

Webcast med Helga Zepp LaRouche 31 maj: Læren af den 10. juni 1963: Fred afhænger af at genskabe USA's bedste traditioner

I en omfattende diskussion i dag rapporterede Schiller Instituttets Helga Zepp-LaRouche om sit netop afsluttede besøg i Kina, og det håb, der eksisterer blandt befolkningen dér for fredelige relationer med USA, på trods af de "forværrede relationer" mellem de to nationer.

Hun indledte med at beskrive, hvordan intet af det, hun oplevede under sin rejse, passer med det negative syn på Kina, som vi hører om i Vesten. Hun gik i detaljer med dette, da hun svarede på et spørgsmål om, hvorvidt Kina har en "dyb stat", som skjuler sine sande hensigter. Selv om deres stat ikke er perfekt, sagde hun, gør engagementet i det fælles bedste folk optimistiske, i modsætning til den fremherskende pessimisme blandt amerikanske og europæiske borgere om fremtiden. Der er bekymring for, hvorvidt en krig mellem Kina og USA kan blive fremprovokeret af de kræfter, der er forbundet med Global NATO. Hun fordømte den "dæmonisering" af Kina, som er typisk for vestlige medier og politikere, og foreslog at de, der er bekymrede for Kinas hensigter, skulle besøge landet for selv at se, hvad der foregår der.

Hun talte også om betydningen af mindehøjtideligheden for præsident Kennedys tale den 10. juni 1963, da det er en "smuk tale", som afspejler et andet paradigme for Amerika, som de fleste unge mennesker ikke er klar over. Som svar på et spørgsmål om, hvordan vi kan genskabe vores forfatningsmæssige friheder og uomstuelige rettigheder, understregede hun

vigtigheden af de begivenheder, der er planlagt som en del af mobiliseringen den 10. juni. Hvis USA ikke får disse rettigheder tilbage, konkluderede hun, vil hele verden lide under det.

Afskrift af webcast på engelsk.

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello welcome to our dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and Chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. It's May 31, 2023, and I'm Harley Schlanger and I'll be your host. You can send in your questions to questions@schillerinstitute.org.

Helga has just returned from a trip to the People's Republic of China. What an amazing time to make such a trip, as we are now, in a sense, in the midst between two paradigms: One, a paradigm of war that's being directed by NATO, by the United Kingdom, and the United States against Russia in Ukraine, with an escalation virtually every day; and on the other side, a tremendous mobilization for a new paradigm of cooperation based on economic development. And for the new paradigm, the Chinese government is engaging in both economic and diplomatic policies toward that new paradigm. We have on the one side, the post-G7 meeting with the promise of more weapons, more money, more war; and on the other side, we're seeing a lot of diplomacy, the Eurasian Economic Union just met, the Argentine Finance Minister was in China; there's more talk every day of a move toward use of national currencies and away from the dollar system controlled by Wall Street and the City of London.

So Helga, I'm sure you have quite a bit to say about the trip to China. Why don't we begin with a report from you on what you found on your visit?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I'm very happy, because it is really important to be able to go places; with the three years

pandemic, one was practically stuck in one place. And again, what I have experienced so many times, I have to reiterate: Being in China, and I visited many institutions, and we also were invited to visit all kinds of industrial places, exhibitions, firms; and I can only say that nothing ever has happened to me in China which would fit the absolutely negative picture which is being portrayed by the mainstream media in the West. And that is really very upsetting, because, I'm not saying that China is a perfect country, but it is absolutely not what is being said in the West! It's a country which is incredibly different from the West; people are generally very optimistic, extremely determined to accomplish things, to get things done, to continue on the road to improve the wellbeing of the people. And obviously, one of the major differences is that the role of the common good, as opposed to the extreme individualism which we find in the West historically and culturally, is much more in the genes of the Chinese for thousands of years.

So people are in a certain sense much more determined for the good of the country, and since we have now the 10 years anniversary of the Belt and Road Initiative, this has been the most remarkable infrastructure project in the history of mankind, bringing economic development to many countries, especially in the Global South; and that reflects itself in the kind of diplomacy you just mentioned, because the countries of the Global South in general are extremely thankful that China reached out and gave them, for the first time, the opportunity to overcome poverty and underdevelopment, and nobody talks about the so-called "debt trap." People are talking about, that they now have perspectives, that they now have railways, ports, industrial parks.

