

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

**Skriv gerne under for at rense LaRouches navn: [klik her](#).**

**Læs også afskriftet (på engelsk) nedenunder.**

### **Trailer:**

Den 21. juni offentliggjorde LaRouchePAC en 80-minutters dokumentarfilm, som opfordrer til at rense 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 Fröhmschen 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 Fröhmschen 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]

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 20.  
juni 2019:**

**Vil Trump samarbejde med Kina  
og Rusland ved G20**

# **eller blive manipuleret ind i krig med Iran?**

## **Se også 2. del inkl. diskussionen**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: 2. del:

Kommer senere. Der skal rettes op på et lyd problem. I midlertid, kan slutning høres i lydfilen nedenfor, inkl. "Hvad er Schiller Instituttet?". (begynd på 1 time 47 min.)

Lyd:

---

## **To videoer om LaRouches rolle i samtidshistorien har premiere på fredag kl. 15 dansk tid**

Se dem her: <https://Action.LaRouchePAC.com/Exonerate>

Den 16. juni (EIRNS) – LaRouche PAC udgiver d. 21. juni en videopræsentation, som indfanger det drama, der udspillede sig i 1995, da de uafhængige høringer om USA's justitsministeriums uredelige embedsførelse omkring anklagerne mod Lyndon H.

Larouche, Jr. fandt sted d. 31. august og d. 1. september.

Høringerne blev ledt an af den US-amerikanske borgerrettighedsbevægelses veteraner. De udgør endnu i dag bevismaterialet, der viser, at retssagen mod Lyndon LaRouche samt dommen mod ham, må omstødes, så hans navn endelig kan blive renset.

Lyndon LaRouche var verdens førende modstander mod de britiske centre for finans og efterretning, som forfulgte ham i flere årtier. Det er de samme kræfter, der i dag forsøger at tvinge USA's præsident Donald Trump til enten at gå af eller at acceptere en permanent krigerisk politik, der bliver ført uden om ham.

Derfor er det stærkeste middel præsident Trump kan bruge mod sine fjender i de britiske kredse at lade sig overtale til at sætte renselsen af Lyndon LaRouches navn i gang.

Den samme dag udgiver Schiller Instituttet en videooptagelse af den mindehøjtidelighed med titlen »Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.s triumf,« der blev holdt i New York City d. 8. juni. Begge disse videoer kan bruges til – med ånden fra denne mindehøjtidelighed – at forstærke og opløfte kampagnen for at rense Lyndon LaRouches navn, ved at blive spredt gennem hans støtters netværk, af dem, der allerede har anbefalet, at hans navn renses, og af dem, der for første gang stifter bekendtskab med denne store tænker og den skændige behandling, han er blevet udsat for.

Se dem her: <https://Action.LaRouchePAC.com/Exonerate>

---

# **På fredag: Se og hjælp til at omdele den nye dokumentarfilm om at rense Lyndon LaRouches navn**

Denne fredag (21. juni, kl. 15.00 dansk tid) offentliggør LaRouchePAC en 80-minutters dokumentarfilm, som opfordrer til Lyndon LaRouches frifindelse, "LaRouche-sagen: Robert Muellers første lejemord" (primært med uddrag af de uafhængige høringer fra 1995 om justitsministeriets embedsmisbrug – med Lyndon LaRouche, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Ramsey Clark og flere).

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, så snart den udkommer fredag morgen.

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, så snart den er udsendt på fredag? (Du kan naturligvis også hjælpe ved at promovere det via dine egne lister/sociale medier/eller hjemmeside)

Her er linket til promovering på fredag. <https://Action.LaRouchePAC.com/Exonerate> (eller [LPAC.co/Exon2019](https://LPAC.co/Exon2019))

Med den rette koordinerede indsats – lanceret sammen på fredag – kan vi få videoen til at gå viralt.

