nuværende strategiske slagmark og forbundne stridskræfter samt den nødvendige fremgangsmåde:

1) Hvad der udspandt sig den 6. januar var en klassisk "gang-countergang"-operation, taget lige ud af Tavistock Instituttets håndbog i Storbritannien og brigadegeneral Frank Kitsons manual for kontraoprør. Debatten om hvorvidt de professionelle provokatører, der førte an i angrebet på Capitol, var 'Proud Boys', 'Antifa' eller den ene eller begge klædt ud som den anden, rammer helt ved siden af. Dette var en klassisk 'tredje styrke'-operation, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede i sin 'Manhattan-projekt'-webcast, 9. januar, hvor efterretningstjenesterne indsættes for med overlæg at udløse vold for at opnå deres tilsigtede chokeffekt. Resten er godtroende fjolser, velmenende, eller på anden vis.

2) Sunde kræfter i USA har internationalt set stærke potentielle allierede i forhold til at besejre denne operation. Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ er et stærkt og voksende alternativ til 'den store omstilling', og initiativets dynamik har allerede bragt størstedelen af verdens befolkning om bord. Mark Zuckerberg kan kontrollere Facebook. Men Kina bygger jernbaner og dæmninger i Afrika. Peru, der har et af de højeste antal dødsfald fra COVID-19 på planeten, fik at vide, at det kun ville modtage få vacciner fra WHO i slutningen af 2021 og ikke vil kunne købe væsentlige antal vacciner på verdensmarkedet indtil 2022 eller 2023. Men i sidste uge meddelte Kina, at de vil give Peru 38 millioner vaccinedoser, hvor den første million ankom denne måned. Det vil dække næsten 20 millioner af Perus 33 millioner indbyggere.

Tror man virkelig, at nationen Peru vil bekymre sig mere om Zuckerbergs Facebook-regler og Pompeos anti-kinesiske udfald end at vaccinere dets befolkning? Der er et realitetsprincip i spil her; lovene for den fysiske økonomi og det fysiske univers, som briterne ikke kan omgå.

Endvidere er betydningsfulde kræfter i andre lande opmærksomme på, hvordan fortællingen om Kongres-angrebets fungerer, og betydningen af den skamløse censur, der pålægges af Wall Street-styrede sociale medier imod enhver opposition. Den mexicanske præsident, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, beskrev det som Facebook gør imod præsident Donald Trump og andre som "en ny hellig inkquisition", udformet til "at skabe en verdensregering". Den højtstående russiske analytiker, Fyodor Lukyanov, formanden for 'Rådet for Udenrigs- og Forsvarspolitik, skrev, at "mål nummer ét er Trump selv". De vil gøre et eksempel ud af ham, så andre ikke tør udfordre det politiske etablissemments hellighed... Og fiaskoen på Capitol i de sidste dage af hans præsidentskab har skabt et perfekt påskud til udrensning".

3) Den britiske slagplan har en endnu mere grundlæggende

svaghed og sårbarhed. Deres plan er, at man hverken må ytre sig eller få lov til at høre andet end det kontrollerede indhold, som er tilgængeligt på sociale medier. Man modtager ingen information, ingen underholdning, der ikke er af den godkendte karakter. Man får at vide, som Bertrand Russell som bekendt udtrykte det, at "sne er sort".

Men der er én ting, som Russell og briterne har overset. Effektiviteten af denne strategi afhænger af, at menneskets natur er, som de hævder den er. Deres informationsdiktatur fungerer kun, hvis viden faktisk er baseret på sanseopfattelse; hvis identitet defineres ved Bentham's 'hedonistiske kalkule', af hedonisme. Men spørg dig selv: Hvordan ville Helen Keller have reageret på kontrollen med de sociale medier? Ville det have påvirket hendes begrebsmæssige kræfter eller hendes evne til at forstå, hvordan verden fungerer? Ville det have grebet ind i hendes evne til at "høre" og forstå en opførelse af Beethovens 9. symfoni?

I sidste ende er det menneskets natur og dets implicite åndsevner til at opdage universelle fysiske principper og forme verden i sit billede, som Skaberen former os i hans – en kraft for det gode, som Lyndon LaRouche brugte en livstid på at opdage, formidle og forøge – det er vores største våben i tider som disse.

