

Video: Sare- og Vega-kampagnerne konfronterer 'krigens spøgelses' med klassisk musik

EIR Nyheder

Ikke korrekturlæst.

Den 26. oktober 2024 EIRNS

Med titlen »Build a Peace Chorus Against the Ghouls of War« var de kombinerede uafhængige kampagner for Jose Vega og Diane Sare vært for en offentlig begivenhed i New York City om eftermiddagen lørdag den 26. oktober.

Jose Vega, kandidat til USA's Repræsentanternes Hus i Bronx' 15. kreds, åbnede arrangementet og lovede »noget, der aldrig er blevet gjort før, en hybrid klassisk koncert/politisk demonstration«.

Derefter gik Sare Brass Quintet på scenen og fremførte Den lille Fuga af J.S. Bach med kandidaten Diane Sare på trombone, efterfulgt af et stykke for messingkvintet af den russiske komponist Victor Ewald. Kvintetten fik derefter selskab af koret Friends of Sare-Vega Chorus, dirigeret af Megan Dobrodt, til et arrangement af en koral fra Bachs *Matthæuspassion* med ny tekst på engelsk, »Because All Men Are Brothers«, af Tom Glazer.

Diane Sare, kandidat til det amerikanske senat i New York, introducerede gæstetalerne, »som alle er genier på deres egen måde.« Den første taler var Dennis Fritz, Command Chief Master Sergeant (ret., USAF) og direktør for Eisenhower Media Group, som bad tilhørerne om at overveje, at hvis den amerikanske

kongres kan se til og ikke sige noget om drab på kvinder og børn, hvad betyder vi så for dem? Han og oberst Lawrence Wilkerson (ret.) og oberst Ann Wright var blandt dem, der blev fordømt i kongressen for at demonstrere uden for den israelske premierminister Benjamin Netanyahus optræden der: »Vores kongres spyttede os i ansigtet på vegne af Bibi Netanyahu.« Fritz hævdede, at vores studerende og professorer i USA har mere mod end vores kongresmedlemmer. Han kom med en besked til Netanyahu om krigen mod Iran: »Du ønskede denne krig, du fik den, men hold os ude af den.« Til sine amerikanske medborgere sagde han: Giv ikke muslimer, arabiske amerikanere, fredselskende jøder eller sorte mænd skylden, hvis jeres kandidat taber. Giv den israelske lobby skylden.

Angela McCardle, formand for det nationale Libertarian Party og medarrangør af Rage Against the War Machine, sendte en videobesked, hvor hun ønskede succes til alle de uafhængige kandidater og kandidater fra tredjeparter.

Dr. Mark Perlmutter, MD, rapporterede i en anden videobesked om de uhyggelige tilfælde af civile, som han behandlede i Gaza, og som var klare beviser på krigsforbrydelser.

Dernæst fulgte et musikalsk intermezzo med et arrangement for solist og kor af »Go Down, Moses«.

Russell Dobular og Keaton Weiss fra »Due Dissidence«, en platform for politiske kommentarer, var de næste talere. Dobular præsenterede en sarkastisk ristning af begge mainstream-præsidentkandidater og fokuserede sin polemik primært på Kamala Harris. Han hyldede Vega og Sare som de eneste fredskandidater, der »giver mig håb i håbløse tider«. Han blev efterfulgt af Weiss, som roste Jose Vegas og LaRouche-bevægelsens » ubønhørlige humanisme« og beskrev, hvordan han delte en søndagsbrunch med kylling og vafler med Jose, som »citerede Platon udenad og i lange baner«. Han kom med lærde bemærkninger om USA's tilstand og citerede den lærde historiker Ibn Khaldun fra det 14. århundrede om begrebet

asabiyya, eller solidaritet, og spurgte provokerende: »Hvem ønsker, at vi skal miste vores følelse af os selv som ét folk?« Han fortsatte med at sige, at »Jose og Diane er blandt de få aktivister, jeg kender, som ikke er faldet i den fælde at hade det land, de forsøger at repræsentere.«

Schiller Instituttets leder Harley Schlanger beskrev USA's 50-årige økonomiske nedtur efter »Nixons paradigmeskifte« og LaRouche-bevægelsens rolle i at tilbyde et alternativ på trods af en bagvaskelseskampagne og politisk forfølgelse af LaRouche, som er slået fejl. Nu er BRIKS klar til at gennemføre LaRouches alternative politik.

Schlanger blev efterfulgt af tenoren Everett Suttle, som fremførte et solo-arrangement af den spirituelle »This Little Light of Mine«.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet og leder af Den Internationale Fredskoalition, advarede om, at USA er blevet det mest frygtede land i verden, fordi det forsøger at blive verdens hersker. Krigene i Ukraine og Sydvestasien truer begge med at optrappe til en atomkrig, som kan gøre en ende på alt liv på jorden. Men BRIKS-nationerne, som repræsenterer den Globale Majoritet, »er fast besluttet på at afslutte perioden med 500 års kolonialisme ved at opbygge et nyt verdensøkonomisk system, som vil give dem mulighed for at industrialisere og overvinde fattigdom og underudvikling... Hvis USA ville indtage en samarbejdsvillig holdning til dette nye system og endda blive en del af det, ville stort set alle problemer i verden blive håndterbare og kunne overvindes.«

Everett Suttle vendte derefter tilbage for at fremføre »He's Got the Whole World in His Hands«.

Garland Nixon, en erfaren progressiv radio- og tv-talkshowvært og medlem af ACLU's nationale bestyrelse, kom med bemærkninger om betydningen af det netop afsluttede BRIKS-topmøde i Kazan i Rusland. Han citerede en kommentator, som sammenlignede BRIKS

med Noahs Ark, et redskab til at redde menneskeheden fra det forestående kollaps. »Jeg tror ikke, at menneskeheden kan overleve med en dominerende holdning i Washington, D.C.,« sagde han. »Amerikanerne tror, at de er på en luksusliner – de er på et piratskib.«

Diane Sare dirigerede derefter sit kor i en opførelse af »O, Freedom«.

Scott Ritter, tidligere FN-våbeninspektør, omtalte ironisk sig selv som en »krigens ghoul« på grund af sin lange militære karriere i marinekorpset. Han gav en poetisk beskrivelse af den proces, hvor han blev forvandlet fra en glødende krigselsker til at ønske en afslutning på krigen og blive en stærk tilhænger af Vega og Sare og det, de repræsenterer.

Dette blev endnu en gang efterfulgt af koret under ledelse af Diane Sare med et arrangement af den spirituelle sang »Hold On«.

Oberst Lawrence Wilkerson (ret., U.S. Army), tidligere stabschef for daværende udenrigsminister Colin Powell, gennemgik imperiernes historie. De er alle væk, bortset fra det nuværende, amerikanske imperium, som har det ene kendetegn, at det har opfundet midlerne til at udslette menneskeliv. »Det alene gør os unikke – forfærdeligt unikke.« Han havde håbet, at Israels fejlslagne angreb på Iran ville afskrække dem fra yderligere optrapning, men desværre ser det ud til, at Netanyahu, som er »en langt værre skurk end Golda Meir«, der havde sagt, at hun ikke ville tøve med at bruge atomvåben til at forsvare Israel i krig), planlægger at optrappe hensynsløst.

Den dystre og alarmerende stemning i Wilkersons bemærkninger blev derefter beroliget af en blid og øm fremførelse af et korarrangement af Spiritual, »Steal Away«.

Den politiske komiker Jimmy Dore serverede sin karakteristiske sorte humor. Han begyndte med en ironisk meddelelse om, at

vores regering fortæller sandheden om Ukraine, selv om de har løjet om alle andre krige. Han mindede om, at Lindsey Graham for nylig havde meddelt, at der er mineraler til en værdi af 11 billioner dollars i undergrunden i Ukraine – “Han sagde det bare ligeud, ligesom hans kærestes navn på valentinsdag.” Han sagde, at han har zionistiske venner, som insisterer på, at Israel er det eneste demokrati i Mellemøsten, hvortil han svarer: »Ved du hvorfor? Det er, fordi vi væltede alle de andre demokratier.« Afslutningsvis introducerede han Jose Vega og sagde: »Der er ingen større glæde, jeg kan opleve i dag, end at se en video af Jose Vega, der laver en intervention på et neoliberalt krigssvin.«

Vega beskrev noget, han først havde lært for nylig, nemlig at den salvadoranske regering indkaldte hans far som 14-årig til at kæmpe mod de USA-bevæbnede Contras i borgerkrigen. Han fortsatte med at forklare, hvordan »interventionsprincippet« fungerer: »Vores job« i disse interventioner «er at chokere USA's og amerikanernes bevidsthed og samvittighed.«

Ray McGovern, tidligere CIA-analytiker og medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, eller VIPS, støttede Jose Vega i en videobesked. Han bemærkede, at Vega stiller op for at repræsentere det samme distrikt i Bronx, hvor McGovern selv voksede op. “Vi er nødt til at have nogen der, som ikke er en skabning af en eller anden lobby... Jose er guld værd, han giver mig håb. ... Med Jose vil der ikke være nogen, der blot nikker eller holder mund om folkedrab.”

Diane Sare tog derefter ordet og sagde, at selv om USA har været ved at blive fascistisk siden FDR's død, og at vi nu har en optrapning af censuren under Biden/Harris-krigsadministrationen, så »har vi stadig frihed nok til at ændre vores nations retning, hvis vi bruger den.« Hun fortsatte: »Min drøm er, at ingen i New York skal kunne komme her og lyve offentligt ... det skal være en by, hvor folk ved, at når de kommer, kan de ikke lyve for befolkningen, for så er der nogen, der rejser sig og laver en Jose Vega.«

Derefter fulgte særlige videopræsentationer af musik fra Iran, Sverige, Finland og Sydafrika samt en liveoptræden af en sang fra Albanien. Resten af arrangementet var for det meste en koncert med bl.a:

- Strygekvartet nr. 12, »American«, op. 96 B. 179, Antonin Dvorak (1841-1904) NEO Strygekvartet
- »Quia Respexit« fra *Magnificat i D* af J.S. Bach (»Han har skuet min ydmyghed«), sopran, obo duet
- En palæstinensisk kvinde læste to rørende digte op om det palæstinensiske folks tragedie og håb via video.
- »Shalom Chaverim« kanon, hebraisk traditionel folkemelodi for fred, kor og publikum
- »My Country 'tis of Thee« arr. af Fred Haight fra Dvoraks Strygekvartet, op. 97 B. 180 Larghetto, kor og NEO Strygekvartet
- »Battle Cry of Freedom«, George Root, 1862, kor og publikum.

The Schiller Institute NYC Chorus' 9/11 Memorial Concert: Restore the Classical Tradition in America

The Schiller Institute NYC Chorus was back in the historic Little Italy district in the Bronx on September 15, 2024, to

present the
9/11 Memorial Concert

Tragedy & Hope- Restoring the Classical Tradition in America.

The inspiring commemoration of the tragedy of September 11, 2001, Tragedy & Hope, took place at Our Lady of Mt Carmel RC Church, and was addressed by FDNY Chaplain Msgr. Jamie Gigantiello with the FDNY Ceremonial Unit Color Guard. Please take a look at the concert program attached below as you watch this phenomenal event which presented the world dialogue of cultures that formed the American Classical Tradition.

Links:

https://www.sinycchorus.com/past_events

YouTube

PROGRAM (PDF)

American music itself is very much what people brought to these shores from diverse circumstances around the world. Alongside native melodies, it was all brought together into a new classical school of music by the courageous efforts of Jeanette Thurber who created the National Conservatory of Music of America with the crucial role of Antonín Dvořák as director in the early 1890s and his collaboration with H.T. Burleigh.

You'll hear for the first time a new arrangement for America's anthem, *My Country 'Tis of Thee*, by Schiller Institute music historian Fred Haight, originally composed by Dvořák to replace the music for the American anthem from the British anthem, *God Save the King*.

You'll also see the theme for another anthem, *Battle Hymn of the Republic*, which made its way from an early 19th century Slavonic church composition of the 26th Psalm by Ukrainian-

Russian composer Dmitry Bortniansky, to the tune of abolitionist camp song, *John Brown's Body*, and finally to the words of Julia Ward Howe during the Civil War.

The program includes the works of Brahms, Dvořák, H.T. Burleigh, Hall Johnson, Verdi & more.

Special guest artists:

The NEO String Quartet, led by Jungwon Yoon

Elvira Green, soprano

Everett Suttle, tenor

Linda Childs, contralto

Michelle Erin, soprano

Dura Jun, pianist

Program

Greetings Jennifer Pearl, Chair, Schiller Institute NYC
Chorus

Opening narrative Dennis Speed, International Schiller
Institute

FDNY Ceremonial Unit Color Guard Invocation and remarks:

FDNY Chaplain Msgr. Gigantiello

Litanei Linda Childs, alto; Dura Jun, piano Franz Schubert
(1797-1828)

Narrative: Elvira Green

African-American Spirituals ~ Schiller Institute Chorus,
Diane Sare conducting

My Lord What a Mornin'

Lord, I Don't Feel No-Ways Tired Everett Suttle, tenor arr. H.
T. Burleigh (1866-1949)

African American Spiritual, arr. Hall Johnson (1888-1970)

Narrative: Elvira Green

Concerto No. 22, The Lord is my Light and my Savior Dmitry
Bortniansky (1751-1825) Schiller Institute Chorus; Megan
Dobrodt conducting

Luleborë: Traditional Albanian Folk Song Michelle Erin,

soprano; Dura Jun, piano

Dem dunkeln Schoß Simon Gjoni (1925-1991) Johannes Brahms (1833-1897) Schiller Institute Chorus; Megan Dobrodt conducting

Narrative: Elvira Green

Soon Ah Will Be Done arr. William L. Dawson (1899-1990) Schiller Institute Chorus; Diane Sare conducting

-- Intermission --

Part 2

Narrative: Dennis Speed String Quartet No. 12, "American", Op. 96, B. 179: Antonín Dvořák (1841-1904) 1st movement: Allegro ma non troppo; 4th movement: Finale, Vivace ma non troppo NEO String Quartet ~

Traditional American Folk Songs ~

Poor Wayfarin' Stranger: Traditional Linda Childs, Alto;

At the River: Aaron Copland (1900-1990): Old American Songs, Set II, No. 4 Everett Suttle, tenor

Long Time Ago: Aaron Copland: Old American Songs, Set I, No. 3 Everett Suttle, tenor

Narrative: Elvira

Green Goin' Home: arranged by William Arms Fisher (1861-1948), from Antonín Dvořák: Symphony No. 9, From the New World, Opus 95, B. 178 – Largo Schiller Institute Chorus; Dura Jun, piano; Megan Dobrodt conducting

Va, Pensiero: from the Opera Nabucco by Giuseppe Verdi (1813-1901) Schiller Institute Chorus; Megan Dobrodt conducting

Narrative: Elvira Green

My Country 'Tis of Thee: arranged by Schiller Institute music historian Frederick Haight from Antonín Dvořák: String Quintet, Op. 97, Burghauer 180- Larghetto (A flat minor/B flat Major) NEO String Quartet; Schiller Institute Chorus, Nancy Guice conducting

Foto; SI

Den Internationale Fredskoalitions 62. onlinemøde i træk, fredag den 9. august 2024

Den 9. august 2024 (EIRNS) – Den Internationale Fredskoalitions 62. onlinemøde i træk, fredag den 9. august 2024

af EIR's medarbejdere

Omkring 550 deltagere deltog i denne særlige udgave af IPC's ugentlige konference. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet, åbnede med en opdatering og bemærkede betydningen af den nylige udtalelse fra Ruslands viceudenrigsminister Sergej Ryabkov om, at æraen med ensidige indrømmelser fra Ruslands side er forbi. Ukraines indtrængen i Ruslands Kursk-region den 5. august krævede helt klart støtte fra NATO og repræsenterer en ekstremt farlig optrapning.

Zepp-LaRouche rejste spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt Iran vil gøre gengæld for de to nylige mord begået af Israel. Sergej Shoigu, sekretær for det russiske sikkerhedsråd, har besøgt Iran, angiveligt for at overbringe et brev fra Putin, hvor han tilbyder at mægle og opfordrer til tilbageholdenhed. Zepp-LaRouche mindede deltagerne om den nylige artikel i Foreign Policy, som fremlagde den politiske mulighed for et amerikansk mord på præsident Putin, og sagde: "Jeg synes, det er et fuldstændigt brud på al diplomatisk opførsel blandt nationer." Hun beskrev den intensive chikane af dissidenter i USA, herunder FBI's razzia mod den tidligere FN-våbeninspektør Scott Ritters hjem og TSA's (transportministeriets

sikkerhedsafdeling) behandling af det tidligere kongresmedlem og præsidentkandidat Tulsi Gabbard, som i realiteten var mistænkt for at være terrorist. "Der er et forsøg på fuldstændig at lukke munden på enhver kritik af denne krigspolitik," sagde Zepp-LaRouche og gentog sine opfordringer til en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur og et Fornuftens Råd.

Oberst Lawrence Wilkerson ("pensioneret"), tidligere stabschef for udenrigsminister Colin Powell, kom med en lidenskabelig advarsel om truslen om atomkrig, "den vigtigste, eksistentielle trussel i verden i dag". Han sagde, at vi har lidt under "ekstremt dårligt lederskab fra alle tre dele af vores regering." Han satte det ind i en historisk sammenhæng og sagde, at hundredvis af imperier er kommet og gået i løbet af de 5.000 år, den moderne historie har varet, men kun det amerikanske imperium fra 1945 til i dag er tilbage. Alle de andre er væk. Ingen havde tidligere udviklet teknologien til at ødelægge alt. En enkelt ubåd bærer i dag nok missiler til at ødelægge verden, som vi kender den. I løbet af de sidste 22 år har vi, USA, ødelagt de fleste af de traktater, der var udformet til at reducere faren for atomkrig, og vi har fået for vane at "sponsorere forfærdelige og meningsløse krige." "Jeg burde nok stoppe op og give noget håb – det er svært for mig at gøre," sagde han; "Svaret er demokrati," et begreb, han beskrev som "slidt, stærkt udmattet." Han foreskrev, at amerikanerne skal protestere, protestere noget mere, afvise "kultiske politiske bevægelser" og konstant arbejde for en reduktion af de hundredvis af oversøiske baser; "Det forurener vores nations struktur at være derude på den måde." Han sluttede af med at sige, at "paria-staten Israel ... må bringes sparkende og skrigende" ind i aftaler om at forbyde atomvåben.

Den tidligere Cleveland-borgmester, kongresmedlem, præsidentkandidat og nu uafhængige kongreskandidat Dennis Kucinich sagde, at "Tredje Verdenskrig er allerede i gang på afbetaling ... den tankegang, der bringer os i krig, har overvældet den sunde fornuft." "Det eneste jeg ved efter 16 år

i Kongressen,” sagde han, er at general Smedley Butler havde ret, da han sagde, at “krig er et spil for galleriet.” Det faktum, at vi stadig taler om atomvåben som en politisk mulighed, “viser hvor afstumpet situationen er.” Kucinich sluttede af med at opfordre aktivister til at “vække folket og fortælle dem om øjeblikkets udfordring” for at stoppe “denne meget nedrige dans med døden.”

Zepp-LaRouche takkede de to foregående talere og opfordrede til optimisme, idet hun mindede alle om, at Gottfried Leibniz sagde, at ethvert onde skaber mulighed for, at et endnu større gode kan opstå. Hun sagde, at stemmer som deres, der kommer fra USA, bringer håb til verden.

Den israelske fredsaktivist Dr. Gershon Baskin insisterede på, at “der er ikke nu, og der har heller aldrig været, en militær løsning på den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt.” “Vi har at gøre med to ekstremt traumatiserede samfund i dag,” sagde han, og alligevel “kan det hele være slut i løbet af få uger.” Han tilføjede, at begge sider har brug for nyt lederskab, og “USA har vist sig at være den værste mægler i Mellemøstkonfliktens historie.” “Dette må være den sidste krig!” krævede han og opfordrede til en regional løsning, der kan bibringe sikkerhed og udvikling til begge sider.

Jack Gilroy fra Veterans For Peace (VFP), Pax Christi og Ban Killer Drones rapporterede, at VFP ønsker at “få vores folk ud på gaderne” og udtrykte stærk støtte til de studerende, som snart vender tilbage til universiteterne efter sommerferien, og som presser på for at afhænde deres aktier i Israel, samt til de ledere i udenrigsministeriet, som træder tilbage i protest. Han mindede deltagerne om, at VFP har udarbejdet et brev, som fastslår, at man ifølge international lov ikke må levere våben til regimer, der krænker menneskerettighederne. De forsøgte at aflevere brevet til cheferne for General Dynamics, Lockheed Martin (“Lockheed Martin fremstiller Hellfire-missilet, kun få kilometer fra Disney World”) og BAE.

Ray McGovern, tidligere CIA-analytiker og medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPs), kom ind på forfølgelsen af sin modige kollega og antikrigsaktivist Scott Ritter. McGovern citerede Thomas Aquinas, som sagde, at mod er grundlaget for alle andre dyder, og at vrede også kan være en dyd (fordi den ser på det gode i retfærdighed.) I diskussionen var Zepp-LaRouche uenig og sagde, at "Vrede er ikke en dyd, vrede er meget problematisk", og hævdede, at *agape* er en bedre følelse. Senere forklarede McGovern, at han kun støttede en mådeholden form for vrede og citerede desuden Aquinas for, at "ufornuftig tålmodighed sår sæden til last".

McGovern stillede det ildevarslende spørgsmål: "Vil Israel bruge et atomvåben i yderste konsekvens?" Han antydede, at de sandsynligvis vil gøre det, og citerede en israelsk officer, som sagde, at "vores væbnede styrker har evnen til at tage verden med os i faldet." Han sluttede af med at sige: "Vi kan ikke bare lade Scott Ritter stå derude som den eneste og praktisere modets dyd."

Steve Leeper, formand for Peace Culture Village, er tidligere formand for Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation og tidligere amerikansk repræsentant for Mayors for Peace. Han sagde: "Det globale magthierarki er ved at ændre sig," og lavede en analogi til dyreriget og sagde, at selv hos chimpanser og hunde sker der en stigning i volden, når alfamagten svækkes. Han sagde, at det er problematisk, at fredsgrupper konkurrerer i stedet for at samarbejde. "Krigere er langt bedre til at samarbejde, end vi er." Han tilføjede, at "det mest sårbare trykpunkt" på krigsindustriens krop er atomvåben, som skal forbydes for at "overgå til en fredskultur." Det ene skridt vil åbne døren til alle andre samarbejds muligheder. Han anbefalede, at vi finder måder at forene de forskellige fredsorganisationer på og skaffer midler nok til at bruge 10-15 millioner dollars om året på at producere korte videoer og andre aktiviteter for at overbevise offentligheden.

Steven Starr, som er professor ved University of Missouri og

ekspert i atomkrig, fortsatte sin præsentationsrække om de ødelæggende virkninger af atomkrig. Han viste billeder af eftervirkningerne af bomberne over Japan, som skabte en ildstorm på 25 kvadratkilometer, og advarede om, at den næste generation af atomvåben kunne skabe en meget større, 243 kvadratkilometer, og at vi i dag har atomspræghoveder, der er så store, at de kan skabe en ildstorm på 10.000 kvadratkilometer.

J.R. Heffelfinger, instruktør af filmen "8:15 Hiroshima", præsenterede traileren til sin film og sagde: "Vi er helt sikkert på en tåbelig march."