---

# **Efterhånden som faren for global krig vokser, er Lyndon LaRouches ideer mere nødvendige end nogensinde før Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 14. juni 2019**

Mindehøjtideligheden til fejringen af Lyndon LaRouches kreative liv gjorde et overvældende indtryk på de fleste deltagere, da det fulde omfang af de utrolige bidrag som Lyn har ydet blev tydelige. Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede, at mens de fleste er fanget i en daglig kamp for at få enderne til at hænge sammen, udfordrede Lyn dem til at tænke 50-100 år frem. Det nye paradigme, der nu dukker frem, blev forudset af Lyn for årtier siden, og han viede sit liv til at realisere sin smukke vision.

I dag identificerede Putin korrekt krisen, at de amerikanske og russiske relationer forværres time for time, selv om muligheden for at USA under præsident Trump, kan have "storartede relationer" med Rusland og Kina, stadig er mulig. Dette blev gjort klart, sagde hun, i rækken af konferencer for nylig i St. Petersburg og Biskek. Men det Britiske Imperium

fortsætter med at presse på for krig, med Iran som en seriøs, umiddelbar potentiel udløser.

Hun opfordrede lyttere til at se videoen fra mindehøjtideligheden og til at sørge for, at den kommende dokumentar om LaRouche-sagen får den størst mulige udbredelse. Løsningen på krisen findes, forudsat at folk påtager sig Lyndon LaRouches mission og gør den til deres egen.

---

## **Lyndon LaRouches triumf, 1922-2019**

### **Hovedtale og afsluttende bemærkninger af Helga Zepp- LaRouche**

Dennis Speed: På vegne af Schiller Institutet vil vi gerne byde velkommen til alle, der er her i dag, og byde velkommen til jer, som er samlet rundt omkring i USA og forskellige steder i verden. Vi har kaldt denne dag og denne mindehøjtidelighed for "Lyndon LaRouches Triumf". I virkeligheden er denne historie imidlertid fortællingen om to menneskers sejr. Den 12. oktober 1988 – for over 30 år siden – på Tysklands Kempinski Hotel, et år før Berlinmuren faldt, sagde Lyndon LaRouche til et forbløffet pressekorps: "Jeg kan forsikre jer for, at det jeg nu fremlægger for Jer vedrørende udsigten til Tysklands genforening er et forslag, som vil blive studeret nøje af de relevante kredse inden for etablisementet i USA. Mange vil i dag være enige om, at tiden

– under de rette omstændigheder – er inde til de indledende skridt imod genforeningen af Tyskland med en klar udsigt til, at Berlin kan genoptage sin rolle som hovedstad.” Lidt over et år senere, den 9. november 1989, faldt Berlinmuren. Den 3. oktober 1990 blev Tyskland genforenet, Berlin skulle atter blive hovedstaden. Inden for de timer der fulgte umiddelbart efter den 9. november, skitserede Lyndon LaRouche, der på daværende tidspunkt sad i fængsel, så den politik som nu går under forskellige navne i Verden, Den nye Silkevej, Bælte- og Vejinitiativet, og Schiller Instituttet ville rejse til de tidligere Warszawa Pagt-lande, og til Rusland og Kina for at tale for denne idé. Verden kom til at kende denne idé som en ny dialog mellem civilisationer, i modsætning til det der blev kaldt “civilisationernes sammenstød”. Som med personen Florestan, i Beethovens opera {Fidelio}, havde LaRouche vovet at tale sandheden, og hans belønning var at blive lænket gennem hans fængsling. Og som med Florestan og Fidelio, førte Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlæggeren og lederen af Schiller Instituttet, gennem sin utrættelige promovering af ‘Den nye Silkevej’, og hvad der nu hedder ‘Verdens-Landbroen’, gennem sin udformning af ‘dialogen mellem civilisationer’ og gennem sin hengivelse til ‘frihedspoeten’ Friedrich Schiller, den vellykkede kampagne for at befri Lyndon LaRouche fra fængsel. I dag er Lyndon LaRouches triumf mulig på grund af hende. Det er mig en ære, som altid, at introducere Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet. [stående bifald]