Derfor er 2021 atter et Beethovens år.

Kredsene bag "den store nulstilling" hysteriske for

at bruge "6. januar" til at afsætte Trump øjeblikkeligt – indføre nødforanstaltninger

Den 8. januar (LaRouche-organisationen) – Her til morgen udsendte præsident Donald Trump to meddelelser om sin, for en kort bemærkning, gendannede Twitter-tjeneste. Han deltager ikke i Biden-indsættelsen den 20. januar. Og han vil tjene som den "gigantisk stemme" for det amerikanske folks interesser "langt ind i fremtiden". Det er nøjagtigt denne udsigt, der, selv før 2016, gjorde Trump et mål for at blive kørt ud på sidelinjen af London/Wall Street-netværk, hvis politiske fløje foretog den ene beskidte operation efter den anden mod USA for at få Trump ud – Russiagate, rigsretssag, racisme, derefter undergravning af valget. Nu siger de, at han er tosset. The Economist, talerøret for City of London, bider negle over, hvordan man hurtigt får ham ud. De har sendt flere e-mails om dette siden 6. januar, og deres specialartikel den 9. januar bærer den angstelige overskrift, "Efter opstanden: De frygtelige scener på Capitol Hill illustrerer hvordan Donald Trump har ændret sit parti. Og hvor svært det bliver at slippe af med ham".

Trump stod fast imod Paris-aftalens grønne diktater og var til at begynde med stærkt for venskabsdiplomati med Rusland, Kina og Indien (skønt han i løbet af det sidste år kapitulerede til Pompeos McCarthyite-vanvid). Trump støttede også agroindustriel virksomhed og rumforskning og biomedicinsk arbejde samt trak amerikanske tropper tilbage fra de "endeløse krige". Disse handlinger er afskyelige for monetaristerne og deres system, hvis førende megafinansielle enheder nu befinder sig i en zombie-tilstand af at være døde, men ikke begravede, holdt oppe af billioner af dollars i redningspakker og andre former for tricks. For disse interesser er den store nulstilling ('Great Reset') løsningen, da den involverer

diktatorisk "regeringsførelse" og bankpraksis af enhver art, herunder forårsagelse af sygdom, hungersnød og død – fordi de siger, at det vil redde planeten fra CO2. Fra den 25.-29. januar er der arrangeret et medicirkus over fem dage med 25 millioner seere af World Economic Forum, kaldet "The Davos Agenda", hvor den store nulstilling officielt rulles ud.

Det er i denne sammenhæng, at man må forstå betydningen af de aktuelle begivenheder. Pøbelangrebet på Capitol den 6. januar involverede en åbenlys mangel på rutinemæssigt sikkerhedsberedskab, i betragtning af at et kendt muligt trusselement kunne indsættes eller tage form. Nu bliver begivenheden brugt som undskyldning for at kræve at Trump forlader embedet i de næste 13 dage, og som en undskyldning for Big Tech til at udøve total overvågning og censur. Dette er den samme måde, hvorpå lignende angreb på "regeringsførelsen" blev håndhævet efter angrebet den 11. september 2001 under det falske påskud af at forsvare offentligheden.

Der forlanges lige nu tre former for handling imod Trump – aktivering af den 25. forfatningsændring for at afsætte ham, afsættelse ved rigsretssag eller hans "frivillige" fratræden. Formand for Repræsentanternes Hus, Nancy Pelosi, har skrevet til vicepræsident Pence, og krævet at han aktiverer den 25. ændringsprotokol for at fjerne Trump, fordi han er 'et løsgående missil'. I dag talte Pelosi med formanden for generalstaben, Mark Milley, for at træffe foranstaltninger for at isolere Trump fra atomvåbenkoderne. Hun skrev i dag til demokrater for at forberede dem på en rigsretssag. Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX) har indgået en rigsretssagsproces, hvoraf de første tre anklager mod Trump drejer sig om ikke at "anerkende", hvordan Rusland har undergravet USA på forskellige måder. Indsigelsen inkluderer en klausul, der udelukker Trump fra ethvert fremtidigt embede af enhver art, hvor som helst. To andre anklager er under udarbejdelse. I mellemtiden siger tidligere udenrigsminister Colin Powell, at