Under diskussionen støttede Zepp-LaRouche Dr. Leepers forslag til handling og understregede behovet for at tilbyde virkelige løsninger for at skabe grundlaget for fred og for at "slynge dette ind i den generelle diskussion"; hun mindede deltagerne om Lyndon LaRouches foreslåede Oase-plan, som er nødvendig for at bringe udvikling og håb om en bedre fremtid til regionen.

Spørgsmål og kommentarer kom fra hele verden:

Guyanas tidligere præsident Donald Ramotar sagde: "Den krise, vi står over for i verden i dag, er en afspejling af forfaldet i det system vi lever i." Han kaldte situationen i Gaza for "et niveau af umenneskelighed, som jeg aldrig har set før."

En colombiansk aktivist foreslog, at voldelige videospil bidrager til krigskulturen.

En aktivist fra Qatar citerede en rapport fra Middle East Monitor, som sagde, at tonnagen af bomber, der blev kastet over Gaza, var seks gange større end den, der blev kastet over Hiroshima. Hun advarede om, at straffrihed for Israel vil opmuntre andre stater til at begå lignende forbrydelser.

Der blev vist en video udarbejdet af Organization for Defending Victims of Violence in Iran, som citerede det juridiske grundlag for at kende Israel skyldig i

krigsforbrydelser.

Zepp-LaRouche sagde, at vi må operere på to niveauer: Vi skal opbygge massebevægelser, der er større end dem i 80'erne, plus vi skal skabe hendes foreslåede Fornuftens Råd. Med hensyn til rådet nævnte hun historiske fortilfælde: Kirkerådet i Firenze, den Westfalske Fred og Kommissionen for sandhed og Forsoning i Sydafrika. Vi har brug for et koncept, der løser alle kriser på samme tid, og som tager fat på krisens systemiske karakter. Hun mindede publikum om sine ti principper for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, hvoraf de sidste tre omhandler den nødvendige tænkemåde. Det sidste og mest provokerende princip er, at mennesket er godt af natur, og at alt ondt er en mangel på udvikling, som kan repareres med mere udvikling. Hun bemærkede, at James Webb-teleskopet har fundet 2 billioner galakser, så det er latterligt at tale om grænser for hverken ressourcer eller menneskelig viden. Til sidst gentog hun sin støtte til Chandra Muzaffar-initiativet og opfordrede deltagerne til at "være modige og kærlige."


**Vil Irans svar på Israels
likvideringer starte
storkrig,
eller vil Vesten sige fra**

overfor Israel? Politisk orientering den 6. august 2024 med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Politisk orientering den 6. august 2024 med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Meld dig til den International Fredskoalitions Zoom møde i anledning af markeringen af atombombningen af Hiroshima og Nagasaki på fredag kl. 17 dansk tid: Final Call Before World War Three—Or First Steps To A New Peace Paradigm?: <https://schillerinstitute.nationbuild...>

Kontakt os: +45 53 57 00 51; si@schillerinstitut.dk Dansk: www.schillerinstitut.dk

Præsentationsvideo: Schiller Instituttet: Fred Gennem Udvikling:  • Schiller Institut trailer: Fred genne...

Andre vigtige hjemmesider:
English: www.schillerinstitute.com
www.laroucheorganization.com
www.larouchepub.com
www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Risikoen ved Vestens “Kina-

strategi”?

International online-konference onsdag den 7. juni 2023

Vi inviterer dig hermed til et onlineforum for at diskutere udfordringerne ved Vestens nuværende Kina-politik.

Blandt talerne er

- Helga Zepp-LaRouche, præsident for Det Internationale Schiller Institut, Tyskland
- Zhang Jun, dekan for den økonomiske skole på Fudan Universitet i Shanghai, Kina
- Charles Liu, Senior Fellow ved Taihe Institute, Kina
- Ole Döring, professor ved Institut for Fremmedsprogsstudier ved Hunan Normal Universitetet, Kina

I det nuværende geopolitiske miljø bevæger vestlige ledere sig væk fra at referere til Kina som en “partner” og betoner Kina i højere grad som en “rival”. For eksempel har EU-Kommissionen for nyligt promoveret “de-risking” for at reducere Europas påståede afhængighed af Kina i visse økonomiske sektorer. USA’s “afkoblingsstrategi” søger at afskære Kina fra de teknologiske forsyningskæder. Og den tyske regering har erklæret Kina for en sikkerhedsrisiko og arbejder på en plan om at indføre import- og eksportkontrol, investeringsbarrierer og andre sanktioner mod Kina.

Kina understreger på den anden side, at hvis landene ønsker at reducere risikoen, bør de handle mere med Kina. Hvad er mulighederne og potentialerne ved disse to synspunkter? Vestlige sanktioner mod russiske energiråvarer og varer har

allerede vist den modsatte effekt og har i høj grad givet bagslag for Europa. Vil de vestlige ledere lære af denne fiasko og forhindre endnu en alvorlig fejlbedømmelse?

I realiteten er Kina verdens vigtigste handels- og produktionscenter, og dets Bælte- og VejInitiativ bringer infrastrukturudvikling til de fleste lande, der har et behov for det. Vil Vesten reflektere over dette faktum og skabe et nyt paradigme for fredeligt win-win-samarbejde? Da den vestlige "fortælling" ikke levner plads til en sådan debat, ønsker vi at skabe en platform, hvor en bred alliance af internationale tænkere, iværksættere og politiske strateger kan føre en offentlig dialog.

June 7, 2023 (EIRNS)–Preliminary report on the June 7 Schiller Institute Webinar: "What Are the Risks of the West's 'China Strategy'?"

Stephan Ossenkopp, moderator, made some initial observations. During the last few days, the head of the BND has alleged that 40,000 Chinese students in Germany could potentially be working as spies. Authorities will closely monitor cooperation in the scientific and high-tech fields. G7 will monitor investments by member nations in China, and the EU has announced sanctions on companies which are allegedly helping Russia.

Helga: She commented on what she called an ominous new word, "de-risking." "What is at stake is much more than the economic relation between Europe and China; it is the existence of Germany as an industrial state." The "North" (the Atlantic nations plus Japan) is going not only against China, but against the BRICS and de facto against the entire Global South. She agrees with Malaysia's Mahathir that this leads to WWIII. Concerning the situation in Germany, she marveled at "the amazing lack of interest" by the German government in investigating the sabotage of Nordstream. She reported a number of devastating statistics for the German economy,

including that up to 46% of German industrial companies are considering relocation to US or China. She sees an impending systemic crisis, because the essential problem went unresolved in 2008. BRI gives 150 nations their first opportunity to realize their innate right to overcome poverty and underdevelopment. The Chinese economy is the world's true growth engine. "President Lula heralded the new development bank headquartered in Shanghai as the coming great bank of the Global South." "For Germany and other European nations, a positive future without cooperation with the Global South is impossible."

Prof. Zhang Jun: The West tries to isolate China, but China can sustain its economic development by itself if necessary, including developing its own technologies to replace those being denied to it by the West (which may not be a bad thing; in the long run, this will prompt China to speed up its R&D.) Likewise, Western nations can find an alternative to the supply chain of China, but it will come with a high cost.

Ole Döring: He lamented the "serious, unprecedented, unfortunate and entirely unnecessary confrontation" between the West and China. Speaking of the West: "After 1989, they have entered a mind-zone called The End of History." He referenced Immanuel Kant: "Concepts without experience are empty; experiences without concepts are blind." He went on to say that "Contextual concepts such as race, gender and even culture have been deprived of their real meaning and have become weaponized." "The Tower of Babel is crumbling once again." "The West needs fresh input of realism and pragmatism in order to regain a humanistic balance. Such input can come from peoples and cultures who are eager to learn, and willing and able to share. Obviously, this makes China the number one choice as an ally...."

Döring approvingly quoted a German business leader who called for culture, science, or youth exchange with China. "However, if we use the wrong terms to describe ourselves and each

other, we run a high risk, we get stuck in the past, we misjudge each other, and create avoidable misunderstandings... Those who define human relationships as systems cut into their own flesh."

Charles Liu: "It's not just China, it's the growth of Asia, the swing from the West to the East," which "had China at its core." "What we had in China, was the building of the most sophisticated, and the most modern, supply chain, and the logistics system, that exists in the world today." He quoted Deng Xiaoping: "To get wealthy, you have to build a road first." What China wants, is not to hear preaching from Europe about political correctness. China wants peace and stability, so that everybody can develop and benefit. Europe risks totally becoming a vassal of the Americans, and missing the boat of the BRI and the many benefits it brings.

Final remarks:

Ole Döring: Another "take home" from Kant: freedom means responsibility. There is no human being without education. Can we combine Kant and Confucius for education?

Charles Liu: Decoupling, interruption of supply chain, will cause social disorder, downgrading of living standards all over the world. Even without WWII we could have a mess all over the world.

Helga: This moment of hope, when we could have a new era for mankind, could be ruined by de-risking/decoupling. Confucius's image of "the sage" and Schiller's Beautiful Soul are compatible visions of what is needed. Young Chinese are interested in Europe's classical culture, we need to make the interest mutual.

China-Europe ties – exploring new heights

What would the future of China-Europe relations hold? Join CGTN for a forum featuring experts from both China and Europe as they dive into the opportunities and challenges of this crucial bilateral relationship. From existing challenges to opportunities for collaboration, this panel will provide valuable insights into the future of China-Europe relations.

Webinar: Menneskerettigheder, udvikling og Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet

Den 13. okt. 2022 Bælte og Vej Instituttet i Sverige (BRIX) organiserede et internationalt webinar på internationalt topniveau om sammenhængen mellem menneskerettigheder og økonomisk udvikling og Bælte og Vej Initiativets rolle i forbindelse med fremme af menneskerettigheder og udvikling på verdensplan.

Sammenhængen mellem kinesiske og vestlige synspunkter på dette spørgsmål blev drøftet af diplomater og eksperter fra Kina, Europa og Asien og blev diskuteret indgående i denne første session af webinarret.

Talere på den første session var:

1. H.E. Cui Aimin, ambassadør for Folkerepublikken Kina i Sverige
2. Dmitry Mironchik, ambassadør fra Republikken Belarus til

Sverige

3. Erik Solheim, tidligere direktør for FN's miljøprogram, Norge.

4. Ambassadør Sven Hirdman, svensk tidligere diplomat.

5. Dr. Hassan Daud, administrerende direktør for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Board of Investment, Pakistan.

6. Henry Tillman, formand for China Investment Research

Talere på den anden session var:

1. Shakeel A. Ramay, CEO Asian Institute for Eco-Civilization R&D, Pakistan

2. Stephen Brawer, formand for Bælte og Vej Instituttet i Sverige

3. Dr. Glenn Diesen, professor ved Vestfold Universitet i Norge

4. Hussein Askary, næstformand for Bælte- og Vej- Instituttet i Sverige

Link til anden session her:

Besøg hjemmesiden: www.brixsweden.org

Kontakt os: infobrixsweden.org

Rand Corporation og den amerikanske hær indledte Ukraine-operation i 2019 – Moon of Alabama, Caitlin

Johnstone, Jimmy Dore m.fl.

Den 22. september 2019 (EIRNS) – Kritikere af det militærindustrielle kompleks har bemærket, at den igangværende konflikt i Ukraine, som kommer tættere og tættere på en nuklear konfrontation, ser ud til at have været en del af en planlægning, fremlagt i et 354-siders Rand Corporation-dokument, "Extending Russia: Competing from Advantageous Ground", som den amerikanske hær har indgået kontrakt med, og som blev offentliggjort i 2019.

Moon of Alabama dækkede det, og podcaster Jimmy Dore blev tilskyndet af den australske blogger Caitlin Johnstone til at producere en kort udsendelse om dokumentet i går. Dore afslørede simpelthen, hvordan Ukraines militære operation, som er koordineret og betalt af den amerikanske regering og andre NATO- og EU-institutioner, følger de anbefalinger, der gives i "Extending Russia", i hovedtræk med ringere resultater end forventet.

Det ser ud til, at Rand nu er blevet lidt flov over hele sagen og ønsker at flytte skylden fra dem, der har skrevet teksten, til dem, som har læst den. De har indsat en erklæring på deres hjemmesides introduktionsside, hvor der er anført: "Redaktørens bemærkning, september 2022: Vi opfordrer dig til at udforske denne rapport og den ledsagende forskningsrapport. Eftersom russiske enheder og personer, der sympatiserer med Putins beslutning om at invadere Ukraine, har misfortolket denne forskning i de seneste uger, tilskynder vi dig ligeledes til at udforske denne nyttige ressource om Ruslands tilgang til propaganda med 'brandslukning af løgn' og vores forskning om begrebet 'sandhedsforfald', som er et fænomen, der til dels skyldes spredningen af desinformation."

Dores indledende citat er Rands forklaring om, at de søgte efter "muligheder, der afslører omkostninger, som kunne skabe ubalance og overbelaste Rusland." Man tilføjede, at resultatet

ville være "ideelt set større byrder end dem, der ville blive tilføjet USA for at forfølge disse muligheder", og "Indførelse af mere indgribende handels- og finansielle sanktioner ville ... sandsynligvis nedbryde den russiske økonomi, især hvis sanktionerne er omfattende og multilaterale. Således vil deres effektivitet afhænge af andre landes vilje til at deltage i en sådan proces. Men sanktioner er forbundet med omkostninger og, afhængigt af deres styrke, betydelige risici." Rand tog fejl i deres prognose af den skade, som Rusland blev forvoldt.

Rand fortsatte med at rådgive om, hvordan man skulle overveje "dødbringende støtte til Ukraine", som kunne "fremprovokere en meget bredere konflikt, hvor Rusland på grund af sin geografiske nærhed ville have betydelige fordele."

Dore fortsatte i yderligere ti minutter med at belyse Rand-anbefalingerne, med advarsler angående deres gennemførlighed. De overvejelser, som blev behandlet, omfattede positionering af bombefly, jagerfly inden for rækkevidde af Rusland og taktiske atomvåben i Europa og Asien", for at "lokke Rusland ud i et dyrt våbenkapløb ved at bryde ud af ordningen om atomvåbenkontrol".

Kort sagt var Rand-rapporten tæt pakket med råd om at forsøge en række udstationeringer, hvoraf mange kunne udløse russiske kontraindsatser eller modangreb med en umådelig destruktiv kapacitet. Adskillige af de muligheder, der blev undersøgt, minder meget om det der rent faktisk er sket, og som kulminerede i præsident Putins trussel om at gengælde kraftige eller nukleare trusler på lignende vis.

Dore's

udsendelse: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oVjPh-8JMjQ>.

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark annoncerer sin videokonference den 9. april ved DEO's online Ukraine-debatmøde

KØBENHAVN, 29. marts – I dag afholdt DEO (Demokrati i Europa Oplysningsforbundet), en online briefing "Ukraine og den nye virkelighed i EU". Der var 90 online-deltagere, og mødet vil blive arkiveret.

Under diskussionen stillede et medlem af Schiller Instituttet det sidste spørgsmål, som bl.a. omfattede en annoncering af Schiller Instituttets kommende videokonference.

Spørgsmålet gik på, at der ud over krigen mellem Rusland og Ukraine er fare for optrapning til endog atomkrig. "Der er sket et skred væk fra ingen første brug af atomvåben, og USA og Rusland taler nu om, under hvilke omstændigheder atomvåben kunne anvendes. Vi må lave en plan for, hvordan vi kan undgå fremtidige krige.

Schiller Instituttet har foreslået en international konference for at etablere en ny sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur for alle nationer med den Westfalske Fred som model. Vi afholder en videokonference om dette den 9. april kl. 15 eller senere. Hvad mener I om dette?"

Chefanalytiker i DEO Rasmus Nørlem Sørensen sagde, at han ville forsøge at svare på, hvordan man kan forhindre en atomkrig i den korte tid, der er tilbage. Han sagde, at siden Trump er nedrustning brudt sammen. Der er stadig NATO-diskussioner om konflikter, hvor atomvåben kan bruges som en sidste udvej. Russerne har nedjusteret, hvornår de er parate

til at bruge atomvåben, men har sagt at de kun ville bruge atomvåben, hvis den russiske stat bliver truet. Kina har atomvåben som et valg i deres konfliktspor.

For at undgå atomkrig vil det kræve en ny international ramme, som SI-repræsentanten sagde, med nedrustning og forudsigelighed med hensyn til røde linjer. Et stort problem er, at der ikke er nogen kanaler åbne til Rusland lige nu.

Link til mødet: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6gfkhufo_bM

Spørgsmål ved 54:20

Helga Zepp-LaRouche opfordrer indtrængende til en konference om en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur på Kinas CGTN's udsendelse "Dialog"

Den 7. marts (EIRNS)-Helga Zepp-LaRouche var en af tre gæster i et panel på CGTN's udsendelse Dialog i dag, hvor hun kommenterede den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yis årlige pressekonference, som varede mindst 90 minutter. De andre gæster var Peter Kuznick fra American University og professor Victor Gao Zhikai fra Soochow University; værtinde var Li Quiyuan. Diskussionen fokuserede på Kinas rolle med hensyn til at skabe fred, især i konflikten mellem Rusland og Ukraine, men vigtigst af alt for verden som helhed.

Her er udvekslingerne mellem fru Li og fru Zepp-LaRouche.

CGTN: Og fru LaRouche, lad mig høre din holdning til dette: Hvilke centrale budskaber fik du ud af udenrigsminister Wangs pressekonference?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg var faktisk meget tilfreds med tonen, fordi det var som en tilbagevenden til fornuften. Det står i skarp kontrast til stemningen i de europæiske og amerikanske medier og den førte politik i de seneste dage. Fokuseringen på at løse problemer gennem diplomati, på at opretholde principperne i FN-pagten og på at have en overordnet holdning til problemløsning gennem samarbejde, var et tiltrængt frisk pust. Og jeg er meget, meget opmuntret, fordi Kina faktisk indtager en ledende rolle i verden lige nu, hvilket der er hårdt brug for.

CGTN: Udenrigsministeren sagde, og jeg citerer hans ord: "Kina vil gerne arbejde sammen med det internationale samfund for at fremme forhandlingerne, når det er nødvendigt", selv om han ikke specifikt sagde på hvilken måde. Men Kina understregede vigtigheden af at holde dialogen helt åben fremover.

Et andet spørgsmål, som blev rejst af journalister på pressekonferencen, er, om denne konflikt eller denne krise i Ukraine vil påvirke relationerne mellem Kina og EU. Så fru Zepp-LaRouche, lad mig høre din holdning til dette? Der er en vis bekymring for, at denne konflikt vil påvirke forholdet mellem Kina og EU. Udenrigsministeren sagde, at dialog og samarbejde mellem Kina og Europa er baseret på gensidig respekt og gensidig fordel, og det vil skabe mere stabilitet i den turbulente verdenssituation. Og han opfordrer også indtrængende EU til at udarbejde en uafhængig Kina-politik. Hvad mener du om denne kommentar?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg finder, at situationen er meget alvorlig, fordi f.eks. handelen mellem EU og Kina, som hidtil har været en søjle i verdensøkonomien, er truet af det, der sker mellem

Ukraine og Rusland. Stemningen i Europa lige nu er ganske forfærdelig, og jeg kan kun tilslutte, at der bør findes nye løsninger, som udenrigsministeren giver håb om.

Jeg er af den overbevisning, at den kinesiske politiske model, den forenede fremtid for en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden, efter min mening er det, der er brug for lige nu, – professor Kuznick har ret, når han understreger, hvor vigtigt det er, at der er brug for noget helt andet. Hvis vi fortsætter geopolitikken som hidtil, er det et spørgsmål om tid, hvornår menneskeheden støder ind i muren, og det kan føre til en atomar udryddelse.

Modellen, der passer perfekt til det fælles samfund af den samlede menneskehed, ville være at indkalde til en konference, en international konference, der skulle varetage de sikkerhedsmæssige interesser for hvert enkelt land på jorden. For man kan ikke have en fredsordning uden at tage hensyn til alle landes interesser, og der findes en model i den europæiske historie, nemlig Westfalens Fred. Den Westfalske Fred afsluttede 150 års religionskrig, der kulminerede i Trediveårskrigen, og den var baseret på en erkendelse fra alle krigens parter om, at hvis krigen fortsatte, ville der ikke være nogen tilbage til at nyde resultatet af den. Og det er i en vis forstand en parallel til den situation, vi står over for overfor i dag, for hvis det kommer til en atomkrig, vil der ikke være nogen vinder, der vil ikke engang være nogen tilbage til at kommentere resultatet.

Dette bør være en motivation for at indkalde til en ny konference om Den Westfalske Fred med det specifikke formål at udarbejde en international ny sikkerhedsarkitektur, som ville omfatte Rusland og Kina i perfekt overensstemmelse med præsident Xi Jinpings politik om menneskehedens skæbnefællesskab og den ene fremtid, som vi alle deler.

CGTN: Kina er vært for dette års BRICS-topmøde. APEC- og G20-møderne vil også blive afholdt i Asien i år.

Udenrigsministeren sagde, at "Asiens tid er oprundet i den globale styring", og "de vil forvandle sig fra følgere til frontløbere og endog foregangsmænd". Fru LaRouche, lad mig høre din holdning til dette: Det er meget stærke ord, der kommer fra udenrigsministeren. Hvad mener du om hans vurdering her?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Det er helt rigtigt, fordi de asiatiske lande generelt, ikke kun Kina, men også nogle andre asiatiske lande, er meget bevidste om deres 5.000 år gamle historie, og ud fra dette synspunkt med en positiv tradition, definerer de en fremtid, og de ønsker at udvikles. Det er den fælles idé i BRICS, SCO og endda andre organisationer, og dette står i skarp kontrast til Europa og USA. Idéen om en ny model for internationale forbindelser, hvis disse organisationer – selv om de skulle blive inddraget i G20 – idéen om, at man har brug for en ny model for internationale forbindelser, som Wang Yi har understreget igen i dag, bør tilføres substans.

Vi har valget mellem at ende i en geopolitisk konfrontation, som vil være til skade for alle og muligvis føre til atomkrig, eller også foretager vi et spring i civilisationens udvikling, ved at definere de internationale forbindelser i en bestemt retning i traditionen fra den alliancefrie bevægelse, Bandung-konferencen og FN-pagtens fem principper for fredelig sameksistens; men også at skabe en vision om at løse menneskehedens største problemer i fællesskab, f.eks. at vi stadig er ramt af en pandemi, og at vi har brug for et moderne sundhedssystem i hvert enkelt land for at bekæmpe denne pandemi og risikoen for nye pandemier. Vi har en hungersnød i verden af, som Beasley fra World Food Program til stadighed siger, "af bibelske dimensioner". Den vil blive større på grund af inflationen i fødevarerpriserne, i gødningspriserne og i energipriserne.

Så der er en presserende dagsorden. Dette år kan bruges til at fastslå, at vi har brug for en ny model for internationale forbindelser, som overvinder geopolitikken: Udenrigsminister

Wang Yi og også præsident Xi Jinping har henvist hertil ved at foreslå, at Bælte- og vejinitiativet skal samarbejde med USA's "Build Back Better"-initiativ og EU's Global Gateway. Hvis det besluttes at disse initiativer strømlines i stedet for at konkurrere, så beslutter vi også, sammen at tage fat på det der belaster hele menneskeheden såsom sult i verden, epidemier og fattigdom. Dette skal ses i lyset af , at det nuværende finansielle system i den transatlantiske sektor, er gået helt i stå. Vi står nu over for et nyt sammenbrud, der er meget værre end i 2008.