I can only say, what I have said many times in the past, but it is first of all totally unjust what is being done, the way China is being portrayed, because if you demonize a country

which has no history of military aggression; if you look at the several thousand years of Chinese history, it had maybe a few wars, but as compared to the hundreds and hundreds of wars in the West, it is an absolutely non-aggressive country; it does not try to proselytize its own model; it does not demand that other countries buy into the political system of China; it has the highest respect for the different social systems that countries choose and their right to their own path.

And naturally, right now, people are extremely concerned about the hardening of the relationship between the U.S. and China. And however, they don't do it from a standpoint of defensiveness, they do it determined. I watched two Chinese movies with English subtitles, which were extremely interesting: One was on the history of the emergence of the Communist Party at the beginning of the 20th century; and the other one was about the developments of the People's Republic of China after 1949. And when you watch these movies, you get a sense of the tremendous accomplishment, how China got rid of what they experienced as a great shame, the Century of Humiliation, the difficulties in founding the first traditional republic, and then more years of civil war, and then finally the creation of the People's Republic. And they do not want to have that kind of trouble any more! So they will defend themselves, but they're not aggressive.

However, the fact that recently, the Chinese Defense Minister refused to meet the American Defense Secretary in Singapore, in the context of the Shangri-La Dialogue security conference, reflects a hardened mood, that they do not want to be pushed around any more. And naturally, there is a big concern about the extension of Global NATO, the fact that Japan will open up a NATO office as of now, next year, in Tokyo; these are all questions of extreme concern.

But anyway, if people have the chance to travel to China, it's not inexpensive, but it is something somebody should do in their lifetime, once, and open your eyes and see with your own

eyes what you see. And you will find that the reality of China is very, very different than what is being portrayed in the Western media.

And given the fact that the two largest economies, the United States and China, if they don't work together, the whole world suffers; and the present idea, to "decouple," as it's being pushed in the United States, or the more sophist way of saying the same thing coming from the European Union, to "de-risk"—what a word! This is a complete stupid word-creation—would be really devastating. It would be devastating for the world economy, and it would be catastrophic for European countries, and it would imply the danger of a military escalation as Dr. Mahathir of Malaysia, in my view, completely correctly analyzed it. He said, it would be a world catastrophe, if the world would fall into two different blocs and it would lead to a world war.

What the Chinese say to all of this, they say, well, if the countries want to "de-risk" they should do more trade with China, because China is very reliable. So if you want to de-risk then come on and trade more.

Anyway, I would have a lot to say, but maybe some of the questions will cause me to say a couple of more things.

SCHLANGER: That's a good start, and we do have more questions on China. But, this idea of "de-risk," it reminds me of "pre-bunking." There's a whole new Orwellian vocabulary that's being produced to explain away the intent for war that's coming from NATO.

We have a question from Maria, who's the CEO of Music Box, Inc. She asks: "Of all that you saw, what was the greatest lesson you brought back from your trip?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I don't know this Music Box, but I actually met several people from the music field, and that was, in one sense the most impressive, because they were totally excited about European Classical music. I don't know if that pleases the questioner, because I don't know if this Music Box involves Classical music. But, for example, there is a whole renaissance of Classical music in China. A lot of young people—several people I talked with basically said, when you go to a concert in Europe, you see Beethoven or other Classical composers, you see a lot of gray heads or white heads, because mostly old people go to these concerts. In China, it's the young people, who are completely enthusiastic about Classical music, because they recognize the absolutely important contribution to the development of creativity that Classical music does.

So I would say that this cultural optimism and the openness for a dialogue with other cultures, definitely was one thing which impressed me the most.

And otherwise, I would say, it's the attitude, who Chinese are so oriented to get things done. In a certain sense, they have all the virtues the Germans used to have, but no longer have. They are industrious, they are punctual, they are reliable, they get their work done on time, they have a tremendous work morale. As I said, these were all virtues which Germany was once famous for in the 1950s and '60s, maybe into '70s, but now the Germans, especially younger people want to have more free time, they want to have more leisure, work is less important. I mean, there is a benefit for that, but the country as a whole suffers.

I think, to sum up those two points, what impresses me all the time, the most, and this time also, is a general positive world outlook, and an optimism which comes from that.