Trump bare skal "forlade" embedet umiddelbart, som præsident Nixon gjorde. I går aftes informerede Mark Zuckerberg, der nu er berygtet for at have overført 300 millioner dollars til lokale valgkredse – private penge til offentlige valg – præsident Trump om, at han ikke længere kan bruge Facebook "på ubestemt tid." Hvorfor? Fordi "vi mener, at risikoen ved at lade præsidenten fortsætte med at bruge vores service i denne periode simpelthen er for stor". Naturligvis blev de politiske ledere, der jublede over masseangreb, plyndring, brandstiftelse og angreb på politiet hele sommeren, aldrig fjernet fra de sociale medier – tværtimod.

Dette vanvittige 'over-kill' antyder imidlertid på ingen måde styrke. Det er hysteri og vil kunne besejres. Mange millioner mennesker er ikke villige til at acceptere den nye 'store nulstilling', ikke mere end de i 2016 ville stemme på Londons Hillary Clinton. Det er indlysende for enhver, der tænker over det, at vi i dag har et stort arbejde for os med at rulle pandemien tilbage, hungersnøden og det økonomiske forfald forårsaget af årtier med neoliberal, neokonservativ økonomi, som må stoppes. Præsident Trump kan med et telefonopkald til enhver tid indlede samarbejdsprocessen med Rusland, Kina og andre. Til helvede med den uligevægtige Schumer, Pelosi/London-bande. Lyndon LaRouche har vist vejen for både politik og tapperhed. En frifindelse af LaRouche og benådning af Julian Assange og Edward Snowden er det bedste våben lige nu. At forstå og handle på dette store billede er en væsentlig del af den kampagne for "sandfærdige valg", som vi fører.

Se også:

Harley Schlanger Morning Update: Coup Plotters (e.g., Schumer & Pelosi) Accuse Trump of Plotting a Coup!

January 08, 2021

What really happened on January 6-7? What should be done now? How can we rebuild optimism for those who have succumbed to the belief that the U.S. is broken beyond repair?

Stop bedraget: Giv oprejsning til LaRouche.

LaRouche-organisationens annonce i Washington Times den 6. januar

LaRouche-organisationen har en halvsides annonce i Washington Times den 6. januar, på dagen hvor den amerikanske kongres vil tælle valgmandsstemmer i forbindelse med præsidentvalget den 3. november 2020.

Tiden er inde til, at præsident Donald Trump vender bunden i vejret på det strategiske skakbræt. På dette fremskredne tidspunkt vil intet mindre end at vælte hele det britiske finansoligarkis slagplan kunne vinde krigen. Dette er den eneste effektive måde at stoppe hele det monumentale bedrag i forbindelse med det amerikanske præsidentvalg i 2020 og ødelæggelsen af selve præsidentembedet. At tage sagen til Højesteret, og at den amerikanske befolkning foretager fredelige masseprotester er berettiget og nyttigt, men vil ikke være tilstrækkeligt. For at vinde krigen må hele det britiske finansoligarkis slagplan fejes af banen. Denne strategi har, fra det øjeblik han tiltrådte for fire år siden, inkluderet fjernelsen af præsident Trump fra Det Hvide Hus, med det formål at indføre en grøn global nulstilling af økonomien, hvilket betyder udslettelsen de tidligere industrielle økonomier i verden (inklusive USA) og en folkemorderisk affolkning af den underudviklede sektor gennem krig, hungersnød og pandemier – alt sammen med det formål at opretholde Wall Streets og City of Londons bankerotte

finanssystem, med dets spekulative boble på 2 billarder \$. Biden er deres mand til dette job. Hvilke øjeblikkelige handlinger kan præsident Trump foretage for at vælte det strategiske skakbræt?

1) Præsident Trump kan trodse den onde, løgnagtige anti-Rusland og anti-Kina kampagne og ringe den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin op og sige: "Se, vi har en pandemi; vi har hungersnød; vi har en ekstrem farlig strategisk konfrontation; og vi har en uløst finanskriser. Lad os holde det topmøde blandt FN's Sikkerhedsråds permanente medlemmer (P5), som du foreslog i januar 2020, og gøre det med det samme". Som Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange argumenterede for, er en sådan kombination af den amerikanske præsident Trump, den russiske præsident Putin og den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping stærk nok til at tilintetgøre det fallerede London/Wall Street-finanssystem, og til at handle hurtigt for at løse disse kriser. Hele verden, der med ængstelse betragter begivenhederne udfolde sig i USA, ville forene sig bag en sådan bestræbelse.