Federal Reserve var ikke i stand til at " tilpasse" renten, fordi de er bange for, at hvis de øger renten, vil der opstå et omfattende kollaps af konkurser. Så der er et presserende behov for at få et nyt finansielt system, et nyt Bretton Woods-system, et nyt kreditsystem, der giver kredit til udvikling af alle udviklingslande – det er nogle af de punkter, som virkelig vil være menneskehedens udfordring. Kan vi, når vi står over for grundlæggende udfordringer, skabe en orden, der gør det muligt for alle mennesker på denne planet at overleve og blive lykkelige? Jeg tror, at det vil være dagsordenen.

Videokonference

på

treårsdagen for Lyndon LaRouches død: Hvorfor verden har brug for LaRouches opdagelsesmetode, Lørdag den 12. februar kl. 20

Lyndon LaRouches revolutionære ideer om fysisk økonomi, ideen om de nødvendige konstante opjusteringer af den verdensøkonomiske platform, er baseret på den universelle nødvendighed af kreative opdagelser. Man kan nærme sig denne idé ved at se på LaRouches arbejde med at fremme idéerne fra især tre videnskabsmænd: Leibniz, Bernard Riemann og Vladimir Vernadskij. Anvendelserne af LaRouches arbejde blev til idéen om udviklingskorridoren i 1980'erne, og er det aktive program, der nu er kendt som "Operation Ibn Sina", som i høj grad er en del af Schiller Instituttets Komité for Modsætningers Sammenfald.

Blandt talerne vil være Harley Schlanger og medlemmer af LaRouche-organisationen.

(Komitéen blev grundlagt af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, den tidligere amerikanske chefmilitærlæge i USA Joycelyn Elders, da COVID-pandemien brød ud, og der var behov for et moderne globalt sundhedssystem. Denne omfattende platform kræver, at der skabes 1,5 milliarder produktive arbejdspladser for at skaffe vand, elektricitet og anden infrastruktur til at skabe et moderne sundhedsvæsen i alle nationer på planeten.)

Video: Samarbej med Kina. Det er ikke fjenden.

Interview med Li Xing, PhD, professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet

KØBENHAVN, 27. januar 2022 – Schiller Institutet i Danmark har gennemført et vigtigt, timelangt videointerview med Li Xing, ph.d., professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet i Danmark. Li Xing er medlem af det samfundsvidenskabelige fakultet på Institut for Politik og Samfund og leder af forskningscentret for udvikling og internationale relationer. Han er oprindeligt fra Jiaxing nær Shanghai og arbejdede i Beijing, inden han kom til Danmark i 1988 for at tage sin kandidat- og ph.d.-grad.

Det omfattende interview dækker Kinas forbindelser med USA, Europa (USA–Kina-rivalisering), Rusland (Kina ville støtte Rusland, hvis det blev smidt ud af Swift-betalingsystemet), Europa og Afrika (Kinas udviklingsprogram er en hjælp for Europa i forbindelse med flygtningeproblemet), Latinamerika (Kina har fremmet den økonomiske udvikling i USA's baghave, mens USA har været fokuseret på krige og farverevolutioner), Afghanistan (med helhjertet støtte til Operation Ibn Sina) og andre udviklingslande.

Det omfatter også, hvad professor Li Xing ville sige til præsident Biden om forbindelserne med Kina, Xi Jinpings Davos-tale, Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og Xinjiang-spørgsmålet. Han opfordrer USA og Europa til at samarbejde med Kina om deres respektive nødvendige infrastrukturudvikling, for at fremme

udviklingen af de underudviklede lande og for at droppe den geopolitiske taber-strategi. Han slutter med at rose Schiller Instituttets udviklingsprogrammer for verden.

Interviewet, der blev foretaget af Michelle Rasmussen, vil blive transskriberet til offentliggørelse i EIR og er nu tilgængeligt på Schiller Instituttets YouTube-kanal i Danmark.

Here is a pdf version published in Executive Intelligence Review, Vol. 49, No. 5 (www.larouchepub.com/eiw). We encourage you to subscribe.:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

INTERVIEW

Professor Li Xing

Cooperate with China – It Is Not the Enemy

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Prof. Li Xing, PhD, conducted on Jan. 26 by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. Dr. Li is a professor of Development and International Relations at the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Aalborg University. Li Xing was born in Jiaxing, China, near Shanghai. He earned his BA at the Guangzhou Institute of Foreign Languages. He came to Denmark from Beijing in 1988 for his MA and later completed his PhD studies at Aalborg University.

Subheads have been added. A video of the interview is available here . <https://youtu.be/rulmlczmaTE>

Michelle Rasmussen: Welcome, Professor Li Xing, thank you so much for allowing me to interview you.

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you too.

Michelle Rasmussen: Li Xing, as we speak, there is an

overhanging threat of war between the United States and NATO against Russia and China, countries which the war faction in the West sees as a threat to the disintegrating, unipolar Anglo-American world dominance.

On the other hand, the Schiller Institute has led an international campaign to try to get the U.S. and Europe to cooperate with Russia and China to solve the great crises in the world, especially the pandemic, the financial and economic crises, the underdevelopment of the poor countries, and the cultural crisis in the West. Our international president, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, has stated that the U.S.-China relationship will be the most important relationship in the future.

You recently gave a lecture at the Danish Institute for International Studies about the U.S.-China rivalry. And you are a contributor to the book *The Telegram: A China Agenda for President Biden* by Sarwar Kashmiri, which was published in 2021 by the Foreign Policy Association in New York City. The book is composed of statements by the contributors of what each would say if they were granted a personal meeting with President Biden. What would your advice be to President Biden regarding China?

Advice to President Biden

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you for giving me this chance for this interview. If I had the chance to meet the President, I would say to him:

Hello, President Biden. I think that it is a pity that you didn't change Trump's China policy, especially regarding the trade war and the tariff. We can see from the current situation that in the U.S., the shortages issue, the inflation issue, these are all connected with tariff issue. Many congressmen and senators are calling for the removal of the tariffs. So, I really think that the president should give

second thoughts to continuing the trade war. Contrary to this, though, the data from 2020 and 2021 shows that the China-U.S. trade actually surged almost 30%, compared with early years. So, the trade war didn't work.

The second issue is the competition in the area of high technology areas, especially regarding the chip industry. I'd say to him:

Mr. President, the U.S. has the upper hand in that technology, and China has the largest market. I think that if the U.S. continues to use a technology sanction on Chinese chips, then the whole country and the whole nation will increase the investment on the chips. Once China has the technology, then the U.S. would both lose the market, and also lose the advantage in that technology.

So, this is the second issue, I think the president should give a thought to.

The third issue, which I think is a very touchy issue, is the Taiwan issue. I would really advise the President:

Mr. President, to play the Taiwan card needs caution, because Taiwan is the center of Chinese politics, in its historical memory, and the most important national project in the unification process. So, to play the Taiwan card really needs caution.

But still, I would also say to the President:

Mr. President, China and the U.S. have a lot of areas for cooperation. For example, climate change; for example, North Korea, Iran, Afghanistan; and last but not least, because China has great technology and skill in terms of infrastructure, so you, Mr. President, should invite China to come to the U.S. and play a role in the U.S. infrastructure construction projects. That would be an ideal situation to promote bilateral relations.

Attitude of the U.S. Toward China

Michelle Rasmussen: In your statement in the book, *The Telegram*, you address whether the United States should consider China as an enemy or as rival. What would you say to the American people about the attitude that the United States should have towards China?

Prof. Li Xing: I don't think that the U.S. should regard China as an enemy, but as a rival. I think there is a truth in that because China is obviously a rival to the United States on many, many grounds, both in materials and also in ideation. Nevertheless, it is not an enemy. China and the U.S. have so many areas of cooperation as you point out, that this bilateral relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world. Were this relationship turned into an enemy relationship, it would be a disaster for the world.

Michelle Rasmussen: On January 17, Chinese President Xi Jinping addressed the World Economic Forum in Davos. What do you think is most important for people in the West to understand about his speech?

Prof. Li Xing: Xi Jinping was invited to the World Economic Forum, and he sent some messages. In his address he admitted that economic globalization has created problems, but that this should not constitute a justification to write off everything regarding globalization, regarding international cooperation. So, he suggested that the world should adapt and guide globalization.

He also rejected the protectionist forces on the rise in the West, saying that history has proved time and time again that confrontation does not solve problems; it only invites catastrophic consequences.

President Xi also particularly mentioned protectionism, unilateralism, indirectly referring to the U.S., emphasizing that this phenomenon will only hurt the interest of others as

well as itself, meaning that the U.S. trade war, or sanctions against China, will hurt both. It's not a win-win, it's a lose-lose. President Xi delivered a message that rejects a "zero sum" approach. I think it was a very constructive message from President Xi Jinping. He totally rejects, if I interpret his address correctly, the Cold War mentality. He doesn't want to see a Cold War mentality emerge in either the U.S., or in China.

The Belt and Road Concept

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on now to the question of the Belt and Road Initiative. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Schiller Institute has worked to establish a new Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, and many of these economic principles have been coming to life through China's Belt and Road Initiative. Li Xing, in 2019 you wrote a book, Mapping China's One Belt One Road Initiative, and have lectured on this. How has the Belt and Road Initiative created economic development in the underdeveloped countries?

Prof. Li Xing: First of all, I think that we need to understand the Belt and Road concept—the historicity behind the Belt and Road; that the Belt and Road is not an international aid program. We have to keep that in mind. It is an infrastructure project attempting to link Eurasia. It has two routes. One is a land route, consisting of six corridors. Then, it has another route called the Maritime Silk Road. Globally, about 138 countries, ranging from Italy to Saudi Arabia to Cambodia, have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with China. Just recently another country in Latin America signed up with the Belt and Road.

The idea of the Belt and Road is founded on two basic Chinese economic strengths. One is surplus capital. China has a huge amount of surplus capital in its banks, which it can use for investments. The second is that after 40 years of

infrastructure development in China, China has huge technology and skill, particularly in the infrastructure development area. So, the Belt and Road is basically an infrastructure development project.

The driving force of China's Belt and Road is that after 40 years of economic development, China is experiencing a similar situation experienced by the advanced countries in world economic history—for example, rising wages, overproduction, overcapacity, and a lot of surplus capital.

So, China is looking for what the Marxist analytical lens calls a "spatial fix," as in its domestic market, the mass production manufacturing is getting extremely large. In looking beyond Chinese territory at Chinese neighbors, China has discovered that all the countries around China are actually very, very far behind in infrastructure development. So, it's kind of a win-win situation. The idea behind the Belt and Road is a kind of a win-win situation.

Historically, the Post World War II Marshall Plan in Europe, and the military aid to East Asia, were, you could say, like Belt and Road projects, helping those countries to enhance economic development. I recently came across a World Bank study pointing out that if the Belt and Road projects were successfully implemented, the real income level throughout the entire region would rise between two or four times. At the global level, the real income can rise between 0.7 -2.9%. So, you can say, the international financial institutions, and economic institutions like World Bank, are also very positive toward the Belt and Road.

However, the Belt and Road also has four areas which we need to be concerned about. Number one: the debt trap, which has been discussed quite a lot at the global level. Number two: transparency, whether the Belt and Road projects in different countries are transparent. This, too, is an issue for debate. Number three: corruption, whether Chinese investments in

countries creates corruption by local officials. The number four area for concern is the environmental and social cost. So, these definitely need to be taken care of, both by China and those countries.

As a whole, I think the Belt and Road project is huge. It's very constructive. But we also need to consider its potential to create bad effects. We need to tackle all these effects collectively.

'Debt Trap' Diplomacy

Michelle Rasmussen: When you spoke just now about a debt trap, our correspondent Hussein Askary, who covers the Muslim world, and also developments in Africa, has argued against the idea that China is creating a debt trap, pointing out that many of the countries owe much more money to Western powers, than they do to China, and that China has done things like forgiving debt, or transferring physical assets to those governments, because the debt trap accusation has been used as the primary argument against the Belt and Road. Do you think that this is a legitimate argument or that this is overplayed to try to just create suspicion about the Belt and Road?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I fully agree, actually, with the comment you just quoted from another study. It is true that the "debt trap" has been used by Western media, or those politicians who are against the Belt and Road, as an excuse, as a kind of a dark picture. But, according to my research, China actually understands this problem, and very often, the Chinese government uses different measures, or different policies, to tackle this problem. One is to write off the debt entirely, when the borrowing country would really suffer, if it had to repay. For example, the Chinese government announced that during the pandemic, debt service payments from some poor countries is suspended until their economic situation improves.

China is a central-government-based country. State policy plays a bigger role than in the political system of the West, where different interest groups drive their countries' policies into different directions. Therefore, the Chinese central government is able to play a bigger role than Western governments in tackling debt problems.

Michelle Rasmussen: What has this meant for the underdeveloped countries, for example, in Africa, and other poor countries in Asia, in Ibero-America? What has the Belt and Road Initiative meant for their economic development?

Prof. Li Xing: The increasing number of countries that have signed up with the Belt and Road, shows that the Belt Road project is comparatively quite welcomed. I have also followed many debates in Africa, where many African leaders were asked the question and they completely agree. They say that the situation regarding the debt of the old time, their experiences with the colonial countries, is quite different from the debt incurred with China's investment projects or development projects. So, they still have confidence in China's foreign development policies, especially in the Belt and Road project. From the many studies and reports I have read so far; they have strong confidence in that.

Infrastructure Means Development

Michelle Rasmussen: What would you say about the role of infrastructure development in China in creating this unprecedented economic growth and lifting people out of poverty? What role has infrastructure played in the incredible poverty elimination policy that China actually succeeded in achieving this year?

Prof. Li Xing: The entire 40-year history of China's economic growth and economic development, and China's prosperity, is based on the lesson that infrastructure is one of the most important factors leading to China's economic success. China

has a slogan: "If you want to get rich, build a road." Infrastructure is connected with every aspect of national economy. The raw materials industry, the metal industry, you name it. Cement industry, etc. Infrastructure is really the center of a nation's economy, which can really get different areas of the country running. So, I think this experience of China is really a good lesson, not only for China itself, but also for the rest of the world, especially for developing countries.

That's why China's Belt and Road project, identified as infrastructure projects, is really welcomed by many people, and especially President Biden. Even though his budget was not passed, because of the resistance, or even if it's shrunken, the idea about improving U.S. infrastructure, became a kind of hot spot. I think that the U.S. needs to increase its infrastructure investment as well. Definitely.

Europe-China Relations

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on to Europe and China relations. You have edited the book China-U.S. Relations at a Crossroads: "Systemic Rivalry" or "Strategic Partnership." What is your evaluation and recommendation about European-Chinese relations? When we spoke earlier, you had a comment about how the impact of African development, if there would be development or not in Africa, would impact Europe. Could you also include your idea about that?

Prof. Li Xing: EU-China relations are increasingly complex, and affected by a number of interrelated factors, such as China's rise, the growing China-U.S. rivalry, U.S. global withdrawal, especially under the Trump administration, the trans-Atlantic split, the Brexit, and at the same time, the China-Russia comprehensive alliance. Under these broad transformations of the global order, EU-China relations are also getting very complex. Right now, I feel that the EU and China are struggling to find a dynamic and durable mode of

engagement, to achieve a balance between opportunities on the one side, and challenges on the other, and also between partnership and rivalry.

For instance, China and the EU successfully reached what is called the EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment treaty in December 2020. It was a joyful moment. However, in 2021, due to the Hong Kong events, the Xinjiang issue, and mutual sanctions in 2021, this investment treaty was suspended. Not abandoned but suspended. You can see that the relationship can be hurt by events. It's really difficult to find a balance between strategic partnership and systemic rivalry. "Systemic rivalry" was the official term used in a European Commission document, "EU-China—A Strategic Outlook," issued March 12, 2019. That document states that China is "simultaneously ... an economic competitor in the pursuit of technological leadership, and a systemic rival promoting alternative models of governance."

So, you can see that a systemic rival means alternative normative values. That's why it's a new term, when used in that way. It shows that China's development has both a material impact, and, also, an ideational impact—that many countries are becoming attracted by the Chinese success. For that reason, the Chinese, and the rise of China is increasingly regarded as a systemic rival.

On the other hand, the message from my book is also that the EU must, one way or another, become autonomous, and design an independent China policy. Sometimes I feel that the EU-China policy is somehow pushed around or carried by U.S. global interests, or affected by the U.S.-China competition. I really think Europe needs an independent China policy. You know, the EU is thinking of developing "defence independence." That is, it is pursuing autonomy in defense. But that's something else.

According to data from Kishore Mahbubani, a very well-known Singaporean public intellectual and professor, the Belt and

Road has special meaning for Europe in relation to Africa. This is of importance to your question about Africa.

According to his data on the demographic explosion in Africa, Africa's population in the 1950s was half of that of Europe. Today, Africa's population is 2.5 times that of Europe. By 2100, Africa's population will be 10 times of that of Europe. So, if Africa still suffers from underdevelopment, if any crisis appears, where will African refugees migrate? Europe!

From Kishore's point of view, the Belt and Road is doing Europe a "favor," so Europe should be very supportive of China's Belt and Road project. I totally agree with that. What he says is also a part of the message of my book.

A 'Differentiated' Europe

Michelle Rasmussen: You were speaking about Europe becoming more autonomous in its relations with China. Former German Chancellor Angela Merkel has stated openly that Germany should not be forced to choose between the United States and China, that Germany needs to have relations with both. Can you say more about that? Is China Europe's biggest trading partner?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, since November last year.

Michelle Rasmussen: There's differentiation inside Europe. For example, the Eastern European countries have a forum called "16+1," where 16 Eastern European countries, plus China, have a more developed Belt and Road cooperation with China, than the Western countries. And there's differentiation in the western European countries. You mentioned that some are making Hong Kong and Xinjiang into obstacles to improving European relations to China. What would you say to these concerns?

Prof. Li Xing: China-EU relations are being affected by many, many factors. One is, as you mentioned, about 16+1, but now it's 17+1, because, I think two years ago, Greece became a part of 16+1, so now it's 17+1. And the western part of the

EU, was quite worried about the 17+1 because some think that the Belt and Road plays a role in dividing Europe. Because Europe has this common policy, common strategy, and common action toward the Belt and Road, they also see the 17+1 grouping as somehow playing a divisive role. So, the EU is not very happy about that. Because you're right, the Belt and Road is more developed in the eastern part of the EU. This is one issue.

The second issue is that the EU has to make a balance between China on the one side, and the U.S. on the other. Right now, my assessment is that the EU is somehow being pushed to choose the U.S. side. It's fine with me, from my analytical point of view, that the EU, most of the countries in the West, the traditional U.S. allies—like including Denmark—if they choose the U.S., that's fine. But my position is that their choosing sides should be based on their own analysis, their own national interests, not purely on the so-called values and norms, that the U.S. and EU share norms, and therefore should have a natural alliance. I think that is not correct. I always advise Western politicians, thinktanks, and policy makers that they should study China-U.S. relations or EU-China-U.S. relations and try to find their own foreign policies. What is the correct direction? And based on their own judgment, based on their own research results, not based on what the U.S. wants them to do.

Michelle Rasmussen: One of Denmark's top former diplomats, Friis Arne Petersen, has been Denmark's ambassador to the United States, to China, and to Germany. At the Danish Institute for International Studies, he recently called for Europe to join the Belt and Road Initiative. Why do you think it would be in the interest of Europe and the United States to join or cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative, instead of treating it as a geopolitical threat?

Prof. Li Xing: Well, on the Belt and Road, as we have already discussed, we must first understand what it is. I fully agree

with Friis Arne Petersen. When he was Ambassador to Beijing, I met him at one of the international conferences. He was always very positive towards Denmark-China cooperation. I fully agree with his point on the Belt and Road. But we have to understand, first of all, why the West is nervous about the Belt and Road. This is very important, because the European's or the American's worry is based on two perspectives. One is geopolitics. The second is norm diffusion. Geopolitics means that through the Belt and Road, China's economic political influence will gradually expand to cover all of Eurasia, which is not in the interest of the West. This is a geopolitical rationale.

Then the second perspective is norm diffusion, which means that through the Belt and Road, the Chinese development model spreads. As I mentioned before, because of the global attraction to China, the Chinese development model will be consolidated and extended through the Belt and Road, and that is also not in the interest of the West. That's why China is a "systemic rival," because it has a norm diffusion effect. We have to understand these two aspects.

But why should Europe support the Belt and Road? I have already discussed this issue in my answer to your previous question regarding the importance of infrastructure development, and regarding why Europe should support the Belt and Road, especially in the context of Africa.

Michelle Rasmussen: And you also spoke about the need for infrastructure development in the United States. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the United States a grade point average of C- for the state of its infrastructure. Looking at high speed rail in China and in the United States, there's nothing to compare.

Prof. Li Xing: No, no.

Michelle Rasmussen: In its 14th Five-Year Plan, China has

committed itself to increase its high-speed rail lines by one third, from the present 38,000 kilometers to 50,000 kilometers by 2025. The U.S. has maybe a hundred and fifty kilometers.

Prof. Li Xing: I was told by American friends that the U.S. has not invested heavily in infrastructure for many, many decades, about half century, something like that. I was shocked to hear that. So, I think Biden's idea of infrastructure investment is great, but somehow the bill could not be agreed on by the Congress, and also the Senate, due to partisan conflict.

Michelle Rasmussen: And it was not very ambitious in any case.

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, totally.

Reordering the World Order

Michelle Rasmussen: It was a step in the right direction, but was not very ambitious.

Let's move on to Latin America, which we in the Schiller Institute call Ibero-America. That's because our members say that the Spanish language did not proceed from Latin. The Iberian Peninsula is Portugal and Spain, so Ibero-America is a better term. In any case, Li Xing, you are working on a study, China-U.S. Rivalry and Regional Reordering in Latin America. Can you please share the main idea with us?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes. I'm working on this book, together with a group of Latin American scholars from different countries in the region. The objective of the book is to provide a good conceptualization, first, of the changing world order, and the reordering process. When we talk about that the world order is changing because of the U.S.-China rivalry, at the same time, we also suggest that the world is experiencing a reordering process, that we do not know the future order, or the new order, but the world is in the process of reordering, driven by the China-U.S. rivalry.

The book will also try to convey that the U.S.-China rivalry, according to our conceptualization, is “intra-core. According to the world system theory, you have a core which is the advanced economy countries, then you have a semi-periphery, and then you have a periphery. The semi-periphery is between periphery and the core, and the periphery is the vast number of developing countries. So the China-U.S. rivalry, competition, especially in high technologies in the security areas, is between these two core countries, or is intra-core.

The China-U.S. rivalry also represents a struggle between two types of capitalism. On the one side is Chinese state capitalism, very centralized, state led, with central planning. On the other side is the U.S. free market, individual capitalist economy. Somehow the China model is gradually appearing to be more competitive. Of course, the U.S. doesn't agree with that assessment, at least from the current perspectives.

So, this rivalry must have a great impact on the whole world, especially on the developing world we call the Global South. Here we've tried to focus on the U.S.-China rivalry, and its impact on the Latin American and Caribbean region.

The message of the book is, first, that global redistribution of power is inevitable. It's still in process, and the emerging world order is likely to be dominated by more than one superpower, so the world order will likely look like a polycentric world, with a number of centripetals competing for high positions or strong positions. This is the first message.

The second message is that the situation shows that the world is in a reordering process driven by the competition between the two superpowers, and it poses opportunities, and also constraints, to different regions, especially for the Global South, such as Latin America, because Latin America is the U.S. backyard; it is the subject of American doctrines—that North America and South America, are a sphere of U.S.

influence.

The Monroe Doctrine

Michelle Rasmussen: You're talking about the Monroe Doctrine?

Prof. Li Xing: The Monroe Doctrine. Thank you very much. North America and South America have to be within the U.S. hegemonic influence. No external power is allowed to have a hand in, or interference in these two regions. You can say that China's relations with Latin America has really been increasing tremendously during the past two decades.