SCHLANGER: Now, here's a question that came in from someone in San José: Are the Chinese you met worried about the possibility the Biden administration would provoke a war over Taiwan?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think, yes. I think the idea that there could be a war is definitely in the minds of the more—the think tanks and the people who are in the political activities. And what should they say? They look at what happened with the NATO expansions in Europe, six NATO expansions which they clearly share the view of Russia and many countries in the Global South, that it was these NATO expansions which contributed essentially to this war in Ukraine. And then they look at Global NATO. You know, NATO was originally supposed to be a North Atlantic defensive alliance against the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. And when the Soviet Union disintegrated and the Warsaw Pact disappeared, NATO should have dissolved. And instead, now they are talking about “Global NATO,” into the Indo-Pacific. As I said, already, they want to open up an office in Japan, and naturally the various activities of NATO-related ships and forces in the South China Sea, and the continuous provocations around Taiwan, delivering weapons to Taiwan; Pelosi being de facto an official member of the government, despite the fact that she's from the Congress, but in terms of line of succession hierarchy, she is in the line of the government of the United States. And despite the fact that the Biden administration also gives lip service to the One China policy, which is international law, nevertheless, they keep pushing the independence of Taiwan, encouraging forces there to go in that direction; and obviously, the Chinese do regard Taiwan as being part of mainland China, and they regard this as an extreme provocation and the red line which absolutely must not be crossed.

So I think that there is clearly a determination. There were articles, not recently, but a little while ago, discussing if

it would come to a military confrontation over Taiwan, or the PLA is absolutely convinced and certain that they would naturally win any such military confrontation: Just look at the map—Taiwan is many thousands of miles away from the United States, and just a few miles away from the mainland, so who has the logistical advantage is pretty clear. And naturally, as long as it remains conventional, nobody has a chance to mess around with Taiwan.

So, I think they are worried, and I think that that is why the relationship between China and Russia, I think is absolutely there to stay. And if you look at the economic power of China and the military power of Russia as a combination, it's definitely something one should not mess with.

SCHLANGER: I'll take up one more question on China right now from Patricia, who asks something that I hear with some frequency: Is there a deep state in China that Biden works with? And is there a front that you may have met, that seems to be more friendly, that's a fake, but really is part of the deep state as a deception?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Uh—I think that that is completely off the wall. The Communist Party is in control of the country. They have something which is called "whole-process democracy," and it's actually quite impressive. I think, if you are interested to really find out about China, you should look at that more closely. Because, they have a system whereby nobody makes a career, who does not go through all the different steps of government, starting with a local level; then if you are doing well on the local level, you will go to the county level; then from the county level to a municipal level; then from there to a provincial level. And you have to go through all of these different steps of leadership to qualify for higher positions

of government, or even in the party.

And the Chinese argue that that is a much better system, than the so-called Western parliamentary democracy, or even the Presidential system in the United States, because, in Germany, for example, we had a politician once, whose name was Franz Müntefering, and he became sort of famous, because at one point he said, "Oh, it's completely unfair to be reminded of promises I gave during the election campaign"—meaning that, a politician can say in the election campaign whatever he wants, and then it doesn't matter what he does afterwards.

In China, they are very proud to say there is an accountability, not only leading into this process of elections, but especially coming out of it, and making sure that whatever was discussed at various levels of decision-making is being carried out, and carried through, and that the accountability exists afterwards.

So, I think whoever is spreading this idea about the "deep state" in China, I think it is really not existent. And President Xi Jinping in particular, he was extremely emphatic in the early years of his office, to make a campaign against corruption. And right now, you can see, this has really gotten through all pores of society: For example, when you try to give the waitress in a restaurant a tip, they don't take it. They are basically told, and this is part of a long campaign, not to be susceptible to money, bribes and so forth. And I have only experienced that that is, indeed, the case.

So, I think that there are definitely many problems which still have to be tackled; I think maybe people are working really very hard, and maybe people would enjoy to go more often to theaters. But the only real criticism I have met, and I always make it a point to talk to as many people as I can, was that the government is not doing enough: That all the laws are good, that the government is good, but if some problem occurs, it just means the government should be more forceful

to make things function. And that is a completely different attitude than, let's say in Germany, where people say, "Oh, too much government, and you can't trust the government." It's the opposite in China.

So, I think that that line, and whoever has peddled that, has no credibility whatsoever.

SCHLANGER: Now, here's a question from someone who is organizing with the "Urgent Appeal," that the Schiller Institute sent out. And by the way, let me remind people, we're taking your questions at questions@schillerinstitutel.org, and you can still send in your questions now.