2) Præsident Trump kan også umiddelbart agere for at give oprejsning til den amerikanske statsmand Lyndon LaRouche og benåde Julian Assange og Edward Snowden. Hvorfor LaRouche? Fordi Lyndon LaRouche (1922-2019) i fem årtier var den mest kontroversielle person i amerikansk politik, frygtet af det britiske imperium som ingen andre. LaRouche blev en trussel i verdensklasse mod det britiske imperiums magt gennem sine amerikanske præsidentkampagner.

"LaRouche-sagen involverer en bredere vifte af bevidst og systematisk magtmisbrug og ulovligheder over en længere periode i et forsøg på at ødelægge en politisk bevægelse og leder end nogen anden føderal retssag i min tid eller efter mit kendskab" – tidligere amerikansk justitsminister, Ramsey Clark.

LaRouche førte an i kampen mod de angloamerikanske

finansinstitutioners folkemorderiske udplyndringspolitik og var ansvarlig for en vellykket organisering af Reagan-æraens Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i 1982-1983. Man fabrikerede anklager mod ham i slutningen af 1980'erne og sendte ham i føderalt fængsel i fem år – for forbrydelser han aldrig begik. Trump blev ramt af det samme apparat, som bragte den uskyldige LaRouche i fængsel. Faktisk var Robert Mueller selv en af de førende personer i retsforfølgelsen og lynjustitsmordet på LaRouche for over 30 år siden, i lighed med bankmanden fra Boston, William Weld. Den 1. september 1995 udtalte LaRouche i sine historiske bemærkninger til Martin Luther King Tribunalet en skarp advarsel, som har givet genlyd op igennem årtierne: "Indtil vi fjerner det rådne, permanente bureaukrati fra vores regeringssystem, der optræder som 'lejemordere' ved at benytte retssystemets autoritet til at begå justitsmord, er dette land ikke frit, og heller ingen der lever i det".

Et vendepunkt i opbygningen af en bevægelse

3. januar (EIRNS) – Lørdagens eksplosive møde i LaRouche-bevægelsen var et utroligt gennembrud, der viser, hvordan LaRouches vision kan samle politiske ledere, samfundsaktivister og tænkende borgere, som repræsenterer forskellige vælgergrupper, omkring en højere ide om statsmandskunst og menneskeheden. I processen kommer den store glæde ved sammen at opdage et højere begreb, der underordner de forskellige årsager, som får folk med samvittighed og mod til at forpligte sig til. Denne dialog viser, hvordan den historiske udvikling onsdag den 6. januar i Washington, D.C. kan tjene som et vendepunkt i opbygningen af en politisk vælgergruppering på basis af LaRouches vidtrækkende ideer og

politik.

Og onsdag bliver faktisk historisk! Kongressens fællessamling kan forventes at fortsætte til ud på de små timer, da valgmandsstemmerne fra seks stater – Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Georgia, Nevada og Arizona – vil blive udfordret af snesevis af kongresmedlemmer og en gruppering bestående af mindst 11 senatorer. Diskussion af resultaterne fra hver stat kan vare op til to timer. Alt imens dette muligvis ikke vil munde ud i, at præsident Donald Trump bliver erklæret som den valgte præsident, vil det bestemt tjene til at henlede nationens opmærksomhed på de bjerge af beviser for uregelmæssigheder ved valget samt ulovlige (uden lovgrundlag) ændringer i valgets gennemførelse. Og det viser, at dette overgreb på demokratisk styreform ikke blot sluges rådt af hele regeringen. Uden for Kongressens lokaler, nær Det Hvide Hus, vil en menneskemængde på mindst hundreder af tusinder af Trump-tilhængere samles for at gøre det klart, at der findes en stor og engageret kerne inden for den amerikanske befolkning, som ikke accepterer ødelæggelsen af demokratiske valg.