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Dette er et enestående øjeblik i vore liv, hvor vi samles her for at mindes og ære min elskede Lyn. Lyn ændrede livet for de fleste af os, på den mest dybtgående måde. Og hvis vi spørger os selv: “Hvor ville jeg have været, hvis ikke for det utrolige privilegium at have mødt Lyn, vor tids mest kreative tænkere?” Hvis man ser rundt i vores samfund i dag, ser man så mange liv, der spenderes dårligt, mennesker, der er fortabt i materiel grådighed, jagten på penge,



genstande, underholdning – nogle er meget succesfulde. De tjener mange penge, men deres sjæl har allerede længe været spist op af mere begær. Mange er ikke så succesrige. De kan ikke få enderne til at mødes. For de fleste af os åbnede Lyn døren til en sand medmenneskelighed, personligt, og i utallige diskussioner han havde med mennesker i løbet af sit lange liv bevægede han tusinder og atter tusinder af mennesker i USA, i Europa, i Afrika, i Asien og i Latinamerika. Han ændrede rent faktisk deres liv, og bevægede dem på en dybtgående måde... i de fleste lande på denne planet, på fem kontinenter. Lyn talte med mange grupper og enkeltpersoner... unge mennesker. Han oplyste fiskerne i Peru. Han fortalte skomagere i Italien om skomageri. Han talte med italienske lovgivere og lovgivere rundt om i verden. Han underviste iværksættere om fysisk økonomi. Han talte med fagforeninger, lærere, akademikere; verdens bedste musikere. Han åbnede døren til sandhed og viden for mange, mange mennesker. Og mange af dem sagde, at Lyn vidste mere om deres fagområde end dem, eksperterne selv, og at han var i stand til at ændre retningen i deres tænkning. Lys eksistens er et mirakel. Han trodsede alle hindringer for forfægtelsen af sit mægtige intellekt. Som ung følte han sig som en "grim ælling", som ikke ville passe ind i det banale miljø, der omgav ham. Men allerede som ung havde han den indre styrke til at afvise enhver intellektuel korruption. Lyn tilføjede imidlertid noget til det talent: Han havde en, for de fleste mennesker, ubegribelig intellektuel omhyggelighed og stringens. Han var virkelig en sandhedssøgende person, en universel tænk, der indtog og tilføjede noget til næsten alle relevante grundlæggende vidensområder: naturvidenskaben, klassisk musik, poesi, historie, og den store Norbert Brainin sagde, efter to dage med meget intensive diskussioner: "Denne mand kender så meget mere til musik, end jeg gør". Man kunne sige det samme om Lys viden om historie, den amerikanske historie, Sovjetunionens historie, om Afrika, om den europæiske filosofi. Og på alle disse områder, og jeg har sikkert glemt halvdelen af dem, gjorde han enestående opdagelser og tilføjede kvalitative gennembrud i dem. Ud af al

denne universelle viden udviklede han sin egen videnskab om fysisk økonomi, og det blev anerkendt af mange fremragende lærde i mange lande, at hans metode var den mest dybtgående inden for økonomi som sådan. Lys motivation for sit arbejde var – og er – kærlighed til menneskeheden. Når han arbejdede på et projekt, arbejdede han i 20 timer om dagen, og han kunne i sin bedste tider producere 60 til 80 sider med fodnoter, således at der ikke skulle ændres noget under redaktionen. Han kunne ikke fordrage tanken om at undertrykke folks potentiale, det være sig at de skulle leve i fattigdom, ligesom han ikke kunne fordrage ideen om fattigdom i udviklingslandene, og han begyndte at hade imperialismen, som den form for regering der gør netop det imod mennesker. Men han kunne heller ikke klare undertrykkelsen gennem fejlagtige ideer om det fysiske univers love, fordi sådanne fejltagelser ville føre til selvdestruktion af kulturer og civilisationer. Jeg har aldrig set eller hørt om nogen, der var så aldeles fokuseret på de nødvendige forandringer i systemet af undertrykkelse, og så aldeles fokuseret på at erstatte det med sin egen vision om en mere menneskelig og smuk verden. Denne opfattelse gjorde det muligt for ham meget tidligt – i 60'erne – at erkende den ødelæggende fare, der lå i rock-sex-modkulturen. Og se på USA i dag med hensyn til den kultur. Hvis Lyn ville have været præsident – og det kunne han have været, fordi han var godt på vej i kampagnen i 1984, og Illinois-kampagnen i '86 – ville det aldrig være sket. Og havde det ikke været for operationerne udført af de neoliberale og det neokonservative etablisement, ville han have bragt verden i orden. Tænk på de ændringer, han allerede påbegyndte i den retning: Udviklingen af Latinamerika gennem sit samarbejde med López Portillo. Den smukke ide om at få bugt med fattigdom i Indien gennem sit arbejde med Indira Gandhi for en 40-årig udviklingsplan for subkontinentet. Han var i færd med at overvinde NATO's og Warszawa-pagtens militære blokke gennem sin ide om SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative –red.) , ideen om at gøre en ende på geopolitik og fortsætte med ideen om én menneskehed. Tænk over hvad der ville være sket, hvis hans opfattelse af at