But this is someone who is circulating the statement for signatures. She asks: "Can you say what you hope to accomplish with the statement the Schiller Institute issued, 'Urgent Appeal by Citizens and Institutions from All Over the World to the (Next) President of the United States!' What is the intent of circulating that?" [https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/urgent_appeal_by_citizens_and_institutions_from_all_over_the_world_to_the_next_president_of_the_united_states]

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, on the 10th of June is 60th anniversary of the famous speech by John F. Kennedy at the American University, which is generally called the "Peace Speech." And if you haven't don't that yet, you should read that speech, or even listen to him on YouTube, because it is a beautiful speech, where Kennedy says that the world needs peace, coming from America, but not a Pax Americana, where the United States would enforce with weapons to subject all others and that way have a "peace of grave." But to have a peace where each country can flourish and work together. [<https://www.jfklibrary.org/archives/other-resources/john-->

f-kennedy-speeches/american-university-19630610]

And it's a very beautiful, poetical speech. And it is so important that people listen to that speech—there are also other, incredible speeches by Kennedy, for example, one where he talks about the importance of art and culture, which I can only underwrite every word he is saying there, that it is the culture of a country which is what makes it human and what makes it beautiful. [<https://www.kennedy-center.org/video/digital-stage/other/2020/an-american-pageant-of-the-arts/>]

First of all, many young people have no real idea who Kennedy was, because they were born long, long after he had been assassinated, and therefore they don't have a vivid idea any more that he represented a completely different paradigm of American politics. And this is very important, because what I want to accomplish with that statement is, as I mentioned before: We are in an unbelievable historic transformation right now, of which people in the West are hardly aware. The Global South is shifting—first of all, they have a completely new self-assurance; they have the economic ties, especially with China, but also among each other, Brazil, India, Indonesia—these are all major countries that are now rising. And the danger would be that the West remains arrogant, and basically says, “who are these people from the South? They should be submitting to the unipolar world,” because they will not.

And it would be very dangerous if you would have a complete separation into two blocs, a Western bloc, and a bloc of Russia, China, and the Global South, because you can't solve the problems of the world by this separation. And if the dynamic would continue, that it would all turn anti-America, which is clearly a tendency, because the United States—there was just a report by Brown University; and they made a study and they said the interventionist wars in which the United States was involved after 9/11, resulted in 4.5 million

deaths! Now, that is an unbelievable figure! [<https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/files/cow/imce/papers/2023/Indirect%20Deaths.pdf>] And naturally, there are many people in the Global South also, who are not exactly friendly to the United States, and that's probably the understatement of the year. And it would be very devastating if that would remain like that. Because I think if that is the tendency, World War III is unfortunately very likely down the road, or sooner or later.

So, since Kennedy represents a completely different paradigm of American politics, more like it was meant to be with the Founding Fathers, the American Revolution, the War of Independence against the British Empire, John Quincy Adams' conception of foreign policy; Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and then Kennedy, who, after all, defused the Cuban Missile Crisis, together with Khrushchev, and who had a very optimistic idea about the ability of man to solve any problems through science and technology.

So, it's a different paradigm. And by making this appeal, by saying, that what the whole world wishes, is that the United States would go back to that kind of a paradigm, which Kennedy represented. I think that first of all, it will help to educate people around the world to look at the United States in a more differentiated way, and hopefully, inside the United States also causes Americans to review their own history. Because, as my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, emphatically always said, that things went wrong with America after the assassination of Kennedy, and especially the cover-up through the Warren Commission. Because, if you assassinate the President of a country, which, obviously, the "lone assassin" theory does not hold for one minute, and then you have a cover-up and the institutions of that country are not able to remedy that, or find out the truth and find justice, this is an extremely—this was a break in the history of the United States. And the last 50, now 60 years, that is something one

has to work through and find back to the kinds of values that existed with Franklin Roosevelt, with Kennedy, and I think that that's the purpose.

And I always think one should relate to the best tradition of the other, and not the worst. When I founded the Schiller Institute in 1984, the main purpose was to contribute to a just, new world economic order, and the idea that this is only possible if one has a renaissance of Classical culture and a dialogue of the best traditions of all cultures, with the idea that peace is really possible when you relate to the best of the other person, or the other country, or the other tradition, and vice versa. Because, when you bring forth what is good in the other, then that is the basis for peace.

So I hope with that, and the memory comes back, that America should become, again, a force for good in the world, and then the whole world would be peaceful, and happy.

SCHLANGER: OK. Happiness is important, as your husband always said, you have to "have fun."

I have two more questions for you, Helga. One goes back to the war danger and it's from Leo, who said: "Thank you for your good work." He asks about NATO's Air Defender 23 exercises coming up in about 10 days, will these be used as a cover, similar to what Seymour Hersh accused the NATO naval exercises in June 2022, to plant the explosives that blew up the Nord Stream pipelines. He said, "Could these exercises be used for a provocation?"