Det stadig igangværende kup, der gennemføres mod Trumps 'outsider' præsidentskab, den koordinerede indsats af det britisk orienterede finansielle, militære, efterretningskompleks for at trække USA ind i en fuldstændig unødvendig konflikt med sine naturlige allierede Rusland og Kina, det morderiske forslag om den "store grønne nulstilling" ('Green Great Reset') og den absolutte parodi på retfærdighed, der begås mod den kompromisløse forlægger, Julian Assange, er alle aspekter af et destruktivt, imperialistisk paradigme. Dette britiske angreb på menneskeheden og dets potentiale søger at spille folk ud mod hinanden på den mest nedværdigende måde, baseret på sådanne årsager, som det der kaldes "race", mens de overbeviser folk om, at deres største fælles fjende er fremskridt i sig selv, imod hvilket der må føres et grønt korstog.

Men den virkelige fjende er det britiske imperium, der mere end noget andet forsøger at forhindre, at sandheden om dets operationer bliver forstået eller ageret imod. Den uetiske, torturlignende forfølgelse af sandhedssigeren Julian Assange er den seneste i en række overgreb, der kan spores tilbage til det enorme angreb på Lyndon LaRouche, hans metode og hans bevægelse.

Dette perspektiv blev bragt op ved et møde om Julian Assange i New York City af Diane Sare, amerikansk kandidat til Senatet i New York (2022). Med et banner med overskriften "Præsident Trump, Benåd Assange og Snowden; stop kuppet, frikend LaRouche", indledte Sare sin taletid ved at springe ud i nødvendigheden af at få rensset Lyndon LaRouches navn, og placerede forfølgelsen af Assange (og Snowden) i relation til dette synspunkt. Mens meget af dækningen til støtte for Assange (hvis udlevering til USA til retsforfølgelse for 'forbrydelsen' ved at offentliggøre sandheden skal afgøres i dag) omhandler hans fængsling i Storbritannien som et resultat af amerikansk pres, forklarede Sare, at det er omvendt – briterne styrer USA. Hun pegede på drabet af Soleimani og oprindelsen til Russiagate-svindlen.

At frigøre mennesker over hele verden ved at bibringe dem en forståelse for karakteren af den historiske kamp, som de har stor mulighed for selv at involvere sig i, er den største gave. Del dette budskab i dag!

**Erklæring om COVID-19-tiltag
af Dr. Joycelyn Elders, fhv.**

chefmilitærlæge i USA på vegne af Komitéen for modsatningernes sammenfald

På engelsk:

This statement was released on Christmas Eve, December 24. The Committee, initiated in July 2020 by a call from Helga Zepp-LaRouche of the Schiller Institute, involves many medical professionals, educators and retired U.S. military officers.

As the year 2020 draws to a close, let us fervently hope and diligently work, that the new year will bring about a great transformation for the health and well-being of all humanity.

This year has seen a sea of troubles, starting with the COVID-19 pandemic, which has already killed over 1.7 million people worldwide; which has exacerbated a famine crisis in large parts of the world, and which according to World Food Program director David Beasley, now threatens the lives of 270 million people; which has created mass unemployment and increasingly desperate conditions throughout the globe.

The COVID pandemic is not under control. We are now seeing new and more infectious strains of the coronavirus, as in Great Britain, which is creating economic chaos. This catastrophic situation can be remedied, but it requires the urgent mobilization of the population, including emphatically the implementation of public health measures, that have proven to be effective in containing the virus. We cannot simply wait for the vaccines to be administered. This emergency requires that nations work together to accomplish these solutions. Pandemics don't discriminate. Any nation, any region, any group of people not treated in the course of this pandemic will come back to harm us.

The following measures should be undertaken by national, regional, and local governments. Community organizations, universities, medical institutions, religious groups, and others can begin to implement aspects of this immediately. This will spur broader action and save lives in the interim.