At the same time, the U.S. was busy with its anti-terrorism wars, and its creation of color revolutions in other parts of the world. If you look at the investment in infrastructure, and also imports of agriculture, China-Latin American trade and Chinese investment in Latin America are increasing tremendously, dramatically, which becomes a worry, a really deep worry, to the U.S.

The different scholars, the book's chapter authors, will use different countries and country cases as examples to provide empirical evidence to our "theoretical conceptualization." This book will be published around summertime by Brill, a very good publisher in Holland.

Michelle Rasmussen: Well, actually, the Monroe Doctrine was adopted in 1823, in the very early history of the United States. This is after the United States had become a republic and had freed itself from the British Empire. It was actually John Quincy Adams—

Prof. Li Xing: Exactly.

Michelle Rasmussen:—who was actually involved in the idea, which was that the United States would not allow imperialism, imperial powers to bring their great power games into Latin and South America, but that the United States would help those

countries become independent republics. So the question becomes, will Chinese policy strengthen the ability of the Ibero-American countries to be republics and enjoy economic development, or is China's intention also a kind of imperialism?

Prof. Li Xing: Based on your definitions, on your conceptualization of the Monroe Doctrine, you can say that there are two implications. One is that the U.S. should defend these two regions from imperialist intervention. The U.S. itself was not an imperial power at that time. The U.S. didn't have intentions to become a global interventionist then, but today it is a different situation.

Second, that the U.S. definitely interprets Chinese investment and infrastructure cooperation, and economic investment in Latin America as "helping," to consolidate the country's independence? No, I don't think that is the case. That would be a kind of positive-sum game. Today, unluckily, these two countries are trapped into a zero-sum game. Whatever China is doing in the South American region, is interpreted as not being good for United States. That's a very unfortunate situation.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, we in the Schiller Institute have said that if the United States were to join with China to have even better economic development in Ibero-America; that would be a win-win policy. You spoke about the immigration challenge from Africa to Europe. It's the same thing from Ibero-America to the United States. People would much rather stay in their own countries if there were jobs, if there were economic development,

Prof. Li Xing: Yes.

Michelle Rasmussen: And if the United States would join with China, then instead of—

Prof. Li Xing: —building the wall! Instead of building the

wall!

Michelle Rasmussen: Exactly, exactly.

Prof. Li Xing: Yeah, I agree with you.

Operation Ibn Sina

Michelle Rasmussen: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the President of the Schiller Institute, has stated that one very important way to lessen the war danger between the United States, Russia and China would be for these countries to join forces to save the people of Afghanistan, where there is the worst humanitarian crisis in the world now, after the war, the drought, and the freezing of Afghanistan's central bank assets by the western countries. She has proposed what she calls Operation Ibn Sina, named after the great physician and philosopher from that region, to build a modern health system in Afghanistan to save the people from disease, and as a lever to stimulate economic development.

I know that when we spoke about Afghanistan before, you also referred to very important discussions now going on in Oslo, for the first time, between the Taliban and Western governments, including in the United States.

But what do you think about this idea of China and the United States, and also Russia and other countries, joining hands to act to alleviate the terrible crisis for the people of Afghanistan?

Prof. Li Xing: It's a superb idea. This is one of the initiatives by the Schiller Institute. When I read your website, you have many development projects, and this one is a great idea. This is one of the areas I mentioned where the U.S. and China have a common interest. Unfortunately, what is happening today is the Ukraine crisis and the China-U.S. rivalry—so many battle fronts—puts Afghanistan more into the background.

Right now, the Taliban delegation is talking with the West in Oslo, and I really hope there will be a constructive result, because after the U.S. withdrew from Afghanistan, Afghanistan's Taliban government immediately went to China. And it was a Chinese interest. It was in China's fundamental interest to help Afghanistan, because if Afghanistan is safe and prosperous, then there will be no terror and terrorism coming from Afghanistan across the border. Many of the terrorists in Xinjiang actually based themselves in Afghanistan. So it is in China's national interest to help Afghanistan.

Right now, I don't know whether it is still in the U.S. interest to help Afghanistan. The U.S. might be tired of that region, because the U.S. lost two trillion dollars in the Afghanistan war, without any positive results. So, I do not know. I cannot tell the what the U.S. politicians' feelings are, but the U.S. holds \$9.5 billion of Afghanistan assets. And I think that money has to be released to help in the country's rebuilding.

And particularly, the Schiller Institute's suggestion of a health care system is the priority. When people are in good health, then people can work, and earn money. When people have a job or have a family, normally, people do not move. According to refugee studies, people normally do not move just because of a shortage. People move because of a situation devastated by war, by climate change, by various crises. Otherwise, people are relatively stable and want to stay in their homeland.

Xinjiang

Michelle Rasmussen: You mentioned Xinjiang again now. Do you have something to say about Xinjiang for people in the West?

Prof. Li Xing: I think that there are a lot of misunderstandings between the West and China, especially the

misunderstanding from the Western side concerning Xinjiang. The other day, I saw a debate at Oxford University between an American former politician and a British former politician, about whether China is a friend or a foe. The American representative put forward the claim that in Xinjiang, we are experiencing what is called genocide. But later, at the end of his discussion, he admitted that there is no genocide, but he deliberately used genocide as a kind of provocation in order to receive attention from the world. The British representative asked if this view caused such a bad misunderstanding, misperception, then why not just give it up?

Do not use genocide. You can criticize China for human rights abuses. You can criticize China for its minority policies, etc. But to deliberately defame China is not a good way. I don't think it's a good way. We also have to be fair.

On the one side, you can criticize China's policy treating problems in the minorities and others. But you have to also condemn terrorist actions because there were a lot of terrorist bomb killings in that region, especially from 2012-2015, around that time.

I was in Xinjiang as a tourist in 2011, and I was advised to not pass by some streets, because there could be some risks. You can see that it was a very tense situation because of a lot of bombings. People pointed out to me, here were some bombings, there were some bombings. You don't understand. So, the West should be fair and condemn these things, while at same time, also advising the Chinese government to develop a more constructive policy to resolve the problem, rather than using harsh policies. It has to be fair. This is the first point.

Second, is that genocide not only defames China, it's also contrary, it's opposite to the facts. Twenty years ago, 30 years ago, Xinjiang's Uighur population was about five million or eight million. But after 30 years, I think it's about 11-13

million. I do not know exactly, but there has been a growth of population. How can you claim genocide, when the local population is increasing? Do you understand my point? So, this is not a good attitude. It is not a very good way to discuss with China and it makes China much more resistant in talking with you, when China fears that it is being defamed.

When some Western sources, in particular one German scholar, use a lot of data from a Turkish scholar, who is connected to the "minority resistance" from Xinjiang, then the credibility, reliability of the source is in question. You understand my point. So, the Xinjiang issue is rather complicated, but the West and China should have a dialogue, rather than use in this specific discourse rhetoric to frame China in a way that China is the bad guy. It should be condemned. I think this is not constructive.

The SWIFT System

Michelle Rasmussen: Going back to the war danger, what do you think the impact on China and on the world economy would be, were the U.S. to force Russia out of the SWIFT international payment system, or similar draconian measures?

Prof. Li Xing: Let me tell you that Olaf Scholz, the current German Chancellor, already expressed it very well, saying that if Russia were sanctioned and pushed out of the SWIFT payment system, then Europe could not pay Russia for its gas and oil. "If we can't pay Russia, then Russia will not supply us. Then what should we do?"

I read in the news today that the U.S. said, "We could supply most of Russia's oil and gas." Then Europe began to ponder: "Well then, this war has become your war, you know—a very egoistical interest, because you actually want to replace Russia's gas and oil supply. That's why you want to instigate the war."

So, I think it's the U.S. that has to be very cautious in its

sanctions, because the only sanctions possibilities for the United States today against major powers is financial, is payment—it's the U.S. dollar. That's the intermediate currency, the SWIFT system.

And when China sees this, that only strengthened China's conclusion to develop what we call electronic currency. China is using a lot of energy today investing in electronic currency. This electronic currency is a real currency. It's just electronic. It's being implemented in some big cities in test trials.

Then, back to the SWIFT system, [if a country were thrown out] it would be rather impossible or would rather create a lot of problems in the international payment system, then the whole system will more or less collapse, because most countries watch this, and they will try to think about how they should react in the future if the U.S. uses the same system of sanctions against them. I just mentioned China, but also many other countries as well. They have to find an alternative.

One other alternative is to use currencies other than the U.S. dollar as much as possible. I just read in the news today that the Chinese yuan has surpassed the Japanese yen as the fourth international [reserve] currency. And the situation will accelerate in that direction. So, I think that the U.S. should think twice.

On China-Russia relations, I definitely think that China will help Russia in case the U.S. really implements a sanction of pushing Russia out of the SWIFT payment system. China definitely will help Russia, because both face the same pressure, the same struggle, the same robbery from the U.S.

So, it is very bad. It is extremely bad strategy from the U.S. side to fight, simultaneously, on two fronts with two superpowers. This is what Henry Kissinger had said many times during the entire Cold War period. The U.S. was able to keep

relatively stable relations between U.S. and China and between U.S. and the Soviet Union, keeping the Russia and China fighting against each other. But now it's the opposite situation. The U.S. is fighting with two big powers simultaneously. I don't know what is in the mind of the U.S. politicians. I really think that the U.S. needs to redesign its strategic foreign policy.

The Schiller Institute

Michelle Rasmussen: Yeah. We've been speaking mostly about the U.S., but the British really are an instigator in this: the British Old Empire policy of trying to drive a wedge between the United States, Russia and China. That also has a lot to do with the current situation. We spoke before about that the Schiller Institute is trying to get the United States' population to understand that the whole basis for the existence of the United States was the fight against the British Empire, and against this divide and conquer strategy, and, rather, to cooperate with Russia and China.

In conclusion, this conversation has been very wonderful. Do you have any parting words for our audience? We have many people in Europe and in the United States. Do you have any parting words of advice as to how we should look at China and what needs to be different about our policy?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I think that I want my last words, actually, to be invested in talking about the Schiller Institute. I think that some of your programs, some of your projects, and some of your applications are really interesting. The Schiller Institute has a lot of ideas. For example, you just mentioned your campaign for an Afghanistan health care system, but not only in Afghanistan. You promote these ideas for Africa, in developing countries. I really think that the Schiller Institute should continue to promote some of the ideas—a health care system in every country, especially now, considering the pandemic. The rich countries,

including China, are able to produce vaccines, but not the developing countries. The U.S. has more vaccine doses stored up than necessary [for itself]. But Africa still has only a very low percentage of people [who have been vaccinated].

Michelle Rasmussen: I think 8%.

Prof. Li Xing: And we claim the Omicron variant of the coronavirus came from Africa. That's an irony. That's an irony, because it's definite that one day, another variation will come from Latin America, or from some other part of the world.

So, it's rather important for the West, and for China, to think about some of the positive suggestions by your Institute. I'm glad that you invited me for this interview, and I expect to have more cooperation with you. Thank you very much.

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing.

Ruslandsekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen deltog i Debatten på DR2 den 13. januar 2022

KØBENHAVN, 13. januar (EIRNS) – I dag, den samme dag som tidsskriftet EIR offentliggjorde et længere interview med Ruslandsekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen med titlen "Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive de traktater, som Putin foreslår", var han blandt de otte deltagere i Debatten på DR2. Emnet var: Kold Krig med Putin?

Se Debatten her.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen anfægtede nogle af de andre debattørers udsagn om, at Rusland var en slyngelstat, som ikke kun truede Ukraine, men også de baltiske lande. De vigtigste ting, som han sagde, var:

– Problemet var, at vi ikke skabte en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur efter Sovjetunionens sammenbrud, da tiden var moden til det. Putin ønskede, at Rusland skulle blive medlem af NATO, men landet blev efterladt isoleret, og NATO udvidede sig mod øst.

– Hvis Paris-aftalen, som en anden debattør nævnte, var blevet gennemført, ville NATO ikke have udvidet sig mod øst. [Fra1997: Det Stiftende Dokument om Fælles relationer, samarbejde og Sikkerhed mellem NATO og Den Russiske Føderation]

– Det er utænkeligt, at Rusland ville angribe de baltiske lande.

– Rusland optræder som en stormagt med interesser i sit nærområde, ikke som en ideologisk magt, og landet optræder faktisk bedre end USA gjorde i Mellemøsten eller Latinamerika.

– Krim: Overdragelsen af Krim til Rusland i 2014 var ikke en klassisk annektering. Der blev ikke affyret skud, og befolkningen støtter Rusland.

– Problemet med at Ukraine er en delt nation blev ikke løst. Minsk II-aftalen (2015), som blev formidlet af Tyskland og Frankrig, ville have lavet en ny forfatning med en særlig status for det østlige Ukraine. Vesten pressede ikke på for at få den gennemført, men sendte i stedet våben til Ukraine. Det er klart, at russerne ville reagere.

Eva Flyveholm, Enhedslistens forsvarsordfører, understregede, at det var vigtigt at føre seriøse forhandlinger med Rusland.

Historisk begivenhed i København – En albansk musikskat genoplivet, af Feride Istogu Gillesberg

Indledningen og interviews er på albansk, men nød musikken.
Read the English version below the Danish.

3. januar 2021 – En delegation af fantastiske albanske kunstnere fra Tirana, Albanien, gik sammen med en schweizisk-albansk pianist og to danske sangere om at indspille 50 albanske traditionelle sange, der var arrangeret af Lola Gjoka (Aleksi), den første albanske pianist. Lola Gjokas sange er en sammensmeltning af autentiske albanske folkesange og klassisk musik – en kulturskat, som nu efter syv årtier vil gense dagens lys.

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) 1910-1985, var den første albanske pianist, og spillede en afgørende rolle for at bringe klassisk musik til Albanien. Lola arrangerede 50 albanske sange, baseret på autentiske albanske folkesange, der stadig var levende, som de blev sunget af lokalbefolkningen rundt om i landet. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) skrev melodierne ned og komponerede derefter klaverakkompagnement til sangene, så det var så tro mod sangenes autenticitet som muligt. Disse sange blev en del af de klassiske koncerter, som hun gav sammen med de første bel canto-operasangere i Albanien.

I 1912 fik Albanien endelig sin uafhængighed efter 500 års brutal besættelse af Det Osmanniske Rige – en uafhængighed, der blev opnået mod alle odds. Da tyrkerne endelig var ude, forsøgte nabolandene alt, hvad de kunne, for at dele Albanien

mellem sig, hvilket til dels lykkedes. Da vi endelig fik en nation, var ønsket om at komme ud af den ekstreme politiske, økonomiske og kulturelle tilbagestående levende i Albanien sjæl og ånd.

Hvordan den klassiske musik fandt vej til Albanien

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) blev født i Sevastopol på Krim. Hendes forældre var albanske indvandrere. Hendes far elskede at synge albanske folkesange, og han var en passioneret mandolinspiller. Han elskede musik og ønskede, at hans datter skulle have mulighed for at spille klaver, så han købte et klaver til Lola. Da hun var 9 år gammel, begyndte Lola at få klaverundervisning i skolen, og hendes klaverlærer var meget begejstret for Lolas musikalske talent. Lola Gjoka studerede på musikkonservatoriet i Sevastopol og havde et år tilbage, da hendes studier blev afbrudt. I 1932 blev der udstedt et ultimatum i form af en lov til indvandrerne: enten skulle de blive statsborgere i Sovjetunionen eller forlade landet. Familien var for patriotisk til at opgive deres albanske identitet, da de vidste, hvor hårdt det havde været for deres folk at opnå uafhængighed.

Derfor besluttede familien at vende tilbage til Albanien. Lola var 21 år gammel da hun ankom til Albanien som den første albanske pianist. Senere afsluttede hun sin uddannelse i Athen efter at have vundet en klaverkonkurrence i Wien.

Da Lolas familie forlod Krim, tog de klaveret med, da de vidste, at der ikke fandtes klaverer i Albanien. Turen endte tragisk, da Lolas lillebror døde på rejsen. Da de ankom til Korca i Albanien, hjalp gamle venner familien med at slå sig ned, og Lola begyndte at give undervisning til piger og drenge fra mere velhavende familier for at tjene til livets ophold for familien, som havde mistet hele deres opsparing på grund af hyperinflation.

Da Lola kom til Korca, var kimen til en kulturel renæssance allerede blevet lagt af den første albanske lyriske operasanger, Mihal Ciko, som var kommet tilbage fra udlandet i

1920'erne. Han var den første albaner, der studerede i Milano på Giuseppe Verdi-konservatoriet. Mihal skabte stor begejstring, og ikke kun i Albanien. Han deltog i den internationale folkesangskonkurrence på Fiera di Milano i 1924, hvor han fremførte albanske folkesange. Sange som aldrig var blevet sunget uden for Albanien før. Mihal Cikos fortolkning var så bevægende, at han vandt konkurrencen.

Lola Gjoka og Mihal slog sig sammen og flere operasangere kom tilbage til Albanien – soprannerne Jorgjia Felice Truja, Tefta Tashko, Maria Kraja, tenoren Kristaq Antoniu og barytonen Kristaq Koco. Kimen til en kulturel renæssance blev dannet, med Lola Gjoka i epicentret.

Den store pianist akkompagnerede alle sangerne i Verdi- og Puccini-arianer, tyske sange og meget mere og albanske folkesange var ligeledes en vigtig del af koncerterne. Tefta Tashko og de andre sangere kom til Lola med sange fra forskellige dele af Albanien, så Lola kunne skrive dem ned og arrangere klaverakkompagnement til dem, med respekt for folkesangenes autenticitet. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) og Tefta Tashko blev beskrevet som bier, der samlede honning fra alle de forskellige blomster i den albanske have.

Disse sange blev en kulturel skat, der fyldte folkets hjerter med skønhed, kærlighed, optimisme og håb om en bedre fremtid. Dette var starten på en kulturel renæssance i 30'erne og 40'erne, som varede i flere årtier.

I 1970'erne omarbejdede Lola sine sange endnu en gang, og hendes sidste ønske, inden hun døde i 1985, var, at disse sange skulle være tilgængelige for den nye generation. På grund af helbredsproblemer udgav Juki, Lolas eneste barn, først en bog med sin mors 52 sange i 2007, men de blev aldrig indspillet.

Jeg blev først introduceret til nogle af Lola Gjokas (Aleksi) sange af den schweizisk-albanske pianist Ermira Lefort, som

kom til Danmark i 2019 for, sammen med mig, at opføre to af Lola Gjokas sange ved koncerten »A Musical Dialogue of Cultures«, arrangeret af Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog og Det Kinesiske Kulturinstitut. Ermira og jeg blev derefter af det danske konsulat i Tirana inviteret til at give en koncert med et dansk-albansk program. På grund af Corona blev koncerten udsat til den 5. juni 2021. Skæbnen ville, at Ermira ikke var i stand til at komme til Tirana, og jeg derfor havde brug for en erstatning. Det blev pianisten Rudina Ciko, og det var virkelig held i uheld.

Da jeg i maj havde mødt Rudina i Tirana, havde hun givet mig bogen med de samlede sange af Lola Gjoka (Aleksi). Det var nogle uger før vores koncert og indimellem havde jeg tid til at kigge på sangene og opdagede, at hver enkelt af dem var både speciel og meget smuk. Efter koncerten i Tirana, på vej tilbage til Danmark, fik jeg den idé, at disse sange burde indspilles. Hver sang var som en perle i en række af perler, der tilsammen udgjorde en smuk halskæde, Folk burde have tilgang til denne skat.

Gnisten, der ventede på at blive til rigtig ild

Jeg besluttede mig for at gøre mit for at få disse sange indspillet. Gennem Rudina Ciko mødte jeg hendes mand, dirigenten Zhani Ciko, søn af den berømte bel canto-sanger Mihal Ciko, Lola Gjokas (Aleksi) veninde. Zhani Ciko var et barn af den kulturelle renæssance og bar den levende arv fra den albanske kulturelle renæssance i sit hjerte og sind. Zhani Ciko organiserede også den første opførelse af Beethovens 9. symfoni i Albaniens historie i 1970'erne.

Da jeg fortalte Zhani idéen om at indspille alle Lola Gjoka (Aleksis) sange, blev han meget begejstret og begyndte straks at arbejde på at realisere den. Zhani organiserede en gruppe af talentfulde sangere, herunder den meget kendte sopran Mariana Leka, sopranen Erlinda Agolli, tenoren Gerald Murraj, barytonen Antonio Zefi og Rudina Ciko, der akkompagnerede på klaver. Sammen med den store pianist Ermira Lefort, den kendte

danske tenor Stig Fogh Andersen og mig selv, en dansk-albansk sopran, blev der dannet en gruppe, som kunne realisere ideen. Vi mødtes alle i Danmark for at gennemføre projektet. Takket være Knud Rasmussen, organist i Virum Kirke, så åbnede Virum Kirke sine døre for os, så vi kunne lave optagelserne der. Og takket være Stig Fogh Andersen, hans søn Ask og Stigs gode veninde Heidrun Beer, så fik vi gennemført optagelserne. Det lykkedes at indspille de 50 sange på mindre end fire dage den 27.-30. december 2021. Vi afsluttede optagelserne med at filme en lille koncert i kirken, da Corona gjorde publikum umuligt.

Indspilningen af disse 50 sange er en historisk begivenhed, da det aldrig er sket før. Udgivelsen af de samlede sange på en dobbelt-cd vil finde sted i slutningen af februar i år og vil ikke kun være en skat, der atter vil blive en del af den albanske kulturarv, men også en perle, der vil blive indføjet i den europæiske kulturskat.

Må cd'erne så være en inspiration til at holde mange koncerter og kulturelle udvekslinger mellem Albanien og mange andre nationer.

For at bestille kopier af cd'erne kan man kontakte Feride Gillesberg på: feridegillesberg@gmail.com.

Udgivet i Executive Intelligence Review Volume 49, Number 6, February 11, 2022.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Earlier article:

Historic Event in Copenhagen – An Albanian Musical Treasure Revived

By Feride Istogu Gillesberg

January 3, 2021 – A delegation of fantastic Albanian artists from Tirana, Albania, joined forces with a Swiss-Albanian

pianist, and Danish musicians, to record 50 Albanian traditional songs, arranged by the first Albanian pianist, Lola Gjoka (Aleksi). Lola Gjoka's songs are a fusion of authentic Albanian folk songs and classical music – a cultural treasure that will now see daylight, after seven decades.

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) 1910-1985, was the first Albanian pianist, who played a crucial role in bringing classical music to Albania. Lola arranged 50 Albanian songs, based on authentic Albanian folk songs that were still alive, as sung by local people around the nation. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) wrote down the notes, and composed the piano accompaniment to the songs, as truthful to the authenticity of the songs as possible. These songs became a part of the classical concerts she gave, together with the first bel canto opera singers in Albania.

In 1912, Albania finally got its independence, after 500 years of a brutal occupation by the Ottoman Empire – an independence achieved against all odds. When, finally, the Turks were out, the neighboring countries tried everything they could to divide Albania among them, which partly succeeded. When we finally had a nation, the desire for rising out of extreme backwardness, politically, economically, and culturally, was vividly in the soul and spirit of the people of Albania.

How classical music made its way to Albania

Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) was born in Sevastopol, Crimea. Her parents were Albanian immigrants. Her father loved singing Albanian folk songs, and he was a passionate mandolin player. Lola Gjoka's father loved music and wanted his daughter to have the possibility of playing the piano, so he bought a piano for Lola. When she was 9-years-old, Lola started getting piano lessons at school, and her piano teacher was very excited about Lola's musical talent. Lola Gjoka studied at the music conservatory in Sevastopol. She had one year left, when her studies were disrupted. In 1932, an ultimatum, in the form of a law, was issued to the immigrants: either become Soviet

Union nationals, or leave the country. The family was too patriotic to give up their Albanian identity, knowing how hard the achievement of independence had been for their people. So, the family left to go back to Albania. Lola was 21 years old. She arrived in Albania as the first Albanian pianist. Later, she finished her diploma in Athens, after winning a piano competition in Vienna.