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, I think the reference to the Nord Stream pipelines, and how this maneuver was used, actually gives a reason for worry that something like that is possible. But even without that, these Defender 23 maneuvers for sure will

take place in a period of utmost tensions, already; escalated warfare, the recent new drone attacks into Moscow show—this is called a “terrorist act” by the Russians, and naturally, it’s an atmosphere of extreme tension. And even before, even without maneuvers, we had, in the last several years, so many incidents where fighter jets almost had collisions, or you had almost accidents with ships and jets. And I said: If world peace depends on the ability of a pilot to avoid an accident, you know, then we are really in bad shape!

So, I think, that unfortunately, I have to say there is worry for this period, and we should really escalate our campaign, even if it does not look likely right now, that there must be negotiations. And you have many forces—President Lula of Brazil, he’s all the time trying to get this peace club of the developing countries together; you have the Chinese trying to get support for their 12-point peace plan; which a high-ranking Chinese official just travelled throughout Europe, but he found very little response; Pope Francis is still very active, trying to promote the role of the Vatican for negotiations. So I think that that needs to be strengthened, and no matter what the refusal is, that is the way to go.

I can only say, we should all be mobilized, and we need a strong peace movement, a much stronger peace movement than we have right now. And the mobilization around June 10, where we have in many cities around the world, we have rallies in the morning and then at U.S. time in the afternoon, we have the conference, which I think takes place in Washington or New York. But we have rallies around the world, so you should join them, and express your absolute determination to make the peace movement strong enough to be heard, and not to be overheard.

SCHLANGER: And one of the ways you should do that is to do is to make a copy of the “Urgent Appeal by Citizens and

Institutions from All Over the World to the (Next) President of the United States!" (https://assets.nationbuilder.com/schillerinstitute/pages/1092/attachments/original/-1684363804/20230517_next_us_pres.pdf?) Print it, copy it, distribute it, send it out via social media: Let's get people talking about these ideas that Helga's been presenting, in terms of what actually is the better tradition of the United States.

And Helga, that brings me to the final question, from Lorry, who asks: "Will we ever get our inalienable rights and our Constitutional freedoms back in America?"

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think it requires a new American Revolution. I can only say, if America does not get these inalienable rights back, the whole world will suffer. Because, you have right now a situation where the United States is the strongest military power. Maybe Russia has certain technological advantages here and there, but the U.S. does have a mighty military complex, and not only that.

I think the whole fate of humanity depends on the answer to that question, to be positive. Because, we have a financial crisis, the Scylla and Charybdis between hyperinflation and the chain-reaction collapse is clearly presently there, and it's reflected in the fact that the central banks are really hovering between interest rate rising and lowering and rising again. If you had a collapse of the system, I think that would mean a heightened danger of war, because I don't think the West would disintegrate as peacefully as the Warsaw Pact did in 1991.

So, the kind of reform and the kind of reorganization of the financial system, as part of a new global security and development architecture which the Schiller Institute has been mobilizing for, is really extremely urgent. And right now, I

think a similar approach—and I can assure you quite independently of each other, because I did not consult with the Chinese before I made this proposal, and I can prove that (anyway, that's a different matter). The Chinese government, otherwise, Xi Jinping has this triple approach of the Global Security Initiative, the Global Development Initiative, and the Global Civilization Initiative, which is all part of a package. And that is a framework for such discussions. And we have to convince our European countries, because I've almost given up the hope that you can convince the Western establishments, because they're like the three monkeys—blind, deaf, and don't speak. I think they're so arrogant, and convinced that they're superior, like Josep Borrell, that they're sitting in a beautiful "garden" and the rest of the world is a "jungle"! I mean, the whole world laughs about that! But they don't get it! They don't get it! They just are completely unwilling and unable to review their own behavior and correct, if they would find it full of flaws; but it does not occur to them.

So I think we have to mobilize the citizens, and that is really a question of not only the United States needs to go back to its inalienable rights, but also all of Europe. Because Europe, right now, is not following its own interests; I think we are being forced into an unipolar world which is very detrimental to the interests of European nations.

We need a mobilization of the state citizens, or citizens have to become state citizens, meaning they have to qualify to know what is going on and not just rely on the very evil mass media at this point, because they're streamlined, in ways which have not happened in 80 years, in Germany, for sure.

So, we need citizens to be awake, to study, to learn about foreign policy, to learn about economics, and take responsibility for your own country: And then, we have a chance. It means, you should work with us.

SCHLANGER: Well, let me thank all of you for your questions. We have run out of time and couldn't take them all. But Helga, let me thank you: I know you're somewhat jet-lagged, just coming back, but I'm sure everyone appreciates what you've contributed to the discussion, and will take seriously your appeal to join this mobilization to bring back the best tradition of America, and not just for America, but for everyone.

So Helga, thanks again, and I'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes, till next week.