bruge SDI som drivkraft for videnskabelig udvikling og at bringe nye teknologier baseret på nye fysiske principper til udviklingslandene, den gigantiske teknologioverførsel, der gør det muligt for disse lande at springe fremad til de mest avancerede produktionsformer. Igennem flere årtier ville en lettelse af fattigdommen i Afrika, Asien og USA have fundet sted. Man ville have haft universel uddannelse af ethvert barn, allerede i anden generation, og af den uddannede ungdom i udviklingssektoren. I USA ville man have haft en offentlig debat om de spørgsmål, som Lyn rejste i sin smukke tale i 1988 i Chicago på konferencen 'Food for Peace' (Mad for fred), med henblik på at gøre de afrikanske ørkener til en frodig have der er i stand til at producere mad nok til verdensbefolkningen. Der ville være en debat i USA, ikke om "Game of Thrones", men om Einsteins Generelle Relativitetsteori og universets love. Han ønskede af få musikere til at diskutere principperne for klassisk komposition, i traditionen der rækker fra Bach til Brahms. Han ville have fået forskere til at opnå en dyb forståelse af livets princip, hvor de ville have fundet en løsning og kur mod de fleste sygdomme. Kreativiteten i sig selv ville være den højeste værdi i samfundet, og alle ville opleve den intellektuelle glæde ved en ny international renæssance. Og vi, der arbejdede med Lyn, havde det privilegium at få en forsmag på hvad det betyder at leve i idéernes verden. Hvis Lyn var blevet præsident, ville denne renæssance-ånd være blevet den intellektuelt fremherskende magt over hele USA og i verden. USA er meget heldige at have sådan en person med et så smukt sind og en sådan profetisk vision. Lyn og jeg havde engang et møde med en biskop i Rom, og han sagde, at Lyn er en mand med forsyn, og jeg er helt enig: Fordi Lyns liv og hans livsværk er i absolut overensstemmelse med skabelsens hensigt. Det er en tragedie for befolkningen i USA og resten af verden, at nutidens onde kræfter var i stand til at afspore denne indsats, i det mindste midlertidigt. Og et gennembrud for hele menneskeheden vil være forbundet med Lyns ideer. Men Lyns vision om, at en fuldt udviklet verden bliver en realitet i

form af en 'Verdenslandbro, er nu ved at ske: En ny form for internationale relationer mellem nationer, en dialog mellem klassiske kulturer, der erstatter konfrontationen, og visionen om et internationalt samarbejde med kolonisering af Månen og en fælles mission til Mars. Hans fjender, som er menneskehedens fjender og fjender af folkets lykke, kan sejre på kort sigt. Men de er allerede hjemsøgt af Erinyerne ('hævnens gudinder', *red.*). De har muligvis kunnet dække over deres forbrydelser for en kort stund, men der er denne højere magt indenfor naturlov, som vil bringe deres forbrydelser for dagens lys. Lyn har tværtimod fortjent evigt liv. Hans liv har udspillet sig i evighedens samtidighed. Hans sind og ideer svæver over alle steder og tider. Lyn er nu i et rige, som det der er vist i *Skolen i Athen* (et billede af maleren Rafael *-red.*): Han er sammen med Sokrates og Platon, med Confucius, Kepler, Leibniz, Bach, Beethoven, Einstein og Vernadsky og alle de bedste 'hoveder' til alle tider, og indenfor alle kulturer.