When Lola's family left the Crimea, they took the piano along, since they knew that there were no pianos in Albania. The tour ended tragically, when Lola's little brother died on their journey. Arriving in Korca, Albania, old friends helped the family settle down, and Lola began giving lessons to girls and boys of wealthier families, to make a living for their family, which had lost all their savings due to hyperinflation.

When Lola came to Korca, a seed for a cultural renaissance had already been planted by the first Albanian lyric opera singer, Mihal Ciko, who had come back from abroad in 1920s. He was the first Albanian who studied in Milan at the Giuseppe Verdi Conservatory. Mihal created a lot of excitement, not only in Albania. He took part in the international folk song competition in "Fiera di Milano" in 1924, where he performed Albanian folk songs, songs that had never been sung outside Albania before. Mihal Ciko's interpretation was so moving, that he won the competition.

Lola Gjoka and Mihal joined forces. More opera singers came back to Albania – the sopranos Jorgjia Felice Truja, Tefta Tashko, Maria Kraja, tenor Kristaq Antoniu, and baritone Kristaq Koco. The seed of a cultural renaissance was formed, with Lola Gjoka in the epicenter.

The great pianist accompanied all the singers in Verdi and Puccini arias, German Lieder, and much more. Albanian folk songs were an important part of the concerts. Many traditional Albanian folk songs were written down by Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) who arranged piano accompaniments, carefully keeping the

authenticity of the old folk songs. Tefta Tashko and the other singers would come to her with songs from different parts of Albania, so Lola could write them down and arrange piano accompaniments. Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) and Tefta Tashko were described as bees that collected the honey from all the different flowers in the Albanian garden.

These songs became a cultural treasure that filled the hearts of the people with beauty, love, optimism and hope for a better future. This was the start of a cultural renaissance in the 30s and 40s, that lasted for several decades.

In the 1970s, Lola reworked her songs once again. Her last wish before she died in 1985, was to have these songs available for the new generation. Due to health problems, Lola's only child, Juki, first published a book of her mother's 52 songs in 2007, but they were never recorded.

I was first introduced to some songs by Lola Gjoka (Aleksi) by the Swiss-Albanian pianist Ermira Lefort, who came to Denmark in 2019 to perform two of Lola Gjoka's songs with me at the concert, "A Musical Dialogue of Cultures," organized by the Schiller Institute, Russian-Danish Dialogue, and the Chinese Cultural Center. Ermira and I were invited by the Danish consul in Tirana to give a concert with a Danish-Albanian program. Due to corona, the concert was postponed to June 5, 2021. As destiny played out, Ermira was not able to come to Tirana, and I needed a replacement. The pianist Rudina Ciko was her replacement, a blessing in disguise.

When I met Rudina in May in Tirana, she had given me the book with the collected songs of Lola Gjoka (Aleksi), some weeks before our concert. In between, I had the time to look through the collected songs, and discovered that each of them was very special and beautiful. After the concert in Tirana, on my way back to Denmark, I was thinking that these songs ought to be recorded. Each song is like a pearl in the row of a treasure necklace, and people should have access to this treasure.

The spark that waited to be transformed into fire

I decided to do my part to get these songs recorded. Through Rudina Ciko, I met her husband, the conductor Zhani Ciko, the son of the famous bel canto singer Mihal Ciko, Lola Gjoka (Aleksi's) friend. Zhani Ciko was a child of the cultural renaissance, and carries the living heritage of the Albanian cultural renaissance in his heart and mind. Zhani Ciko also organized the first performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony in the history of Albania, in 1970s.

When I spoke to Zhani about the idea of recording all of Lola Gjoka (Aleksi's) songs, he became very excited. He immediately began working on realizing this idea. Zhani organized a group of great singers, including the very well-known soprano Mariana Leka, soprano Erlinda Agolli, tenor Gerald Murraj, baritone Antonio Zefi and Rudina Ciko playing the piano. Together with the great pianist Ermira Lefort, Stig Fogh Andersen, a very well-known Danish tenor, and myself, a Danish-Albanian soprano, a group was formed that could realize the idea. We all met in Denmark to carry out the project.

Thanks to Knud Rasmussen, the organist at Virum Church, the church opened their doors for us to make the recordings there. And thanks to Stig Fogh Andersen, his son Ask, and his good friend Heidrun Beer, we were able to make the recordings. Thanks to all the musicians, we succeeded in recording the fifty songs in less than four days (December 27- 30, 2021).

We concluded by holding a little concert.

This recording is an historical event, as it has never been done before. Publishing Lola Gjoka (Aleksi's) collected songs on a double CD in the spring of this year will not only be a treasure that will be given back to the Albanian cultural heritage, but, also, be a pearl to be added to the European cultural treasure.

May the CDs be an inspiration for many concerts and cultural

exchanges between Albania and many nations.

To order the CDs, contact Feride Gillesberg at:
feridegillesberg@gmail.com

Organisationen for islamisk Samarbejde forpligter sig til koordineret støtte til Afghanistan; verden må skride til handling – vores 'historiske mission'

Den 19. december (EIRNS) – I søndags mødtes Ministrenes Råd fra Organisationen for islamisk Samarbejde (OIC) i et ekstraordinært samråd (session) i Pakistan og blev enige om forslag for koordineret humanitær støtte til Afghanistan, samt økonomiske tiltag. Mekanismer for at følge disse til dørs blev fastlagt, således at OIC's beslutninger kunne realiseres. Mere end 70 delegerede deltog, som repræsenterede medlemslande, gæstnationer, internationale, finansielle og FN-relaterede - nødhjælpsagenturer. Med 57 medlemslande er OIC den næststørste sådan organisation efter De forenede Nationer. Men selv med dette, vil det som vil bestemme hvad der sker med den afghanske befolkning og nation, den større omkringliggende region, samt verdenssituationen, være en nødvendig forandring i tilgangen, væk fra den dødelige geopolitik og påbegyndelsen af fælles, positiv handling blandt stormagterne.

Dette blev understreget i fredags – åbningsdagen af det tre dage lange OIC-møde i Islamabad – af Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som deltog i en diskussion, der blev vist på Pakistans nationale TV, PTV, som nøje fulgte OIC-begivenheden. Hun sagde følgende: »I en vis forstand er det at samle alle internationale kræfter for at hjælpe Afghanistan, efter min mening en af de allervigtigste, historiske missioner. På en vis måde tror jeg, at hele menneskeheden er som en laser, koncentreret om hvad der sker i Afghanistan. Så, jeg vil virkelig håbe, at alle de deltagende og berørte nationer vil fordoble og flerdoble deres anstrengelser for at gøre redningen af Afghanistan til et tema for hele verden, fordi det er det lige nu. Og jeg mener, at alle fremgangsmåder må tages i brug: medier, FN, konferencer. Der bør være et trommeslag, et trommeslag for at vække verdens samvittighed, fordi jeg tror, at dette er en slags bedømmelse af vores evner som menneskehed: er vi i stand til, moralsk, at overleve eller ej?«

Hvad der sker her til aften er, at tilsagn begynder at komme fra OIC-nationer, angående donationernes størrelser, som har til formål at yde den hårdt tiltrængte støtte. Baseret på de første udmeldinger omfatter rammerne for den tildelte bistand flere funktioner. En resolution om, at OIC vil oprette en Humanitær Fond og et Program for Fødevarer-sikkerhed blev enstemmigt vedtaget. OIC-mødet opfordrede til, at den eksisterende Islamiske organisation for Fødevarer-sikkerhed (IOFS) arbejder med dette nye Program for Fødevarer-sikkerhed for Afghanistan, herunder brugen af IOFS-reserver, hvis dette giver mening. Den Humanitære Fond står til at blive operationsklar i løbet af det første kvartal i 2022, under Den islamiske Udviklingsbanks regi.

I Kabul skal den eksisterende OIC-mission styrkes med større logistiske, finansielle og menneskelige ressourcer for at gøre det muligt for den at koordinere operationer med globale agenturer og partnerskaber. Under disse inkluderes de åbenlyse

FN-agenturer, fra UNICEF til Verdens Fødevarerprogram, samt andre organisationer. En prioritet vil blive lagt på at samarbejde med Verdens Sundhedsorganisation indenfor vacciner og medicinske forsyninger.

Der vil være støtte til de afghanske flygtninge, som er flygtet til nabolande, og til de internt fordrevne i Afghanistan selv. Det vurderes, at 665.000 mennesker er blevet fordrevet blot imellem januar og september 2021, udover de allerede 2,9 millioner fordrevne i deres nation. Kortfattet: 60% af befolkningen på 38 millioner mennesker trues med - hungersnød og manglen på livets fornødenheder.

Konferencen bød velkommen til Usbekistans tilbud om, i fællesskab med FN, at skabe et regionalt, logistisk knudepunkt i byen Termez for at håndtere fragten af humanitært materiel til Afghanistan. OIC-mødet godkendte ambassadør Tarig Ali Bakhit Salah, assisterende generalsekretær for humanitære, kulturelle og familiære Anliggender ved OIC-sekretariatet, som OIC's Særlige Udsendte i Afghanistan for OIC's Generalsekretær for at koordinere indsatsen og rapportere til OIC.

Det meddeles af AP Pakistan (APP), at der var en indtrængende appel for at bygge storstilede projekter i det multinationale område for at tilvejebringe genopbygning og udvikling. Overordnet set burde dette inkludere energi-, transport- og kommunikationsprojekter. To af disse var TAPI-rørledningen og TAP-ledningen, som skal overføre strøm mellem Turkmenistan, Afghanistan og Pakistan. Diskussionens deltagere henledte opmærksomheden på vigtigheden af Den økonomiske Samarbejdsorganisations 15. topmøde, som mødtes den 28. november 2021 i Ashgabat i Turkmenistan.

Det andet område af OIC-initiativer, parallelt med arbejdet indenfor humanitær støtte, fødevarerhjælp og anti-pandemiske tiltag, er i skabelsen af bank-, kredit- og relaterede rammebetingelser, som skal tjene en genetableret, - fungerende økonomi, samt til genopbygning. Ifølge

APP vedtog Udenrigsministrenes Råd, at de første forhandlinger, »der skulle frigøre finansielle og bankrelaterede veje for at genoprette likviditet, samt - finansiell og humanitær assistance«, burde begynde under vejledningen af OIC's Generelle Sekretariat og Den islamiske Udviklingsbank. APP tilføjede, at deltagere diskuterede at »udforske realistiske måder, hvorpå Afghanistans finansielle aktiver kunne frigøres«.

Det er her, at en direkte konfrontation kommer ind i billedet med London, Washington D.C. og medsammensvorne, der uberettiget insisterer på at tilbageholde 9,5 milliarder dollars af Afghanistans statsaktiver, som er svært nødvendige for regerings- og økonomiske funktioner. En særlig styg, dobbeltmoralisk offentlighedskampagne finder sted i USA, hvor åbne breve blev offentliggjort i den seneste uge, hvor krokodilletårer blev fældet, og det blev påstået, at nogle af de 9,5 milliarder dollars burde blive frigivet og brugt til »direkte at afhjælpe det afghanske folk«, men kun hvis de kunne overføres direkte til FN og andre agenturer, hverken relateret til Kabul-regeringen eller Taliban. Et af brevene var fra forhenværende militære personligheder, som står i forbindelse med det berygtede Atlantiske Råd, og det andet brev var fra 39 kongresfolk, enten uvidende, blåøjede, korrupte eller alle tre.

Ingen nation eksisterer uden fungerende institutioner. Ingen uafhængighed er mulig uden økonomisk suverænitet. At tilbageholde finansielle midler, eller på uberettiget vis kontrollere beslutningstagningen over benyttelsen af disse, er ensbetydende med at ødelægge en nation. Dette vil fuldføre opgaven gennem folkemord, hvilket 20 år med militær tilstedeværelse og manglen på udvikling ikke var i stand til i Afghanistan. Dette er en moralsk prøve for Vesten.

Hvad de finansielle midler bør bruges til, samt hvad der generelt må gøres i Afghanistan, er præsenteret i et nyudgivet

EIR-interview med Dr. Shah Mehrabi, som i 20 år sad i bankbestyrelsen i DA Afghanistan Bank, Afghanistans centralbank.

Vores rolle i at udbrede sådanne politiske tiltag er uundværlig, parallelt med at bringe sandheden om størrelsesordenen af Afghanistans krise, som fuldstændig udelukkes af den transatlantiske presse. Zepp-LaRouches opråb for Operation Ibn Sina, som vil skabe en moderne sundhedsplatform i landet, er en opfordring til at verden agerer. At rette lyset på Afghanistan, og mobilisere for det som må gøres, udbreder forståelse af nødvendigheden for at gøre en ende på grebet fra den imperialistiske udenrigspolitik og det globalistiske finanssystem overalt, som nu bryder sammen og truer med atomkrig.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche afsluttede sine bemærkninger på PTV den 17. december, ved at sammenfatte situationen således: »Så, i en vis forstand tror jeg, at Afghanistans skæbne og menneskehedens skæbne er langt tættere forbundet end de fleste mennesker kan forestille sig.«

Links:

Et *EIR*-interview med Dr. Shah Mohammad Mehrabi, som sidder i den regerende bestyrelse af Afghanistans centralbank (Da Afghanistan Bank), er blevet offentliggjort i video- og tekstformat. Heri går han i dybden med det, som er nødvendigt for at Afghanistan kan fungere økonomisk. Interviewet har titlen: »Amerikansk politik 'kvæler det afghanske folk'«:

<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/12/18/interview-with-dr-shah-mehrabi-u-s-policy-is-suffocating-the-afghan-people/>

Fire repræsentanter for Schiller Instituttet blev interviewet på Pakistans PTV i forbindelse med OIC-konferencen:

Stifteren af Schiller Instituttet, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og Hussein Askary:

<https://schillerinstitute.com/blog/2021/12/19/pakistan-tv--special-broadcast-on-oic-extraordinary-meeting-on-afghanistan-gets-briefing-from-helga-zepp-larouche-hussein-askary/>

Harley Schlanger:

https://youtu.be/_sb7eD5sLdc

Karel Vereycken:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Td7T64hPNq0>

Schiller Instituttets videokonference PANEL II (Lørdag d. 6. sept. 21:00 – 24:00 dansk tid): Videnskabens rolle i skabelsen af menneskehedens fremtid

1. Jason Ross (USA), videnskabsrådgiver ved Schiller Instituttet
2. Dr. Bernard Bigot (Frankrig), generaldirektør for den internationale termonukleare eksperimentelle reaktor (ITER), tidligere direktør for den franske kommission for alternativ

energi og atomenergi (CEA)

3. Sergey Pulinets (Rusland), Principal Research Scientist, Space Research Institute, Det Russiske Videnskabsakademi

4. Dr. Stephen O. Dean (USA), præsident, Fusion Power Associates (10)

5. Michael Paluszek (USA), Princeton Satellite Systems

6. Philip Tsokolibane (South Africa), head of LaRouche South Africa

7. Dr. Kelvin Kemm (South Africa), CEO, Stratek Business Strategy Consultants, former board chairman, South African Nuclear Energy Corporation

6. Spørgsmål og svar

NSA-whistleblower William Binneys reaktion på skandalen i Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste

KØBENHAVN den 29. august – William Binney, fhv. tekniskchef for USA's NSA (Det Nationale Sikkerhedsagentur) var i dag gæst på LaRouchePAC live-programmet "William Binney AMA tour: Lad ingen spørgsmål forblive ubesvarede" (The William Binney AMA tour: Leave no questions unanswered på LaRouchePACs youtube kanal i samarbejde med 'Action for Assange' og en undergruppe på Reddit.com.

Som det første spørgsmål blev han bedt om at svare på rapporten fra Schiller Instituttets næstformand i Danmark, Michelle Rasmussen, med titlen "Efterretningsskandale i Danmark: Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste har givet enorme mængder rå elektroniske data til NSA"; rapporten blev læst op for ham af ordstyrer José Vega.

Her er rapporten og hans svar, som begynder 6 min. inde i programmet.):

Efterretningsskandale i Danmark: Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste har givet enorme mængder elektroniske rå-data til National Security Agency (NSA)

KØBENHAVN 28. august 2020 (EIRNS) – For et par dage siden blev chefen for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (FE) hjemsendt sammen med øvrige medarbejdere efter massiv kritik fra en institution, der blev oprettet i 2014 for at føre tilsyn med tjenesten. I dag videregav DR information fra flere kilder om at skandalen er, at FE før 2014 har aflyttet centrale kommunikationskabler, og givet NSA adgang til enorme mængder rå elektroniske data, som kan omfatte e-mails, sms'er og telefonopkald fra mange danskere, hvilket er ulovligt. Ifølge DR er deling af efterretningsmateriale med en udenlandsk efterretningstjeneste kun lovligt, kun hvis det drejer sig om data fra enkelte danskere. Flere whistleblowers har givet oplysninger til tilsynsmyndigheden (Tilsynet med Efterretningstjenester). FE beskyldes også for at holde oplysninger tilbage for tilsynsorganet. (Michelle Rasmussen)

Ordstyreren bad derefter Binney om hans reaktion:

Det er netop det problem jeg så, nemlig at NSA, CIA, FBI og Bush – det startede med Bush, Cheney og [tidligere NSA-direktør Michael] Hayden og [tidligere CIA-chef George] Tenet. De startede denne proces i 2001, og udvidede den derefter til forskellige andre lande i verden, inklusive 'Five Eyes' [USA, Storbritannien, Canada, Australien, New Zealand]. De

samarbejdede alle om at gøre dette, og de gør det alle hver især, inklusive Japan, Polen, sandsynligvis Israel, vil jeg tro, og der er et par andre nøglepunkter i Europa, som Holland, og jeg tror, at Frankrig skulle være en del af det. Men.. du ved, jeg kender bestemt ikke alle disse lande, men jeg var klar over, at Danmark blev involveret for ganske længe siden. Og så...

Pointen er, at de alle dybest set narrer alle andre på planeten. Det har aldrig været et problem at være i stand til at finde 'slemme fyre' hvor som helst, uden at opgive sikkerhed. Vi beviste det i 2000, og også i 1999... [det] var det tidligste, vi viste – at det var muligt at gøre det.

Problemet er, at det ikke kostede mange penge, og det var det som efterretningssamfundet var ude efter, og så sagde de, at vi var nødt til at foretage denne masseovervågning, fordi det er ekstremt dyrt, og vores budgetter er på vej op. Vores viden og information om mennesker i verden, herunder alle parlamentsmedlemmerne i ethvert land i verden såvel som alle de mennesker i verden, der aktivt deltager på ethvert elektronisk apparat.

Så jeg mener, at det er sådan man får 'overhånd' over alle og enhver Hvis nogen gør sig ud til bens har man noget at gå tilbage og se på, og analysere med tilbagevirkende kraft, og derefter kan man gå ud og foretage... og derefter kan man udnytte det på enhver måde, som man måtte ønske.

Så det er grundlæggende set en forbrydelse mod menneskerettigheder over hele verden, og det er de en del af... og nu er danskerne, i det mindste, begyndt at tage det alvorligt.

Jeg tror også østrigerne. Deres parlament forkastede et forslag eller et forsøg på at få en lov på plads, hvor de kunne tillade masseovervågning. De nedstemte det, og deres højesteret, eller højeste domstol, besluttede, at det var

forfatningsstridigt i henhold til østrigsk lov. Jeg mener, at det er forfatningsstridigt i henhold til amerikansk lov.

Og Elliot Schuchardt og jeg har en lov... eller en begæring i Højesteret, der vil blive gennemgået den 29. september, og det udfordrer det forfatningsmæssige grundlag for NSA, CIA og FBI, der alle deltager i denne masseindsamling af data på amerikanske borgere og alle andre på planeten.

Problemet, som jeg havde, da jeg var teknisk direktør, var, at jeg var klar over, at massedata gjorde vores analytikere dysfunktionelle. Så jeg var nødt til at finde ud af en måde at være i stand til at løse dette problem på... at skaffe dem et rigt informationsmiljø for at kunne lykkes. Det gjorde jeg, men [NSA-direktør Michael] Hayden og hans folk kasserede det, fordi det ikke kostede mange penge, og det effektiviserede tingene, så de ikke behøvede at bygge ting som Bluffdale... nogle få milliarder dollars her og der til flere lagercentre overalt i landet, ovre ved Ft. Mead, i Denver og forskellige andre steder. Alt dette blev gjort for pengenes [skyld], og det blev gjort, fordi efterretningssamfundet ønskede at få magt over alle.

Det var derfor, at præsident Trump – da han tiltrådte embedet – udgjorde en trussel mod dette. Han ønskede at reformere det. Derfor var general Flynn en trussel mod dette. Han ønskede at revidere og foretage ændringer i hele processen, der foregik. Så det ville sætte en kæp i hjulet på efterretningssamfundet. Derfor sagde [New York Senator Charles] Schumer, at de har seks dage [om ugen] efter søndag til at komme efter dig, hvis du går imod dem.

Jeg mener, dette er hele problemet her. Vi er nødt til at slippe af med det. Og der er måder at gøre det på. Der er måder at udslette alle disse data fra deres system, så ingen af dem er i stand til at bruge det og krænke folks rettigheder hvor som helst i verden. Det er en nem ting at gøre.

Jeg kalder dette for den 'første svindel'. Dette var en stor svindel fra efterretningssamfundets side mod hele USA's befolkning. De svindler os for titusinder af milliarder dollars hvert år.

Og det gælder også de andre lande, der deltager. De bliver også svindlet. Og folk i alle disse lande mister deres menneskerettigheder under deres forfatning, og det er det største problem rundt om i verden.

Derfor er denne indsigelse i USA's højesteret så vigtig.

Derfor er det så vigtigt, hvad de gjorde i Danmark. Jeg har sørget for, at Elliot Schuchardt kender til det, så han kan inkludere det i sin appel, når han træder frem for højesteret, forhåbentlig tidligt næste år.

Sammendrag af panelerne fra konferencen (video)

1. Hvorfor et topmøde mellem USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien er så presserende netop nu

Helga Zepp-LaRouche leder en international dialog angående den øjeblikkelige nødvendighed af at bringe lederne af de "fire stormagter" (USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien) sammen til et topmøde, for at håndtere pandemien, den finansielle nedsmeltning og økonomisk underudvikling. Udklippene er taget fra Schiller Instituttets internationale konference, d. 27. juni, 2020, med titlen: "Vil menneskeheden blomstre eller gå til grunde? Fremtiden kræver et firemagts-topmøde nu".