- Public health measures should be strictly adhered to and enforced. These measures were recently reiterated by Surgeon General Dr. Jerome Adams, appearing on Sunday's "Face the Nation," December 20th: "We need to wash our hands, wear a mask, watch our distances, keep our household gatherings small."
- Get vaccinated. While this cannot be a mandatory requirement and is not without legitimate questions and concerns, it is highly recommended, as the best option, at present, to beat the COVID pandemic.
- Rapidly recruit, train, and employ thousands of young people to work as community health care workers to educate people regarding the public health measures cited above and to overcome "vaccine hesitancy and fear," and, where viable, to assist medical personnel with vaccine administration.
- Conduct mass testing, especially in areas of vulnerable populations, i.e., the elderly, the impoverished, and "hot spots," etc. This should be done with a rapid test, so that people get results immediately. This testing should be done regularly, once per month, until the area has a 65-70% vaccinated population. Testing sites should be established in areas where the vulnerable populations live, i.e. neighborhood churches, supermarket parking lots, etc. Mobile medical/clinic vehicles should be utilized wherever possible to reach out-of-the-way areas.
- Isolate and quarantine infected individuals. A safe, secure environment should be provided where people can

recover and receive good food and medical treatment, while doing so.

- Begin public protocols immediately on promising prophylactic treatments, including Alpha-interferon and Vitamin D-3 supplements. These promising treatments and their results have generally been unreported. This may also address and build trust among the medically underserved communities, who have in many cases legitimate concerns about their general health conditions, independent of COVID-19.
- Get everything moving as rapidly and on as large a scale as possible. What would it take to get everyone in the U.S. and in most of the world vaccinated and COVID-free by Independence Day, July 4, 2021? In this regard the expertise of the U.S. military including the National Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers, should be utilized.

It is often said that hindsight is 20/20. Let the year 2020 be remembered as the year the population woke up, realized our past mistakes, and changed, in order to create a better and healthier world for all mankind.

**Spil ikke i et aftalt spil:
Hvorfor præsident Trump bør
nu acceptere Putins P5**

topmøde tilbud. Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 30. december 2020

As President Trump continues to fight to overturn the biggest election fraud in U.S. history, he has an opportunity to turn the tables on those who have attempted to destroy him and wreck his presidency over the last four years. While the enemies of the U.S. in the City of London and Wall Street are moving to turn the U.S. into a banana republic, and are trying to divert attention away from their treachery by blaming Russia and China, and calling banker's puppet Joe Biden a Communist (!), their system is collapsing.

Helga Zepp LaRouche urged President Trump to outflank them, break out of the rigged game, by accepting Putin's offer for an emergency summit, to change the dynamic from war and collapse to cooperation against today's corporatist fascists. With the Davos billionaires desperately scheming to use a would-be Biden administration to impose Green fascism and push for new war provocations, there is an alternative solution: work with Russia and China, and adopt Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws. She again reiterated her conviction that immersing oneself in great classical culture, especially the works of Beethoven, one can find the inner strength and beauty needed to win this world historic battle.

For at knuse den globale oligarki, anvende Schillers og LaRouches princip om statskunst.

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 26. december 2020

In her weekly dialogue, Schiller Institute Founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche evoked the principle of statecraft as developed by Friedrich Schiller as the means by which the present dominant global paradigm can be swept away. She reviewed how that paradigm is threatened by a systemic collapse, but as long as the method of the thinking imposed by the oligarchy remains hegemonic, we face a worsening world situation of pandemics, famine and war.

The alternative requires a new idea of politics, in which citizens elevate the quality of thinking to a new level. Zepp-LaRouche said that Schiller provided the means to achieve this, in his Aesthetical Letters, in which he argues that "true political freedom is the highest form of art." In the battles ahead, including that of reversing the election theft of the 2020 election, the defense of the ideals of a constitutional republic requires that citizens come to distinguish between the real enemies of the U.S., centered in the City of London, and potential allies, such as Russia and China.

She concluded by urging that to accomplish this essential goal of elevating the level of thinking of the citizenry, the "Beethoven Year" should be extended, until a majority of people are able to "Think like Beethoven."

Den malthusianske grønne finansfidus må knuses

29. december (EIRNS) – Verdens centralbankfolk, under ledelse af tidligere chef for Bank of England, Mark Carney, har aktiveret deres plan om at udføre folkedrab ved at bruge centralbankernes og de tilknyttede "to big to fail" megabankers magt til overtage den økonomiske politik fra de folkevalgte regeringer, og afskære kredit til enhver virksomhed, der producerer det som de anser for at være et for stort "kulstofaftryk". Det faktum, at kulstof ikke har noget med klima at gøre, er kendt af enhver kompetent videnskabsmand i verden – i hvert fald de der baserer sig på kreativ tankevirksomhed snarere end computerfremskrivninger.