Du er udødelig, elskede Lyn. *Herefter følger Helga Zepp-LaRouches afsluttende bemærkninger:*

Speed: "Et stort menneskes gerninger fortsætter med at indvirke på andre menneskers liv gennem tiderne. For det gode, som en dydig mand kan gøre, kan ikke gøres indenfor en livstid. Således lever han videre efter sin død, og virker videre som i livet. Den dydige handling, det veltalte ord kæmper videre, udødeligt, sådan som han, der var dødelig, kæmpede. Lev således også du videre igennem endeløse tider". Denne idé er den idé, som Lyndon LaRouche levede med, og levede for. Den sidste linje i dette digt, der er dedikeret til komponisten Ludwig van Beethoven, lyder: "Glød dig i al evighed". For at afslutte dagens proces har vi har flere andre ting, flere stykker musik, og i øjeblikket uddeler vi et af dem til alle blandt publikum. Men hvad angår de sidste ord, som vi gerne vil sige i dag, er det mig endnu engang en ære at introducere Helga Zepp-LaRouche. [bifald]

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg vil gerne give jer et citat, som William Warfield gav som bidrag til *Festskrift* til Lyns 80-års fødselsdag i 2002. "Ja, også for mig har *Vier Ernste Gesänge* (Fire Alvorlige Sange –red.) af den store Johannes Brahms været hans sidste vilje og testamente. Min ven, hvad kan være bedre end, 'nu er der tro, håb og kærlighed, disse tre. Den største af dem alle, af disse tre, er kærlighed. 'Die Liebe er den største af dem alle".

"Lyn, vi elsker dig så højt, så højt – du har elsket menneskeheden på en sådan måde, at vi gør det til vores hellige engagement at udføre og realisere din vision, at bidrage med hele vores potentiale for at gøre verden til et bedre sted. Du er med os, og vi er med dig, for evigt. Og jeg siger til dig, som dine sidste ord til mig lød: Ich liebe dich (Jeg elsker dig)." [stående bifald]

---

**Efter folketingsvalget: Tak for jeres stemmer og hvor går vi videre fra her. Se også diskussionen. Klik her.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Diskussion:

Lyd:

---

# **Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Kina: Øst/Vest-samarbejde er den eneste vej fremad Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 30. maj 2019**

I denne uges webcast diskuterer Schiller Instituttets grundlægger, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, hendes seneste rejse til Kina, hvor hun deltog i konferencen om dialog mellem asiatiske civilisationer, den 15.-16. maj i Beijing, med præsident Xi Jinping som hovedtaler. Zepp-LaRouche og vært Bill Jones diskuterer, hvad der faktisk står på spil i den såkaldte handelskrig mellem USA og Kina, og hvordan det er muligt at løse den, så begge nationer vinder ved det. Hun advarer om, at det ikke er nogen fordel for Vesten at forsøge at indeslutte en nation som Kina, der har givet så mange bidrag til den menneskelige civilisation. Den eneste vej fremad, som vil være til gensidig gavn for begge lande og deres befolkninger, er et samarbejde og en overvindelse af de vestlige neokonservatives strategi for 'sammenstød af civilisationer' – "Clash of Civilizations".

---

**Følg med i Schiller  
Instituttets Venners'  
Folketingsvalgkampagne uden  
for partierne  
på [www.sive.dk](http://www.sive.dk), inkl.  
pressedækning af Tom  
Gillesberg (København)  
på TV2's Go' Morgen, DR's P3  
og i BT og Ingeniøren.**

Klik her.

Se også

Kandidat i Nordsjælland Hans Frederik Brobjergs mange korte videoer og læs hans valgdigte.

Kandidat i Københavns omegn Christian Bechmann Olesens valgvideo.

Kandidat i Østjylland Hans Schultz' udtalelse.