<https://youtu.be/thQuRg-rzwE>

2. Lad os gøre en ende på krig, hungersnød, fattigdom og sygdom

Ledere indenfor landbrug, økonomi og videnskab fører en diskussion angående den skrækindjagende fare, som konfronterer verden, i form af hungersnød, krig og sygdom, pga. ødelæggelsen af produktivt arbejde, over de seneste 50 år. Dette efterfølges af en diskussion om perspektivet for at implementere LaRouche-planen; en økonomisk strategi for at skabe 1,5 milliarder produktive arbejdspladser verden over. Talerne deltog i det andet panel af Schiller Instituttets online konference, d. 27. juni.

https://youtu.be/J_jKCa6GkW0

3. LaRouches internationale ungdomsbevægelse opfordrer til frikendelsen af Lyndon LaRouche

Skriv under på begæringen for at frikende Lyndon LaRouche: Frikend Lyndon LaRouche. Et kor af stemmer svarede på forslagene fra Theo Mitchell, tidligere statssenator fra South Carolina, angående hvad der kan gøres for at frikende Lyndon LaRouche og rette op på den uretfærdighed som er ude af kontrol i mange dele af verden. Lederne fra LaRouches internationale ungdomsbevægelse adresserede Schiller Instituttets konference, d. 27. juni, angående det presserende behov for at rekruttere den næste generation af ledere, der kan tænke på samme niveau som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

<https://youtu.be/AUnaUpA2yIlg>

Storbritannien burde afkobles, ikke Kina

Den 17. maj (EIRNS) – Den farligste udvikling, der kan ske i den nuværende strategiske situation, er USA's afkobling fra Kina, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en diskussion i søndags. Verden står over for en eksistentiel krise med en kombineret pandemi og hungersnød "af bibelske proportioner", alt sammen som et resultat af et systemisk finansielt og økonomisk sammenbrud, der gentagne gange er blevet forudsagt af Lyndon LaRouche. Ingen løsning på denne krise er tilgængelig for menneskeheden uden USA's og Kinas tætte samarbejde – sammen med Rusland, Indien og andre nationer – centreret om den presserende, højteknologiske udvikling af den underudviklede sektor. Det er det centrale punkt i LaRouchePACs kommende "LaRouche-plan for genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi: Verden har behov for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive job."

Det faktum, at al snavset omkring det britiske-Obama-støttede kupforsøg mod præsident Donald Trump endelig kommer frem – og at Trump insisterer på, at folk vil blive fængslet for dette – hjælper med til at styrke denne politiske mulighed.

Men hvis forholdet mellem USA og Kina kører skævt, hvis der sker en alvorlig afkobling, af den slags som briterne aktivt arbejder for gennem deres agenter i positioner, som Mike Pompeo, vil planeten brække over i konkurrerende blokke, meget som det skete under Den kolde Krig – blot denne gang under forhold af en sammenbrudskrise. Zepp-LaRouche uddybede: Dette vil være ødelæggende for USA, det vil skabe kaos i hele Europa, og det vil sætte verden på en kurs mod krig mellem supermagterne.

Den amerikanske ambassadør i Polen, Georgette Mosbacher, agerer efter den samme britiske geopolitiske drejebog som Pompeo. Hun opfordrede til, at amerikanske atomvåben, der nu er stationeret i Tyskland, skulle overføres til et mere fjæligt Polen – et stenkast fra Ruslands grænse. Den tidligere FN-våbeninspektør Scott Ritter svarede syrligt: "Simpelthen en af de dumme ideer i verden. Den russiske overkommando takker i øvrigt for at have gjort det lettere at overmande og bemægtige sig denne såkaldte nukleare afskrækkelse – Google 1st Guards Tank Army". Nyhedsbureauet Sputnik International bemærkede korrekt, at dette hurtigt kunne eskalere til en ny cubansk missilkrise.

Æstetisk opdragelse gennem ballet: August Bournonvilles koreografiske trosbekendelse

Bournonvilles koreografiske trosbekendelse afspejler Friedrich Schillers begreb om æstetisk dannelse, som man finder udtrykt i hans breve om menneskets æstetiske opdragelse, skrevet til den danske prins Frederik Christian af Augustenborg.

Dansen er en kunst, fordi den forudsætter kald, kundskab og færdighed.

Den er en skøn kunst, fordi den stræber efter idealet, ikke alene i plastisk, men i lyrisk og dramatisk henseende.

Den skønhed, som dansen bør hige efter, er ikke betinget af smag og behag, men grundet på det naturliges uforanderlige

love.

Mimikken omfatter alle sjælelige bevægelser; *dansen* derimod er væsentlig et udtryk for glæden, en trang til at følge musikens rytmer.

Det er kunstens og navnlig teatrets mission at skærpe tanken, løfte sindet og forfriske sanserne. Dansen bør altså fremfor alt vogte sig for at smigre et blaseret publikums forkærlighed for indtryk, der er fremmede for den sande kunst.

Munterhed er en kraft, *berusning* er en svækkelse.

Det skønne beholder stedse nyhedens friskhed, *det forbavsende* trætter i længden.

Dansen kan ved musikens hjælp hæve sig til *poesi*, men også ved et overmål af gymnastik nedsynke til *gøgleri*; det såkaldte *vanskelige* har utallige adepter, hvorimod det tilsyneladende *lette* kun opnås af nogle få udvalgte.

Højdepunktet af kunstfærdighed er at dølge mekanismen og anstrengelsen ved *harmonisk ro*.

Manér er ikke *karakter*, og *affektationen* er *gratiens* afgjorte fjende.

Enhver danser bør betragte sin møjsommelige kunst som et led i skønhedskæden, som en nyttig prydelse for scenen, og denne igen som et betydningsfuldt moment i nationernes åndelige udvikling.

Fra Mit teaterliv: Erindringer og tidsbilleder. Bind 2, Thaning & Appel, 1979

Mere:

Vi behøver Schillers æstetiske breve i dag, Feride Istogu Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets kampagneavis nr. 9, 2009

Den danske hjælp til Schiller, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller

Instituttets kampagneavis nr. 8, sider 10-14, 2009

Friedrich Schiller, Menneskets æstetiske opdragelse, udgivet af Per Øhrgaard, Gyldendal, 1970

August Bournonville 101: An Introduction to Denmark's Greatest Choreographer, by Jon Teeuwissen, Michigan Opera Theatre Artistic Advisor for Dance, April 17, 2020 on the homepage of the Michigan Opera Theater

'V-dagen' blev fejret af Schiller Instituttet

Den 9. maj (EIRNS) – Schiller Instituttet afholdt en fejring af 75-års jubilæet for sejren i Europa, og samlede repræsentanter for USA, Rusland, Tyskland, Frankrig og andre for at reflektere over fortiden samt den presserende nødvendighed af, at samarbejdet mod nazismen dengang må gentages nu, hvis den eksistentielle krise, som menneskeheden står overfor, skal løses. Den historiske tre-timers konference kan og bør ses online på <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EM9PR3IgX6k>.

Det er en uheldig kendsgerning, at der i USA fandt meget få begivenheder sted til minde om denne historiske begivenhed. For at give et kort billede af præsentationernes globale rækkevidde på konferencen er her en kort beskrivelse af nogle af indlæggene:

- **Helga Zepp-LaRouche**, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet, beskrev den ekstreme fare som menneskeheden er stillet overfor i dag, med COVID-19-pandemien, den ekstreme fødevarekrise på grund af virusset og den

nødvendige isoleringspolitik, den økonomiske nedgang og faren for hyperinflation som følge af den enorme pengeudstedelse for at redde boblen af derivater, der knuser det finansielle system. Ikke desto mindre, hævdede hun, har den nuværende krise blotlagt den mislykkede nyliberale politik, der underminerede økonomierne i den avancerede sektor, og som har forhindret udviklingslandene i at slippe af med ødelæggende fattigdom og underudvikling. Nu er det tid, sagde hun, til at anvende den politik for globalt samarbejde og udvikling, der blev fremlagt af hendes afdøde mand, Lyndon LaRouche.

- **H.E. Hr. Dmitry Polyanskiy**, første vice-repræsentant for Den Russiske Føderations permanente repræsentation ved FN, udtrykte vigtigheden af, at USA og Rusland lægger forskellene til side og slutter sig sammen – ligesom USA og Sovjetunionen gjorde for at besejre fascismen – for at imødegå de mange gensidige problemer, som vore folk og verden står overfor. Han udtrykte bekymring over dem, der forsøger at forfalske historien om den 'Store Fædrelandskrig', som 2. verdenskrig er kendt under i Rusland, for at nedgøre Rusland i dag. Han mindede om, at 27 millioner borgere i Sovjetunionen mistede deres liv i kampen mod fascisterne.
- **Jim Jatras**, en tidligere amerikansk diplomat og rådgiver for den republikanske ledelse i det amerikanske senat, opfordrede de amerikanske borgere og ledere til at holde op med at lytte til det fejlslagne lederskab af dem, der fik os ind i dette rod. Han bemærkede, at præsident Trump har insisteret på at foretage store ændringer, men at stort set hele hans kabinet er uenigt og nægter at handle, eksempelvis i forbindelse med Trumps hensigt om

at trække sig ud af de sidste tre årtiers "uendelige krige".

- **Jacques Cheminade**, leder af Solidaritets- og Fremskridtspartiet i Frankrig, en tidligere præsidentkandidat og nær medarbejder til Lyndon LaRouche, imødegik myten om, at præsident Franklin Delano Roosevelt og leder af 'Det frie Frankrig', Charles DeGaulle, hadede hinanden, ved at karakterisere deres uoverensstemmelser og deres lejlighedsvis nedsættende ord om hinanden som blot en del af den seriøse dialog mellem to mænd, der begge var sande patrioter, og som kendte hinandens betydning i forhold til at besejre det onde.
- **Bill Binney**, tidligere leder af den tekniske afdeling ved det amerikanske nationale sikkerhedsagentur (NSA) beviste for år tilbage med kriminaltekniske metoder, at russerne ikke havde hacket Det Demokratiske Partis Nationale Komités computere – hvilken sandhed nu er blevet bekræftet med offentlighørelsen af Kongressens vidnesbyrd i forbindelse med 'Russiagate'-heksejagten.
- **H.E. Igor Khobaev**, Den Russiske Føderations ambassadør til Filippinerne, sagde, at det er på tide at lægge forskelle til side for at imødegå den globale krise.
- **Dr. Gary Kotmacher**, kommunikations- og uddannelsesmissionen ved det Internationale Rumstationsprogram, beskrev den Internationale Rumstation som vor tids smukke arkitektur, hvor det demonstreres, at internationalt samarbejde er både muligt og nødvendigt.

Han påpegede, at der en dag vil være flere mennesker, der bor i rummet end på Jorden.

- **Al Korby**, 95, veteran fra 2. verdenskrig og en ven af Lyndon LaRouche, talte om vigtigheden af at have havearbejde og at læse Lyndon LaRouche.
- **Richard Black**, tidligere senator i Virginia, sagde, at hverken præsidenten eller folket har været i stand til at stoppe de uendelige krige. Hysteriet mod Rusland og nu mod Kina må slutte, fordi vi i denne tidsalder med atomvåbenbevæbnede konkurrenter ikke har andet valg end at samarbejde.
- **Diane Sare**, direktør for Schiller Instituttets kor i New York, læste svar fra blandt de tusinder af glade russere, der reagerede på korets virtuelle præstation, på russisk, af en berømt russisk militærsang, "Tri Tankista" ("Tre Kampvognsmænd"), der blev set af millioner i Rusland. Konferencen blev afsluttet med en afspilning af denne dybtføjte opførelse.
- Se morgenbriefingen med Harley Schlanger mandag den 11. maj: <https://larouchepac.com/media-content-types/morning-briefing-harley-schlanger>. Hver formiddag orienterer Harley dig om, hvad du har brug for at vide for at starte din dag. Abonner på LaRouche PAC YouTube-kanalen, og tryk på meddelelsesknappen for at blive underrettet, når Harleys orienteringer offentliggøres. Eller du kan lytte til lydfilen på SoundCloud <https://soundcloud.com/larouche-pac>.

‘Alle mennesker skal være brødre’: Fra COVID-19 til Det nye Paradigme LaRouche PAC Manhattan-projekt; dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Hussein Askary og Jacques Cheminade

Lørdag den 4. april 2020. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Jacques Cheminade, LaRouche-bevægelsens leder i Frankrig og fhv. præsidentkandidat samt Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien, talte om USA i forbindelse med LaRouche-bevægelsens mobilisering for at vedtage Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske politik globalt, for at tackle den udprægede mangel på udvikling rundt om i verden. Der er ingen ‘nationale’ løsninger på COVID-19 eller finansielle kriser som sådan, alene globale løsninger.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Goddag. Jeg synes det bliver meget tydeligt nu, at vi befinder os midt i, eller i begyndelsen af, hvad der ser ud til at blive den værste krise i menneskets historie. Det står allerede klart, at sundhedssystemerne i Europa – i Italien og Spanien – i USA ikke slår til. Der er

ikke nok medicinske forsyninger, ansigtsmasker, respiratorer, læger, sygeplejersker, intensiv-enheder. Det står også meget klart, at denne pandemi – pandemi betyder, at det er en verdensomspændende epidemi – spreder sig meget hurtigt til udviklingslandene. Man kan være sikker på, at hvis den rammer lande som Haiti, eller de 55 afrikanske nationer eller store befolkede nationer i Asien, vil situationen blive endnu værre. Det er meget tydeligt, at de ikke har tilstrækkelige medicinsk forsyninger; de har ikke engang et sundhedssystem. De har ikke rent vand. Idéen om at isolere sig selv og vaske sine hænder betyder intet, for sådan noget findes ikke for mindst halvdelen af befolkningen. Og det betyder, at denne ting er ved at komme helt ud af kontrol.

Så formålet med denne konference og dette møde i aften er at starte en kampagne for at sætte ét enkelt spørgsmål på dagsordenen. Det er, at vi er nødt til at reagere på dette som en enig menneskehed, og at vi må droppe alle andre dagsordener. Vi er nødt til at opbygge et verdenssundhedssystem; vi er naturligvis nødt til at geare op for at forsvare folket i USA, i de europæiske lande. Men i betragtning af det faktum at det er en pandemi, vil dette ikke være tilstrækkeligt. Denne virus vil mutere; den vil vende tilbage, og den vil vende tilbage i bølger, og i stigende grad ødelægge vores reelle produktion. Det vil have en alvorlig indvirkning på fødevareproduktionen. OECD (Organisationen for Økonomisk Samarbejde og Udvikling) har allerede fremsat erklæringer om, at de forventer, at den økonomiske effekt vil være en reduktion af den industrielle produktion i OECD-landene på 30%; man vil få millioner af arbejdsløse. Derfor er vi nødt til at have et komplet skifte i dagsordenen for udelukkende at producere for en effekt; nemlig at opbygge et sundhedssystem i hvert eneste land i verden med den samme energi, den samme lidenskab, de samme midler.

Præsident Trump har indført undtagelsesloven 'National Defense Production Act'. Guvernør Cuomo har opfordret til en hidtil

uset mobilisering af alt sundhedspersonale – læger, sygeplejersker, omskoling, uddannelse af unge. Dette er skridt i den rigtige retning, men det skal ledsages af en opbygning af den industrielle produktion for at producere alle de nødvendige midler til at bekæmpe denne pandemi. Det betyder hospitaler i hvert land; det betyder beskyttelsesdragter, ansigtsmasker, respiratorer. Hele industrien skal indrettes med dette for øje, indtil vi har besejret denne pandemi.

Der er ingen måde, hvorpå centralbankernes likviditetspumpe vil kunne fortsætte igennem denne mobilisering. Der er mennesker der siger, at dette kommer fuldstændig uventet, at dette er et komplet chok. Altså, vi kan bevise, at dette ikke er tilfældet. Lyndon LaRouche advarede siden 1971 om, at dette ville ske, da han advarede om konsekvenserne af, at Nixon forlod Bretton Woods-systemet. Siden 1973 og 1974 advarede han i særdeleshed om, hvad den økonomiske effekt af de betingelser som IMF og Verdensbankens politik pålagde udviklingssektoren ville være. Og han advarede om, at pandemier ville blive resultatet. Hele hans livsværk var at advare om den kendsgerning, at monetarisme – denne anden dødbringende virus som Dennis talte om – ville resultere i pandemier. Man kan ikke sænke levestandarden på hele kontinenter over længere tid uden at fremme lavere livsformer i biosfæren til at tage over; nemlig vira.

Ideen er at starte en mobilisering på verdensplan, en mobilisering som fuldstændig vil ændre paradigmet. Vi har opfordret til et topmøde med de vigtigste lande i verden – USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – at de må holde et topmøde for at ændre systemet; at blive enige om at få en ny verdensøkonomisk orden, der skaber mulighed for, at ethvert land på denne planet kan overleve. Der er bevægelser i denne retning. Netop i dag talte præsident Trump i telefon med Macron, den franske premierminister, og de blev enige om at fremskynde et lignende forslag fremsat af præsident Putin i begyndelsen af januar, hvor de fem faste medlemmer af FN's

Sikkerhedsråd straks skal indkalde et hastemøde og enes om øget samarbejde mellem FN's nationer om at gå i denne retning.

Schiller Instituttet indkalder til en international internetkonference den 25. og 26. april. Længe før omfanget af pandemien stod klart, var målet med Schiller Instituttets konference at formulere et program, der kan hjælpe med at forme diskussionen for topmødet mellem disse stormagter. Vi er nødt til at have en drastisk aksiomatisk ændring. Der er allerede mange diskussioner, som er nyttige og skal understøttes; såsom ophævelse af alle sanktioner for at give alle lande mulighed for at bekæmpe pandemien. At holde en øjeblikkelig våbenhvile; at stoppe for alle militære handlinger, men der er brug for mere. Der er brug for en massiv mobilisering med opbakning fra mange mennesker og mange organisationer, for fuldstændig at ændre dagsordenen.

Der findes en vellykket model for, hvordan coronavirus blev besejret, i det mindste midlertidigt; det var hvad Kina gjorde i Wuhan og Hubei-provinsen. Det vil sige, at man må have total testning; man bliver nødt til at have identifikation af de mennesker, der tester positivt, man må isolere dem og sætte dem i karantæne. På den måde kan infektionskæden brydes, og virusset kan besejres. Problemet er, at det har vist sig, at det ikke er muligt at gentage denne model i den transatlantiske verden, simpelthen fordi testudstyr ikke er tilgængelige, fremstillingsvirksomhederne var ikke klar endnu. De vestlige regeringer bortødslede den varslingsperiode, som de fik gennem den kinesiske intervention.

Men det må der nu sættes fart i, ved hjælp af den form for mobilisering som jeg talte om. Den apokalyptiske dimension af hvad vi står over for vil stå meget klar inden for kort tid. Al forvirringen, alle de falske nyheder om, at coronavirus kun ville være som en slem influenza, al denne misinformation vil fortone sig. Der vil være en åbenhed over for at diskutere et helt nyt paradigme.

Der er også behov for at gøre det meget klart, at bagmændenes ideer, de folk og kræfter der er ansvarlige for, at vi endte i denne situation i første omgang, ikke må sejre. I dag er der for eksempel en artikel af Henry Kissinger i Wall Street Journal med overskriften "Coronavirus vil for evigt ændre verdensordenen". Vi skal huske, at Kissinger måske ved, at timen er ved at være inde, hvor den gamle verdensorden uopretteligt og for evigt forsvinder. Men vi må ikke glemme, at det var Kissingers politik med NSSM 200 (National Security Study Memorandum 200 er et amerikansk dokument om befolkningsreduktion, *red.*) der blev aftalt i 1974, og som var en stor del af denne morderiske malthusianske affolkningspolitik mod udviklingslandene.

Dette memorandum, som først blev offentliggjort i begyndelsen af 1990'erne, sagde, at befolkningen i visse udviklingslande må reduceres og kontrolleres, fordi der er store ressourcer, som alle er i USA's strategiske interesse. En anden af 'gerningsmændene' var den onde politik fra Romklubben, der begyndte at sprede denne idé om, at der er grænser for vækst, og at man er nødt til at gå over til en økonomi med nulvækst. En løgn som straks blev tilbagevist af Lyndon LaRouche, der skrev en meget vigtig bog med titlen 'There Are No Limits to Growth' (Der er ingen grænser for Vækst). Det var også John D. Rockefeller III's politik, der på FN's befolkningskonference i Bukarest samme år – 1974 – begyndte at tale om overbefolkning, befolkningsekspllosion og andre sådanne malthusianske ideer.

Disse mennesker er mordere. Hvis I ønsker at se beviser, så se på hvad Jeremy Warner skrev den 3. marts i Daily Telegraph, hvor han sagde, at der er en fordel forbundet med coronavirus. Det er, at den frasorterer de ældre. Det er klart, at Warner er på linje med prins Philip, der på en offentlig konference om religion sagde, at han ønsker at blive reinkarneret som en dødbringende virus, så han bedre kan hjælpe med at reducere verdensbefolkningen. Eller lyt til hvad Sir David King, den ledende videnskabelige rådgiver for både Blair- og Brown-

regeringerne, der åbent sagde, at de ældre må ofres af hensyn til økonomien. Disse malthusianeres synspunkter må bringes for en ny Nürnberg-domstol, fordi det helt klart gælder for dem, at de vidste eller burde have vidst, hvilke konsekvenser deres politik ville have for Den tredje Verden.

Selv den tyske hærs tænketank, Det Tyske Institut for Forsvar og Strategiske Studier, har netop fremsat et krav om en tilbundsgående undersøgelse af, hvordan verden så blindt kunne gå ind i katastrofen. En sådan undersøgelse er allerede foretaget. Den har vi foretaget igennem de sidste 50 år. Lyndon LaRouche advarede igennem et halvt århundrede om, at nøjagtigt dette ville ske. Også i det tyske parlament var der, i 2012, i forbindelse med SARS-pandemien, et scenarie på den såkaldte modi-SARS – hvilket betyder modificeret SARS – der sagde, at en mulig pandemi kunne nå frem til Europa, USA og Asien. Mærkeligt nok udelod de Afrika, så hvis man taler om pandemien og man udelader Afrika, er det meget underligt. Men det blev også ignoreret.

Hvad der er brug for nu, er en hidtil uset – og jeg mener virkelig hidtil uset – mobilisering. Jeg opfordrer jer alle til at deltage i at opbygge en alliance af mennesker, der vil deltage i Schiller Instituttets konference den 25. og 26. april. Og jeg vil have jer til at nå ud til mange organisationer og mennesker i Nordamerika, Europa, men også Latinamerika, Asien, Afrika. At nå ud til FN-organisationer, til ngo'er, til Verdenssundhedsorganisationer med det ene formål: At vi er nødt til at geare op for at opbygge et Silkevejs-sundhedssystem i alle lande. Vi må opnå en dampromleeffekt af mennesker, der straks kræver hospitaler, ICU-enheder, men også mad. Fordi der allerede er fare for, at denne pandemi ledsages af en fødevaremangel på grund af sammenbrud af dele af fødevareproduktionen, fra de berørte mennesker, osv.

Men hvis vi samtidigt ønsker at opbygge et nyt sundhedssystem på verdensplan, er det meget tydeligt, at det ikke kan gøres

med den nuværende kasinoøkonomi. Så er der brug for Lyndon LaRouches fire love. Det vil være nødvendigt med en global Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling for at finansiere et sundhedssystem i alle lande. Vi har brug for en nationalbank i hvert land, og disse nationalbanker skal være tilsluttet et Nyt Bretton Woods-kreditsystem. Resultatet af dette må også være et helt andet sæt af værdier. Absolut ikke den liberale orden og 'Oplysningstidens' værdier, som Kissinger beder om, men hvad vi i stedet har brug for er en tilbagevenden til humanistiske værdier, til ideen om menneskeheden som én menneskehed. At vi sætter de fælles interesser for menneskeslægten foran de nationale interesser, og at vi kommer ud af dette med et helt nyt paradigme for kærlighed til menneskeheden og et nyt system for internationale relationer, der sætter samarbejde over konfrontation. Hvis vi alle er forenede i denne ånd, tror jeg, at vi kan forvandle denne forfærdelige krise til en chance for hele menneskeheden ved at ændre paradigmet til at blive virkelig menneskeligt, som en menneskelig art.