Den britiske imperialistiske plan handler ikke om klima; dette er intet andet end det seneste fabrikerede påskud for at begå folkedrab. Engang hed det eugenik – at de "laverestående racer" i Afrika og Indien simpelthen ikke forstod den "moralske nødvendighed" af at gennemføre kontrakter om at eksportere deres mad, blot fordi millioner af indere og afrikanere sultede ihjel. (Se Matthew Ogdens kommende artikel i EIR om, hvordan den påtvungne hungersnød i Indien bidrog til at overbevise Amerikas grundlæggende fædre om at gøre oprør mod det Britiske Imperium.)

Sidenhen var det "naturretten" om "den private ejendomsret"

(se Fred Haight's kommende artikel i EIR om John Lockes "forfatning" for sin slavekoloni, Carolina, der definerede retten til at eje folk som Guds naturlov. Dette folkemorderiske synspunkt blev holdt ude af den amerikanske forfatning, som i stedet forfægtede Leibniz' "ret til at stræbe efter lykke").

Nu er det så det videnskabelige bedrageri kendt som "menneskeskabte klimaforandringer" forårsaget af kulstof (CO₂, red.) – kulstof, der produceres af maskiner, husdyr og mennesker. Uagtet at kulstof er føde for plantelivet – det skal elimineres, og menneskene og dyrene sammen med det. Som en ideologi er denne bevægelse i årtier blevet fordømt og modarbejdet med ægte videnskab af LaRouche-bevægelsen. Men nu er det ikke længere et ideologisk spørgsmål. Det er en malthusiansk plan for at gennemføre prins Charles' foreslåede reduktion af den menneskelige befolkning til omkring 1 milliard mennesker – hvilket de britiske baroner og baronesser betragter som vor Jords maksimale "bæreevne". Husk på at Bertrand Russell engang sagde: "Hvis den sorte død kunne brede sig over hele verden én gang i hver generation, kunne overlevende formere sig frit uden at fylde for meget op i verden." Og det var Barack Obama, der fortalte de unge afrikanere på et universitet i Soweto, at de ikke må stræbe efter at have store huse, klimaanlæg og biler, for ikke at verden skulle "koge over".

Det er indlysende for ethvert tænkende menneske, at den nuværende pandemi og den hungersnød den har forårsaget – nutidens "sorte død" – kunne have været forhindret, hvis de vestlige nationer ikke med vilje havde reduceret deres sundhedssystemer som en del af "privatiseringsprocessen" – kortsigtet fortjeneste prioriteret over menneskeliv – samtidig med at udviklingslandene nægtes adgang til fungerende sundhedsvæsen. For at løse denne krise kræves samarbejde mellem verdens førende økonomier og videnskabelige institutioner, især dem i USA, Kina og Rusland. Overvej dette

i forbindelse med at forstå tankegangen bag dæmoniseringen af Rusland og Kina. Er fortalene for den nye McCarthyisme i Storbritannien og USA uvidende om, at denne opdeling af verden i konkurrerende, geopolitiske blokke forårsager millioner af dødsfald – eller er det netop deres hensigt?

Præsident Trump blev valgt, fordi han afviste dette levn fra den Kolde Krig, og insisterede på at "det er en god ting, ikke en dårlig ting", at være venner med Rusland og med Kina. Han blev manipuleret til at bakke ud af dette ædle engagement af russiagate-kupmagerne og talsmændene for det militærindustrielle kompleks, der manøvrerede sig ind i hans kabinet.

Det er ikke for sent for Trump at handle. Skulle han indkalde præsidenterne Putin, Xi og sig selv til et topmøde for at behandle alle aspekter af den globale krise, kunne der brydes med det kontrollerede miljø. At benåde Julian Assange og Edward Snowden ville være et nyttigt første skridt.

LaRouche-organisationen (se www.laroucheorganization.com) blev grundlagt lige før jul for at tage fat på alle disse aspekter sammen med Schiller Instituttet (www.schillerinstitute.com) og for at samle mennesker med god vilje fra rundt om i verden, der ellers er isolerede. Dette er en civilisationskrise, ikke separate kriser for hver enkelt nation. Det kan være muligheden for at indføre et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden som helhed, hvis folk handler.