Overvindelsen af COVID-19: Opdatering fra LaRouche- bevægelsens formand i Italien, Liliana Gorini

Epicenteret for COVID-19-pandemien har skiftet fra Hubei-provinsen i Kina til det nordlige Italien. Vi taler med den politiske og musikalske aktivist Liliana Gorini, som bor i

Lombardiet, der for øjeblikket er det mest aktive brændpunkt for coronavirus i Europa. Hør om hvordan livet er i et område, hvor lighusene er overfyldte, hvor man kan ende i fængsel ved at gå ned ad gaden uden et formål, og hvor planer om at bygge akuthospitaler bliver sat i værk.

Lær hvad du kan gøre – selv hjemmefra – for at forandre den globale politik ved at bidrage til gennemførelsen af de økonomiske ideer som Lyndon LaRouche udviklede og kæmpede for i årtier. Menneskeliv må komme først, ved hjælp af aggressive regeringstiltag for at tilvejebringe nødvendig sundhedspleje, forskning i sygdomshelbredelse, og udvikling af en robust økonomi i de kommende årtier, som gør os i stand til at håndtere ethvert problem naturen påfører os.

<https://larouchepac.com/20200317/defeating-covid-19-update-italy>

Trump imødegår grønne fascister i Davos med renæssance-optimisme.

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche d. 22 januar 2020

Alt imens 190 milliardærer og deres lakajer i erhvervsliv og institutioner er forsamlet i Davos og presser på med en grøn

fascistisk dagsorden, greb den amerikanske præsident Trump ind med et anderledes sæt af grundregler. Mens hans tale fremprovokerede hysteri, hvor nogle beskyldte ham for "meningsløs optimisme", priste han Firenzes borgere, der handlede med fantasi og dristighed ved bygningen af den store kuppel – en bedrift, som Lyndon LaRouche ofte omtalte som et eksempel på ånden i menneskelig kreativitet og engagement i fremskridt, der resulterede i renæssancen – og understregede dermed atter, hvorfor oligarkiet er opsat på at afslutte hans præsidentskab.

Helga dækkede en række emner, fra krigsfaren til den stigende sandsynlighed for et økonomisk sammenbrud, og vendte tilbage til nødvendigheden af et hastetopmøde mellem de tre præsidenter som et skridt i retning af et nyt paradigme for at overvinde farerne. Hun opfordrede tilhørerne til at slutte sig til os for at ændre dagsordenen, med henblik på at bringe menneskeheden tilbage til videnskab og kultur for at imødegå krig og ødelæggelse. Udnyt muligheden i dette jubilæumsår for Beethoven til at opdage den sande skønhed i den menneskelige kultur.

Se og del: Dokumentarfilm om at rense Lyndon LaRouches navn.

Skriv gerne under for at rensse LaRouches navn: klik her.

Læs også afskriftet (på engelsk) nedenunder.

Trailer:

Den 21. juni offentliggjorde LaRouchePAC en 80-minutters dokumentarfilm, som opfordrer til at rensse Lyndon LaRouches navn, "Hvorfor Lyndon LaRouches navn skal renses" (primært med uddrag af de uafhængige høringer fra 1995 om justitsministeriets embedsmisbrug – med Lyndon LaRouche, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, USA's fhv. justisminister Ramsey Clark, og LaRouches sagfører Odin Anderson).

Hjælp med at få denne nye video til at gå viralt.

I samarbejde med Helga LaRouche lancerer vi en international mobilisering for at få så mange som muligt (medlemmer, tilhængere, aktivister, kontakter osv.) til at dele, promovere og sprede videoen.

Kan du gøre en særlig indsats for at nå ud til kontakter med vigtige e-mail-lister, hjemmesider, blogs, Twitter, Facebook osv. og bede dem om at cirkulere dokumentaren. (Du kan naturligvis også hjælpe ved at promovere det via dine egne lister/sociale medier/eller hjemmeside)

Med den rette koordinerede indsats kan vi få videoen til at gå viralt.

Afskrift på engelsk:

The Case of LaRouche: Robert Mueller's First Hit Job

The Case for the Exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche

June 21, 2019

[music]

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The most important in history is ideas, especially those ideas which move mankind forward; which are ideas which make the life of generations to come more human.

For me, the biggest crime of what happened to my husband is not that he was innocently in jail. I'm not saying it was not a hard time, because it was. But the lack of the ability to have important ideas govern history; that is the biggest crime. Lyn, while he was incredibly courageous of producing creative work while he was in prison – I mean, he did more in prison than any of us outside, and he put us to shame.

But nevertheless, I will only give you one example. In 1989, he was already in jail for nearly one year, when the borders of Europe opened. He, from his prison cell, designed a great vision of how to integrate Eastern Europe, Western Europe, China, the whole Eurasian continent, which would have been a groundbreaking conception which would have put the entire history of the 20th century on a totally new basis. Because economically, to integrate that economic space as one would have given opportunities and freedom to the states of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the Asian countries. But because Lyn was in jail, this idea did not become as effective as if he would have been free.

Now, I'm saying this because to put a man of great ideas into jail is a crime all by itself, because of the ideas. The reason why we were able to mobilize hundreds of parliamentarians and thousands of VIPs from around the globe – why would people from Africa sign the parole request for

Lyndon LaRouche? Why would people from Latin America do this? Why would people from around the world, from Russia; why would people come out of completely different cultural worlds to fight for this man? Well, because we not only said this man must be free and his innocence must be proven, but they, many of them told me and others that they understand that the kind of change in global policy my husband is standing for, the kind of just new world economic order which allows the economic development of Africa; which allows the economic development of the developing countries, of Eastern Europe, they say is the only hope for them, for their nation, as far away as it may be.

So, the reason why we must win is not because it's a personal affair. But as my husband was saying, we are going into a period of crisis, which most people are completely unaware of. The kinds of changes have to be big, and they have to be done with the help of the United States, because the world cannot be saved against the United States.

So, it is an historical necessity. And I think in a certain sense, given the experience I have from eight years of fighting this, given the fact that more and more people around the globe are united around this and understand that mankind is sitting in one boat this time; that either we solve all our problems at once, or nobody will live. I think we can win, and I think we must have that attitude. [applause]

NARRATOR: On August 31st and September 1st, 1995, a series of extraordinary hearings were convened in Tysons Corner, Virginia, to investigate gross misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice. The hearings were chaired by former U.S. Congressman James Mann of South Carolina and J.L. Chestnut of Alabama – the great lawyer and icon of the Civil Rights movement. The hearings focussed on abuses by the U.S. Department of Justice, highlighting the onslaughts of

targetted criminal cases against black elected officials in the United States – dubbed “Operation Fruehmenschen” according to FBI whistleblowers and Congressman Merv Dymally of California; as well as the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: My case may be, as Ramsey Clark described it, the most extensive and the highest level of these cases, in terms of the duration and scope of the operation.

NARRATOR: Witnesses included: LaRouche’s attorney, Odin Anderson; former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who had been LaRouche’s defense attorney in his appeal; Lyndon LaRouche’s wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche – from whom you just heard; and Lyndon LaRouche himself. The panel was comprised of leading national and international political figures, including the former Vice Premier of Slovakia, Jozef Miklosko; numerous state senators and other elected officials from across the United States; as well as Chor-Bishop of the Maronite Church, Monsignor Elias el-Hayek. Numerous international observers were present, including legendary Civil Rights heroine Amelia Boynton Robinson of Selma, Alabama.

As you will hear, these hearings demonstrated not just the injustice which was perpetrated against leading U.S. political officials by the Department of Justice because of their political views – exemplified by the case of Lyndon LaRouche – but the inherent danger at that time that such abuses, if left unchecked, could subsequently threaten the very existence of our Constitutional republic itself; a fight we see playing out today as we speak at the very highest level of our government, in the form of the attempted takedown of the U.S. Presidency.

[from Oct. 6, 1986]

NEWS REPORTER 1: The raid command post, about three miles from town, was busy all night. Just before dawn, Virginia State Police moved out. It was a combined strike force, including FBI, Internal Revenue Service, Secret Service, and other Federal and state agents. As FBI agents approached LaRouche's estate in Leesburg, Virginia, 50 miles from Washington, police lined up outside.

NEWS REPORTER 2: Good evening. Federal and state agents today raided the Leesburg, Virginia headquarters of political activist Lyndon LaRouche.

NEWS REPORTER 3: Today, it was a law enforcement assault here in Leesburg that set this town buzzing.

NEWS REPORTER 4: Scores of state and local police joined Federal agents in a coordinated, nationwide raid.

NARRATOR: On October 6, 1986, four hundred FBI, state police, IRS, ATF agents, and the national news media descended on Leesburg, Virginia, to search offices associated with the LaRouche political movement. At a farm outside Leesburg, where Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche were staying, heavily armed agents dressed in full tactical gear patrolled the perimeter as armored personnel carriers surrounded the property, and helicopters buzzed constantly overhead.

In addition the materials specified in the Federal search warrant, according to later court testimony, the FBI case agent in charge was searching for evidence by which to obtain

an arrest warrant for Lyndon LaRouche himself and a search warrant to allow armed entry to the farm. A plan was in place to provoke a firefight with LaRouche's security guards, to take out LaRouche, which was admitted years later.

During the evening of October 6th, moves to implement that plan seemed to begin with news stations broadcasting that now an assault was about to occur on the farm. A telegram was sent in LaRouche's name to President Ronald Reagan, seeking his intervention to call off the raid. Coincidentally, at exactly the same time, President Reagan was in Reykjavik, Iceland, refusing to back down in negotiations with Mikhail Gorbachev on his commitment to the so-called SDI – the Strategic Defense Initiative. The same SDI that Lyndon LaRouche had worked for years alongside top officials in the Reagan Administration to craft and support.

LAROUCHE: A first-generation of strategic ballistic missile defense ...

NARRATOR: Only after this telegram to Ronald Reagan was sent did the forces surrounding the farm begin to dissipate and recede. However, this was merely the opening chapter, in a concerted campaign involving elements within the Justice Department to target and dismantle the political operation of Lyndon LaRouche. A campaign which astute observers of this case would readily compare to the operation underway, today, against none other than President Donald J. Trump. There are striking similarities between the LaRouche case and the present attempt to prosecute or impeach Donald Trump.

The first one is that both cases with a British call for prosecution and criminal investigation. In LaRouche's case, British intelligence sent a letter to the FBI in 1982, demanding investigation because LaRouche, the British claimed,

was an agent of Soviet disinformation. At the same time, Henry Kissinger and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board triggered a counterintelligence investigation of LaRouche under Executive Order 12333. In the Trump case, the British government began demanding Trump's head as early as 2015; and have bragged to the {Guardian} and other British newspapers that their spying was the origin of Russiagate.

Both cases shared a legal hit man in the form of prosecutor Robert Mueller. And, both cases involved the employment of the criminal law enforcement and intelligence capacities of the United States to defeat and silence a political opponent for political reasons; something which violates the very core principles of the U.S. Constitution. In LaRouche's case, the effort was to permanently demonize him, in order to bury his ideas, precisely as Helga LaRouche stated in her testimony.

As can be seen, the failure to challenge the gross abuses of justice, perpetrated by the Justice Department in the case of Lyndon LaRouche, has now brought us to the point, where the very Constitutional system on which our republic depends is being threatened.

REP. JAMES MANN: All right, the session will come to order.

NARRATOR: Let's hear from Lyndon LaRouche's lawyer, Mr. Odin Anderson of Boston, Massachusetts.

MANN: As we attempt to study the broad subject of misconduct by the Department of Justice ... we cannot overlook the case that is perhaps the most pervasive (and I'm stealing the words from Ramsey Clark, I think), most pervasive course of

misconduct by the Department of Justice, in the history of this country: broader-based, longstanding, abuse of power beyond expression, abuse of power through the use of Federal agencies, including, even, a Bankruptcy Court.

Throughout the days of the LaRouche ordeal of criminal charges, Odin Anderson, a lawyer from Boston, has been the solid rock of criminal defense and counsel, far and above any other person. He can, therefore, speak to the subject of misconduct, or such facets of that as he may choose to discuss, better than anybody, with the possible exception of Lyndon and Helga. He has, literally, devoted a major portion of his life in the last 7 or 8 years, 8 or 9 years, to that task. And we appreciate him taking the time to be here from Boston, to make some such statement as he wishes to make, and be responsive to questions.

Thank you.

ODIN ANDERSON: Thank you, Congressman, honorable panel. It's I who thank you for this opportunity to speak about the LaRouche case.

I'm thankful, as I looked up and counted names, there are only 11 of you. If there had been a 12th, I would have been tempted to re-try this case in front of you, assured, I think, that Mr. LaRouche would finally get a fair trial...

I have represented Lyndon LaRouche since 1984, at which time he was directly targetted by the Department of Justice, through its U.S. Attorney's office in Boston, although there is a history of many years of harassment prior to that...

Back in the late '60s, you probably all remember a student organization called the Students for a Democratic Society, (SDS); very active on campuses, particularly around the Vietnam War, but on many other issues of political importance

to the United States; economic, social, a broad range of issues.

Mr. LaRouche, and a number of political associates of his, became involved in those very same issues. But they had a difficulty with SDS, and essentially founded their own group, which became known, originally as a faction of SDS, the Labor Committees. They ultimately became known as the National Caucus of Labor Committees, which was and remains a political association ... of people who share like political views.

Probably the best way to demonstrate the government's venal behavior, and the unconstitutional activities undertaken, directed out of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, is to show you their own documents, and read to you their own words. And, by way of history, I'd like to have No. 1 put up on the screen.

What you see before you, is an FBI memorandum from the SAC, the Special Agent-in-Charge, of the New York Field Office of the FBI, to the Director. It's dated March 1969. And, it requests authorization of the Director to issue a false leaflet, to stir up antagonisms between these various aspects of SDS. Now, I'm sure that's a tactic familiar to all of you, if in slightly different form. They want to disseminate this leaflet under false cover, to various of these groups, and stir up as much controversy between them, hopefully, undermining their ability to act in concert, and getting them into faction fights, which would destroy their efficiency and cohesion.

Well, if you put up No. 2, you'll see that they got that authority from the Director of the FBI, and his blessing: "Authority is granted to anonymously mail copies of the leaflet submitted." Now, I'm not going to bother to show you the leaflet, because it's a piece of scurrilous garbage. It's available for anyone who would like to see it. It was called "The Mouse Crap Revolution," but its intent and purpose was

exactly as defined in the letters. {This} is the Department of Justice, {this} is the FBI at work in the 1960s, under – if you look at the bottom – what was called “Cointelpro,” or “Counterintelligence Program.”...

So in 1969 and the 1970s, this was the kind of activity which was going on against the LaRouche political movement, and many others, including people you’re well acquainted with personally.

If we could move on to the next overlay [No. 3]. This is to the Director, again from the SAC in New York, regarding the named subject, Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, Jr., also known as Lynn Marcus, as they suggest. This is one of the most incredible pieces of FBI material that I have ever seen...

What this suggests, is that the Communist Party has let the FBI know, that they want to eliminate Lyndon LaRouche, for their political reasons. They consider him to be a “politically dangerous person,” and the Communist Party wants to eliminate him.

If you look at the bottom, “New York proposes submitting a blind memorandum to the {Daily World},” to foster these efforts. Here’s the FBI climbing in bed with the Communist Party, in order to effect the elimination of Lyndon LaRouche from the political scene. I think we all know what that means. And they go on to say, that it’s believed, that once LaRouche is eliminated, the political effectiveness of the National Caucus of Labor Committees will, thereby, be diminished, and it will cease to be of any political significance. Here, again, is the FBI, in the ’70s, in operation.

Years went by, and the members of the National Caucus of Labor Committees continued their political efforts. Now, they are considered, Mr. LaRouche is considered, extremely controversial by many. Those he’s considered controversial by, tend to be those whose policies are inconsistent with his, or

those that he has named as operating against the best interests of the society and peoples of the United States. And we all know, that those people tend to be very powerful people....

Henry Kissinger, who we all know by name, and some probably remember by reputation and actions, was a very powerful man. Mr. LaRouche took exception with his policies, which he considered to be genocidal, particularly in the context of the financial policies, and the conditionalities imposed on the Third World in order to get money from the World Bank, and got into a serious row with Mr. Kissinger.

And Mr. Kissinger writes to (on his letterhead) William Webster, the Director of the FBI [Exhibit No. 4]. They had recently had a lovely social occasion together at the place called the Grove, where these powers associate, and frolic around, in various curious ways. And after that, he [Kissinger] appreciates having seen him there, and asks for the assistance of Bill Webster in dealing with "the LaRouche menace."...

Here is [Exhibit No. 5]— within the short period thereafter, "Buck" Revell, who was the head of counterintelligence for the FBI, at the time, is sent this memorandum by William Webster, who had been contacted by David Abshire of PFIAB, that's the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. And these same parties, Henry Kissinger and his colleagues, are now raising before PFIAB, the question as to whether LaRouche, because he seems to have funding from sources that they don't understand, is operating as a foreign intelligence agent, and they want them to look into this.

Now, what that does, and the words are bad enough, but the reality is terrifying. This triggers the Executive Order I referred to earlier, Executive Order 12333, which allows virtually *{any form of conduct, any activity}*, to be undertaken, as long as it's under this national security

cover. So, this was the beginning of a national security-covered operation against Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues...

The common denominator between all of these cases is twofold. It's, as I said, political targetting, and it's the Criminal Division of the Justice Department.

You probably also know, from your own experiences with colleagues who have run afoul of the situations that have been discussed, that the first place they try you, is in the press. Only *{then}* do they try you in the courts, once they've set the stage, once they've poisoned all the minds in the community against you, then, they haul you into court, where you can't get a fair trial, because the jurors who are sitting there, have been told for days, months, years, or millennia, what a bad person you are, and what horrible offenses you've committed against the moral or social fabric of the community.

Well, that's precisely what happened in the LaRouche case, probably more so than in any other case... In the LaRouche case, the press began, not by accident, because we all know who owns the press: It's not owned by individuals, and as a matter of fact, there's an awful lot of ownership of the press which represents certain political and financial interests.

So, the fact is that beginning in the same period of the 80s, a private financier in New York City, John Train, with reach into the media community, by virtue of his social and financial circumstances, convened a group of media types in a salon that he hosted in his apartment, to plan a press campaign against LaRouche, and his political movement. Their objective was threefold: to tar and feather Lyndon LaRouche and his colleagues as best they could; to advocate and press for prosecutions of any kind, in any place; and, ultimately, to destroy and jail LaRouche, and destroy the political movement which he headed.

Among those who attended this meeting – and there were several of them, that we have evidence of, collected over a period of years, and admissions by people under oath – were members of and persons associated with the intelligence community, as well as people with political axes to grind against Mr. LaRouche, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, who has, historically, done everything it could, financially and editorially, to label Mr. LaRouche as an anti-Semite, as a fascist, as a racist, as a “Hitler,” a “little Hitler,” and some of the most scurrilous names we can imagine hurling in another person's face without basis.

All of these parties, collectively, – and unfortunately, this is the way these things operate; they don't operate above board, they operate under the table where you can't see them, because they don't flourish well in the light of day, but they grow well in darkness. They get together, and in fact, this has been referred to by others as part of the “secret government”: The powers that be that operate in conjunction with official agencies but are never seen or heard of. ...

I want to move on briefly and specifically to the LaRouche cases, which are, in fact, a series of cases, that began in 1984.

In 1984, Mr. LaRouche, under his name, sued NBC and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in Federal court in Alexandria, Virginia, on libel charges, on the basis of the accusations which I've already told you about.

We tried that case. NBC lied through their teeth, in terms of what information we had. In fact, we had FBI documents that indicated that the NBC reporter had received proprietary and non-public information from four agencies of the federal government, with reference to Mr. LaRouche.

So they make the stories up, and then they leak them to people who want to use them against you. ...

We sued NBC in Alexandria, Va. As soon as that case was over, NBC in Boston, on the very day – I had finished our presentation and was packing up to go back to Boston, published a so-called “investigative series” of theirs, alleging that certain persons associated with the LaRouche political campaign, had made false credit charges against certain contributors. And they [NBC] had a couple of contributors who got up and said, “you know, I met these people, and I gave them 35 bucks, and the next thing I knew, there was 100 bucks charged to my credit card.”

Well, I’ll say one thing. Mr. LaRouche is very controversial. And people who contributed to them, frequently came under various types of criticism for that contribution. It could be their wife who says, “what’re you giving \$100 away? We need to buy new shoes for the kids.” Or, it could be a neighbor, or a child. And many times, the amounts of money were larger, so the reasons for opposing the contribution were even greater.

But, if you know anything about credit cards, the only way a person can re-capture money charged to his credit card, which has been charged to the account, is to say “it was unauthorized.” Those are the magic words. If you don’t use the magic words, you can’t collect the \$100. So, in order to reverse a credit card charge, one must say, “I never authorized it.”

Therefore, what you’re alleging in that case – although the intent was probably not to make the allegation – but in fact you’re alleging that the person did it without your authority, which could be a criminal act.

Now, they started an investigation around this, which they conducted for two years. It ultimately culminated in a trial in Boston.

Of course, another thing you’ll all recognize from your personal experiences, is that when they want to charge you and

they don't have anything, they charge you with conspiracy; because then, they don't have to prove anything! They just go around, tell a bunch of stories, and hope that the jury is poisoned against you, is going to link it all up somehow, and convict you. So "conspiracy" is the vehicle, and that's precisely what happened in Boston: LaRouche and his colleagues were charged with conspiracy, with a few other specific charges linked on as an afterthought.

We tried the case for seven months. We weren't even through with the government's case, when the case mis-tried. The reason it mistried, is that the jury had been led to believe that the case would have been over long before, which it would have, had we been able to concentrate on the evidence. But, because of the hearings that the judge was forced to conduct for literally months and months, on governmental misconduct, the case dragged on, and the jury sat in the jury box.

The jury ultimately got frustrated and ... wanted to go home, and the case mistried.

This is an article from the {Boston Herald} that printed that day. [Exhibit No. 6] I'm only showing it to you for one reason, not because of the highlight, "LaRouche Jury Would Have Voted 'Not Guilty'" – although that's true, and those come out of the words of the jury foreman, who was interviewed – but, in the first line of text, there are some very important words, from the foreman:

"'We would have acquitted everybody at this point, and that's based on prosecution evidence', said foreman Dashawetz. "There was too much question of government misconduct in what was happening to the LaRouche campaign.'"

"Government misconduct." Very seldom do you get a jury to see it, because the government fights you {*nail and tooth*}. They lie, they cover up evidence, they, in fact, deny information to their own agents, so that the agent won't be in a position

to have to intentionally not disclose it. These are common tactics, and that's what happened here. Fortunately, in our case, we were able to show enough of it to the jury, so that the jury got the smell.

However, the government wasn't about to quit, particularly having taken what was a serious public relations beating at that point in time. So, they decided to switch forums, come down to a much more favorable forum, – {the} most favorable forum – the Eastern District of Virginia: the so-called “rocket docket,” the home of almost every government agency, and government contractor in the country, with a few other pockets here and there.

They brought the case down to there, indicted the case, and brought us to trial. New charges, new defendants. LaRouche was also indicted, so he was one of the few who was also charged the second time – and forced the case from indictment to trial in 28 days.

There's a great book, and it's not a novel, it's a factual book. It is the history of the case shown by the documents of the case; it's called {Railroad!} and I commend it to your attention. If you're to see how that system worked in this particular case, it's all there, and it's not somebody else's words, it's the words from the court documents.

In any event, LaRouche was convicted, as were all of his co-defendants, {again}, on conspiracy charges. That was the seminal charge, the rest were just tacked on. This time it wasn't credit cards. It was allegations of wire fraud, the allegation being that loans were taken from contributors, without intent to repay, or with reckless disregard of that fact that payment wouldn't take place.

Now, these were political loans, made in the political context, by political people, to a political candidate, and his political candidacy. Everybody knew that...

Back in Boston, the grand jury that was investigating the case, held certain businesses associated with Mr. LaRouche in contempt of court, for not producing documents which were under subpoena, which were being fought during a period of time based on various privacy grounds.

Twenty million dollars' worth of contempt sanctions were imposed. The government then sought to collect that \$20 million, by filing an involuntary bankruptcy against these organizations in Alexandria, Virginia, just prior to – not just prior – but at some point prior to the Alexandria indictments.

They also did this, {*ex parte*}. The government was the {*only*} creditor – in violation of federal law. But, by virtue of their {*ex parte*} petition to the judge, they were able to effect the closing of these four businesses, all of which were engaged in First Amendment advocacy and publication. These businesses were closed. They were seized by Federal marshals. They never reopened. The publications were never reprinted.

The \$20 million the government sought, was a ruse. In fact, what they intended to do, and what they did do, was close the conspiracy that they alleged in the Alexandria indictments, on the very day that they filed the bankruptcy. The point of the bankruptcy being that from the moment a bankruptcy is filed, an order issued, that no one can pay any debts without order of the court. So it was physically impossible for any debts to be repaid after that, thereby creating a pool of persons who were owed money, who couldn't be repaid. They [the government] got five or six of these people to come forward and say, "I was promised repayment and didn't get it," and that was the basis of the conviction for loan fraud.

In any event, I want to say that we have fought as vigorously as anyone can through the appeals process, without success and through the {*mandamus*} process, 2255s in federal court. And are now at a stage, where, Ramsey Clark, former Attorney

General of the United States, who has been with me on all of the appeals, – he joined the effort just after the sentencing of Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues in 1990. Recently, he wrote a letter to the Attorney General, asking for a departmental review of the LaRouche case. I'd like to read you some portions of his letter. He'll be here tomorrow to speak to you personally. I'd like to leave you with the following words of Ramsey Clark:

“Dear Attorney General Reno,

I have been an attorney in this case since shortly after the defendants were sentenced in January 1989 and appeared as co-counsel on appeal and on the subsequent motions and appeals in proceedings under 28 U.S.C. sec. 2255 and F.R. Cr.P. Rule 33. I bring this matter to you directly, because I believe it involves a broader range of deliberate and systematic misconduct and abuse of power over a longer period of time in an effort to destroy a political movement and leader, than any other federal prosecution in my time or to my knowledge. Three courts have now condemned the Department's conduct in this prosecutorial campaign. The result has been a tragic miscarriage of justice which at this time can only be corrected by an objective review and courageous action by the Department of Justice.”

MANN: The session will come to order. The session will come to order.

We are pleased and honored to have with us today, the former Attorney General of the United States Ramsey Clark, who will make such presentation as he may choose. Attorney General.

RAMSEY CLARK: Thank you very much. It's a good feeling to be here with you again this year. I wish I could say it's been a

good year for freedom and justice under law, but I can't say that. But at least, in this company, you know that the struggle goes on, and that we shall overcome.

I will, probably, unless my mind wanders, which it does, talk about three cases primarily. And I'll start and end, with the case of Lyndon LaRouche and his co-defendants. not because it's the Alpha and Omega, although it's about as close as a case gets to the potential perfidy of justice, but because it shows how bad it can be, and yet, it has, as so very, very few of these cases ever do, a positive side that we have to consider.

I came into the case after the trial. As a person who lives in the country and pays attention to these things, I followed it carefully. I knew something about the ways of the judicial district in which the case was filed and the meaning of filing a case there. To call it the "rocket docket" is a disservice, unless you identify the rocket, because if there's a rocket in present use that would be similar, it would be the so-called depleted uranium-tipped missile, the silver bullet used in Iraq.

In other words, it's a lethal rocket. It's not a rocket that sought truth or intended justice. ...

I was prepared, therefore, for what might happen. I had followed the earlier case in Boston, which, by any measure, was an extremely peculiar case, both in its charges and its prosecution, and in its history. I knew the judge there as a fellow Texan. His brother, Page Keeton, had been dean of the law school where I started out, down at the University of Texas. And he's one of the old school, that doesn't like tricks, falsity, or injustice. He became outraged with the prosecution, and did a lot. I can't tell you he did all that a judge could have done. I believe Odin would agree, though, he did a lot. And not many judges, who come through a political conditioning process, who have the courage to stand up to the

power of the Executive Branch, to the FBI and others, and say the things that he did. And, that was almost an early end to a malicious prosecution.

But, in what was a complex and pervasive a utilization of law enforcement, prosecution, media, and non-governmental organizations focussed on destroying an enemy, this case must be number one. There are some, where the government itself may have done more and more wrongfully over a period of time. But the very networking and combination of federal, state, and local agencies, of executive and even some legislative and judicial branches, of major media and minor local media, and of influential lobbyist types – the ADL preeminently – this case takes the prize.

The purpose can only be seen as destroying—it's more than a political movement, it's more than a political figure. It {is} those two. But it's a fertile engine of ideas, a common purpose of thinking and studying and analyzing to solve problems, regardless of the impact on the {status quo}, or on vested interests. It was a deliberate purpose to destroy that at any cost. ...

And yet, all this law enforcement was coming down on them. We didn't have that kind of violence, that physical violence, in the LaRouche case. But the potential from one side was entirely there. The day they went out to seize 2 million documents, as I recall (I may be off a million or 2 million), a big warehouse! These people produce a lot of paper, and it's not trash; it's not bureaucratic paper-keeping; you may not agree with it, but it's all saying things. They had several times more agents, armed, than the ATF force that initially attacked the Mount Carmel Church outside Waco on Feb. 28, 1993. They just didn't have people on the other side, who were shooters....

I guess I'm really still caught with the idea, the old idea of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States,

that is ingrained in a lot of Americans, in particular, young lawyers, who are kind of idealistic and believe in the idea of freedom and the power of the word and the truth. I believe the truth can set us free. I think that's the struggle. The real struggle, is whether we can see the truth in time... The truth can set us free.

In the LaRouche case, they're book people. (I have to confess to an intellectual weakness: I find reading easier than thinking, so I read constantly, nearly blinded myself from too much reading. I've got 15,000 books at home, read most them, unfortunately. As you can tell, I haven't learned much, but I haven't stopped yet.) These are book people. They had publishing houses going on. Important publications. Non-profit stuff... **And the government comes in a completely** – these are just some of the peripheral things, that Odin and others might not have explained to you, but these are what they were about: {ideas}, information, social change! Meeting the needs of human people all over the world, humanity all over the world.

We're going to have a billion more people before the end of this millennium, century, decade, and the vast majority, 80% of them are going to have beautiful, darker skin. And they're going to live short lives, {short lives} of sickness, hunger, pain, ignorance, and violence, {unless we act radically}. And these books have ideas! Some will work, some won't work, but they're ideas. They can be "tested in the marketplace," as we used to say.

And they [the government] come in with a {false} bankruptcy claim, against a non-profit publishing houses, and {shut 'em down!} What's the First Amendment worth, you know? "We'll silence you, you'll have no books out there."

And not only that: then they take people who were contributing and supposed to be paid back their loans to the publisher, and try to prosecute, falsely, on it. They put on witnesses, to

give false testimony. From the tens and tens of thousands of contributors, and thousands of people who gave loans, they came up with a baker's dozen, roughly – 13, 14, 15 people – who got their feelings hurt, perhaps. And some who were mean-spirited enough to lie about it, and who didn't get their money back, although they were being paid back. Because anybody can have financial crunch, where you can't pay back.

Imagine what would happen to political campaigns in this country, if you enforced law strictly against those who are raising money like this, by inquiring about all the people who gave money; whether they got what they wanted, what they expected, and whether they were misled about it. Nobody could run for office.

We know in this society that we are plutocracy, that money dominates politics, absolutely dominates it: Read this new book *{The Golden Rule}* by Thomas Ferguson, University of Chicago Press, about the role of money in our democratic society, how it absolutely controls not just the elections, and not just the politicians, but the whole shebang! The media, the military, the industry, everything. And we call it "democracy."

We need some ideas, we need the good words out there. And that's why it had to be stopped, and that's why they came after him.

I read the record – in addition to reading books, I read lots of records of trials. Absolutely no evidence to support a conviction there, if you take it all, if you exclude the parts that were false or venomous, there's not even a shell. But they had to say that this noble enterprise, agree or not with it, was corrupt. Corrupt – have nothing to do with it! It's corrupt! Nobody respects financial or other corruption. Destroy 'em that way.

They were put to trial, without any chance to prepare their

case, and they made a valiant effort. And got consecutive sentences – unbelievable...

We've been trying in every way we can, others much more than I, to make the LaRouche case known. I personally have appeared at meetings in Europe and North America. There have been books and pamphlets and there's a constant flow of literature and verbal communication.

We've tried, for I can't tell you how many years right now, but several years, maybe four even, to explore the possibility of fair hearings in the Congress.

Hearings are risky in a highly political environment like that. ...

There's a continuing effort. I think it will bear fruit. We've asked the Department of Justice for a comprehensive review. Lyndon LaRouche has always asked for a review, not only of his case, but of all cases where there are allegations of serious misconduct, and usually names a bunch of 'em. And so, we've always done that. That's his vision. It happens to be my vision, too, of how you correct things.

But the capacity of the Department of Justice for self-criticism, is of a very low order. It has two offices that are charged with the responsibility. One's called the Office of Professional Responsibility, and one's called the Office of the Inspector General, and neither have ever done anything very serious that I'm aware of. Maybe someone was caught stealing pencils, or something, taking home for the kids. That's about the dimension of their address.

So our efforts to secure a review of injustice; we've tried in the courts. We sought {*habeas corpus*}, which is the grand English – it's the Writ of Amparo; in the Dominican Republic, it's the grand old way of reviewing injustice and wrongful conviction – and we got short shrift. We had to go back to the same judge who gave us the fast shrift the first time!

The [inaudible 54:09] rocket docket.

So, we have to find solid means. The media's a great problem. The media's controlled by wealth and power that prefers the *{status quo}*, and it's very sophisticated in how it manages these matters. I can take a cause that they're interested in, that's virtually meaningless, and be on prime time evening news. And I can take on a cause of what I consider to be international importance of the highest magnitude, that they oppose, and shout from the rooftops, and you'd never know I existed. That's the way it works.

That's one reason that publications – the books and magazines and newspapers that spread the word – even though they're minor compared with the huge international media conglomerates that we're confronted with, but they reach thinking people, and they spread the word.

I think we'll get our hearing in time, and I think it'll be a reasonably short time, but I think to be meaningful, it's going to take a regeneration of moral force in the American people.

I'm both an optimist and an idealist, so you have to take what I say with a grain of salt. But I believe that the civil rights movement was the noblest quest of the American people in my time. I think it was real, and vital, and passionate. And I think it consumed the energies and faith of some few millions of people. I mean, we really believed in it! We were marching and singing and doing! And then it kind of dribbled out. So that now we have this vicious fights that divide us.

We have to have a moral regeneration and energy and commitment and faith and belief, that we can overcome; that equality is desirable; that justice is essential; that a life of principle is only worth living; then we'll get our hearings. Then we won't need our hearings, but we'll have to keep on.

MANN: The session will come to order.

If anyone needs an introduction to the next presenter, I suggest you see him after the meeting. [laughter] We're delighted to have Lyndon LaRouche.

LYNDON H. LAROUCHE, JR: Just for the record, I'll state a few facts which bear upon the circumstances in which certain events befell me.

I was born in Sept. 8, 1922, in Rochester, New Hampshire, lived there for the first 10 years of my life, lived for the next 22 years of my life in Lynn, Massachusetts, except for service overseas. I moved to New York City, where I lived until July of 1983, and, since that time, except for a period of incarceration, I have been a resident of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I attended university a couple of times, before the war or at the beginning of the war, and after it; and then had a career in management consulting, which lasted until about 1972, tapered off, sort of.

My most notable professional achievement was developed during the years 1948-1952, in certain discoveries of a fundamental scientific nature in respect to economics, and my professional qualifications are essentially derived from that.

In the course of time, in 1964, approximately, I was persuaded that things were being done to change the United States, which, from my view, were the worst possible disaster which could befall this nation. And thus, while I had given up any hope of political improvement in this country before then, to speak of, I felt I had to do something. So I became involved part time, from 1966 through 1973, in teaching a one-semester course in economics, largely on the graduate level, at a number of campus locations, chiefly in New York City, but also

in Pennsylvania.

In the course of this, a number of these students who participated in these classes, became associated with me, and, out of this association, came the birth of a nascent political organization, as much a philosophical organization as political. Our central commitment was Third World issues and related issues, that is, that economic justice for what is called the Third World is essential for a just society for all nations. I became particularly attached to this, during military service overseas in India, where I saw what colonialism does to people. And I was persuaded at the time, as I believe a majority of the people who were in service with me, was that we were coming to the end of a war, which we had not foreseen, but which we had been obliged to fight. And that if we allowed the circumstances to prevail that I saw in the Third World, we would bring upon ourselves some kind of disaster, either war or something comparable down the line.

And that was essentially our commitment as an association.

We became rather unpopular with a number of institutions, including McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation. About 1969, we made a mess of a few projects he was funding, by exposing them. And we also became unpopular with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, perhaps on the behest of McGeorge Bundy.

In 1973, according to a document later issued under the Freedom of Information Act by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the New York Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, acting at all times under supervision of Washington headquarters, hatched a plot to have me eliminated, or to induce the Communist Party U.S.A., that my elimination would solve a number of their problems. There actually was an abortive attempt on me during that period. I knew the FBI had been involved. I couldn't prove it then, but I knew it, and, later, a document appeared showing that.

From that point on, during the 1970s, until the end of COINTELPRO, we were constantly beset by the FBI. Our main weapon against the FBI was jokes. We used to make some jokes about the FBI, which we would pass around, to try to persuade them to keep off our tail, but they kept coming, and all kinds of harassment.

Then, in 1982, there was a new development. I sensed it happening, but I received the documents later: The events which led to my, what I would call, a fraudulently obtained indictment and conviction and incarceration.

It started, according to the record – of which I had some sensibility this was going on at the time – of Henry Kissinger, the former Secretary of State (with whom no love was lost between us), went to William Webster and others, soliciting an FBI or other government operation against me and my associates. This led, as the record later showed, to a decision by Henry Kissinger's friends on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, recommending an operation against me and my associates. This was adopted during the same month of January by Judge Webster, the Director of the FBI, who passed the implementation of this instruction along to his subordinate, Oliver "Buck" Revell, recently retired from the FBI, I believe.

The first inkling I had of this, was in about April of 1983, at which time a New York banker, John Train, who is very intelligence-witting, shall we say, of the private bank of Smith and Train in New York City, held a salon at which various government agents, private individuals, the Anti-Defamation League, for example, and also NBC-TV News, the *Reader's Digest*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and others, were represented.

The purpose was to coordinate an array of libels, a menu of libels, which would be commonly used by the news media, in an attempt to defame me, and hopefully, from their standpoint, to

lead to criminal action against me and my associates.

In January of 1984, this attack came into the open, launched by NBC-TV, which had been a participant in this salon of Train's, which launched the pattern, which was the pattern of coverage by all U.S. news media – major news media, and many minor news media. From the period of the end of January 1984, through the end of 1988, I saw no case of any significant coverage of me or mention of me, in the U.S. print media, particularly the major print media, the Associated Press, in particular, which was an active part of the prosecution, in fact, or in the national television media, network media, especially; not a single mention of me which did not conform to the menu of libels concocted by this salon, which had been established under John Train, as part of this operation.

This salon, including the Anti-Defamation League, NBC-TV, others, the Associated Press, actively collaborated, beginning sometime in 1984, with forces inside the government, which were determined to have a criminal prosecution against me and my associates. The criminal prosecution was launched at about the time of the 1984 presidential election, in October-November 1984. And from that point on, it was a continued escalation, until a Federal case in Boston led to a mistrial, occasioned largely by government misconduct in the case, in May of 1988.

Following that, on or about October 14 in Virginia, a new prosecution was opened up, and that led to my conviction in December of 1988, and my sentencing, for 15 years, in January 1989. I believe Mr. Anderson has described the nature of the case. And that resulted in five years of service in Federal prison, from which I'm now released on parole.

The motivations of the case against us, I think, are, in part, obvious, perhaps partly not.

In 1982-83, there were two things which greatly excited my

enemies. Number one, I had been involved, in 1982, in presenting a proposal which was based on my forecast in the spring of 1982, that a major debt crisis would break out in South America, Central America, and the expectation that Mexico would be the nation that would have a debt crisis. I'd been involved with many of these countries and personalities in them, in projecting alternatives to this kind of inequitable system, where the "colonial nation" had been replaced by the term "debtor nation." And the debt of South America, Central America was largely illegitimate, that is, it was a debt which had not been incurred for value received, but had been done under special monetary conditions, under the so-called floating exchange rate system, where bankers would come to a country, the IMF in particular, would say, "We just wrote down the value of the currency; we're now going to re-fund your financing of your foreign debt, which you can no longer pay on the same basis as before."

So I proposed, that the debt crisis be used as the occasion for united action, by a number of governments of South and Central American countries, to force a reform in the international debt relations, and to force a reform within international monetary relations. This report was entitled *{Operation Juárez}*, largely because of the relationship of President Lincoln to Mexico during the time that Lincoln was President; with the idea that it was in the interest of the United States to accept and sponsor such a reform, to assist these countries in the freedom to resume development of the type which they had desired.

This report was published in August of 1982, ironically a few weeks before the eruption of the great Mexico debt crisis of '82, and was presented also to the U.S. government and the National Security Council, for the President's information at that time. There was some effort, on the part of the President of Mexico, to implement my proposal in the initial period of the debt crisis. He had, at that time, some support from the

President of Brazil and the government of Argentina. But under pressure from the United States, the government of Brazil and Argentina capitulated, and President José López Portillo, the President of Mexico, was left, shall we say, "hanging out to dry."

As a result, in October of 1982, he capitulated to the terms which were delivered to his government and people around him, by people such as Henry A. Kissinger, who made a trip to Mexico at that time, to attempt to intimidate the Mexicans to submitting to these new terms. This was one issue between me and Kissinger, and his friends.

The second issue was, that sometime about December of 1981, a representative of the U.S. government approached me, and had asked me if I would be willing to set up an exploratory back-channel discussion with the Soviet government, because the Soviet government wanted, according to them, an additional channel to discuss things. And I said I didn't reject the idea, I said, but I have an idea on this question of nuclear missiles. It was becoming increasingly dangerous, forward-basing, more precise missiles, electromagnetic pulse, we're getting toward a first strike. It would be very useful to discuss what I proposed in my 1980 election campaign, with the Soviet government, to see if they'd be interested in discussing such a proposal. This might prove a profitable exploratory discussion.

And so, from February of 1982, through February of 1983, I did conduct such back-channel discussions with representatives of the Soviet government in Washington, D.C. Those were somewhat fruitful, but ultimately abortive. Kissinger and others became aware of this discussion, during the summer of 1982, and their circles were very much opposed to that. The general view was expressed, that I was getting "too big for my britches," and I had to be dealt with: on the question of debt, which some of these people were concerned about, and on this question of strategic missile defense, where I had this proposal, which

the President adopted, at least initially, in the form of what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. And when the Strategic Defense Initiative was announced by the President on March 23, 1983, there were a lot of people out for my scalp.

Those are the at least contributing factors, in what happened to me. But they may not be all. There probably are others, as well...

We have, in my view, a system of injustice whose center is within the Department of Justice, especially the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. The problem lies not with one administration or another, though one administration or another may act more positively or more negatively. You have permanent civil service employees, like Deputy Assistant Attorney General Jack Keeney and Mark Richard, who are coordinators of a nest of institutions in the Criminal Division, which show up, repeatedly, as leading or key associates of every legal atrocity which I've seen.

This is the case with the so-called Frühmenschen operation, which is largely an FBI operation, but which cannot run without cooperation from these people. ...

We have an out-of-control Justice Department, in my view, where the rot is not in the appointees, as much as it is in the permanent bureaucracy. We have a permanent sickness, in the permanent bureaucracy of part of our government.

In my case, when the time came that somebody wanted me out of the way, they were able to rely upon that permanent injustice in the permanent bureaucracy of government, to do the job. As in the Frühmenschen case, the Weaver case, the Waco case, the case of Waldheim, the case of Demjanjuk, and other cases. Always there's that agency inside the Justice Department, which works for contract, like a hitman, when somebody with the right credentials and passwords walks in, and says, "we want to get this group of people," or "we want to get this

person.”

My case may be, as Ramsey Clark described it, the most extensive and the highest level of these cases, in terms of the duration and scope of the operation. ...

So my case is important, in the sense it's more extensive, it's more deep-going, long-going. But when it came to getting me, it was the same apparatus, that, I find, in my opinion, was used in these other cases. And that until we remove, from our system of government, a rotten, permanent bureaucracy which acts like contract assassins, using the authority of the justice system to perpetrate assassination, this country is not free, nor is anyone in it. ... That's my view of the matter. Thank you. [applause]

MANN: Thank you.

J.L. CHESTNUT: You and I had a little chat in Selma, Alabama. ... I guess you can understand, that even somebody like me, sometimes, feels {*overwhelmed*}, and wonders whether or not America is just a lost cause. I hate to sound that way, but after 40 years, I've got {*serious*} reservations about whether we can save this country, about whether this country even {*wants*} to be saved.

LAROCHE: Well, I take an evangelical view of this. I've been associated with many lost causes in my life – as you have – and, once in a while, we win them. [laughter] ...

The problem of people, as I see it, is people don't trust the leadership; and I don't blame them for not trusting their leadership. I blame them for being too pessimistic. And it's up to us and others, to get enough people moving, to create a movement.

Like the case, just, of Martin Luther King. Now, I never personally met Martin Luther King, but I watched him closely. And I know something about Martin Luther King, from people who knew him, and his circumstances. And here was a man, he was a good man, he was a preacher, a Baptist preacher, I don't know. They run to this way and that way.

But one day, somebody appointed him, nominated him, to be a leader of the civil rights movement; out of a crowd, so to speak. He took the job, as an appointee, like a federal appointee! Only this was a civil rights movement. He went from crisis to crisis, in a few years, from the time that he received that appointment, until he went to his death, knowing he was facing death.

And in that period of time, he made a number of public speeches of great power and pith. Each of those speeches corresponded to a point of crisis in the history of the civil rights movement. And I saw, on television, and I read in the recorded speeches, I read a man who had gone into private, into his own Gethsemane, probably inspired by reading the New Testament, and said: "I will drink of this cup." And he came out with an *idea*, with a lot of people swarming around him. But he came out with the *idea*, and he presented a concept, which took a whole people who were looking to him and the civil rights movement; and he *ennobled* them.

He said, "You're not fighting for African-American rights. You're fighting for everybody's rights! You're fighting to make the Constitution real!" And it was a new idea, a different idea. And, as he did with his "Mountaintop" speech that he gave just before he went – again, a man who had walked into Gethsemane and said, "Yes, Lord, I will drink of this cup, as my Savior before me." And he went out, and he drank of the cup; and he inspired people.

Now, we don't know who among us is going to be the great leader of this period. But we know, as the civil rights people

of the 1960s, who had been at the civil rights business for many centuries, in point of fact, many of them with a conscious family tradition. They assembled together. They picked people from their midst as leaders; and among these leaders, was a Martin Luther King.

And I think, if enough of us assemble today around these kinds of issues, and show the nation that there {is} something moving, something which is of concern to the average citizen, that from among those we gather, together for that purpose, we will find the leaders we need.

[closing music]