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING OG SCHILLER INSTITUTTETS VENNER VALGMØDE den 23. maj 2019:**

**Være med til at skabe  
historie – to uger til  
valget.**

**Tom Gillesberg og Christian  
Bechmann Olesen**

Lyd:

---

## **Folketingskandidat Tom Gillesbergs tale på Blå Bar den 14. maj 2019**

Tom Gillesberg, Folketingskandidat i Københavns storkreds uden for partierne, holdt et indlæg på en halv-time, og svarede på spørgsmål. Tom Gillesberg er formand for Schiller Instituttet og aktivt i Schiller Instituttets Venner.

Inklusiv: Hvorfor han blev politisk engageret.



---

# GBTimes.com interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche om Bælte og Vej-Initiativet og Europa

Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav d. 10. maj et fortræffeligt 42 minutters video interview til GBTimes.com redaktør Asa Butcher. GBTimes.com er en multimedie hjemmeside med base i Finland, der er etableret til at fremme en dialog mellem Kina og Europa. GBTimes.coms grundlægger, direktør Zhao Yinong, sendte en skriftlig kondolence ved Lyndon LaRouches død, og underskrev erklæringen til at rense ham fra de falske anklager der ledte til hans uretmæssige fængsling (1989-1994).

Her følger interviewet på engelsk:

GBTimes: We'll begin. I'm going to focus on the Belt and Road Initiative today, following on from the Forum in Beijing last week. If you could describe your feelings on the outcome of the Forum that concluded last week in Beijing.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Oh, I think it was very a really important progress as compared to the first Belt and Road Forum. The first Belt and Road Forum was filled with optimism and the knowledge of all the participants that we were experiencing the birth of a new system of international relations – that was already extremely important. But I think the Second Belt and Road Forum saw a consolidation of that, so you have actually a new system of international relations which is overcoming geopolitics, and I think this is one of the most important outcomes, apart from, naturally, the enormous economic development which was presented. But I think the idea that you have a system which has a win-win

possibility for everybody to cooperate, is the way to overcome geopolitics, and that is the remaining danger, which after all, caused two world wars in the last century. So this is a real breakthrough for humanity.

GBTimes: There's been a growing criticism and backlash against the BRI. Do you think this is misunderstanding, suspicion toward this new system? What are your thoughts on that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It's actually a temporary phenomenon, because the funny thing was, here you had the largest infrastructure program in history, ever, with enormous changes for Africa, for Latin America, for Asia, even for European countries, and the Western media and think-tanks pretended it did not exist for almost four years! And then, all of a sudden, they realized, "Oh, this is really growing so rapidly; it is including more than 100 countries." So they started what I think was a coordinated attack, slandering the Belt and Road Initiative, with arguments which I think can all individually can be proven to be a lie. It comes from the old geopolitical effort to control the world by manipulating countries against each other, and with the Belt and Road Initiative, I think that possibility is vanishing, and that's why they're so angry and hysterical.

GBTimes: What could China do to reduce this demonization of the BRI?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think China is already doing a lot. For example, even {Handelsblatt}, which was very negative towards the Belt and Road Initiative in the past, they had to bring an article which brought out the fact that the whole argument that China is putting the countries of the third world into a "debt trap" is not holding. For example, the IMF just released figures that there are 17 African countries which may not be able to pay their debt, but China is only engaged in 3 of them, and all of the others have huge debts to the Paris Club and to other big Western banks – so, who's putting whom into a

debt trap?

All of these arguments will be very easy to counter-argue, and the more China makes known its beautiful culture, people will be won over. Because the beauty of Chinese painting, of Classical music, it will win over the hearts. And the most people understand what China is actually doing, the less these attacks will be possible to maintain.

GBTimes: The attacks are more on China than on the Belt and Road Initiative, you say?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, yes. They're on China because China is the major motor behind it. And some of the attacks were that China is supposedly an autocratical dictatorship, and surveillance state and all of these things. But first of all, concerning surveillance, I think the NSA and the GCHQ have outdone anybody already. And naturally China has a system which uplifts the morality of the people: This is based on the Confucian tradition, and for some of the very liberal people in the West, that is already too much, because it disturbs their idea that everything goes, everything is allowed, and from that standpoint, any kind of emphasis on morality is too much for these people.

GBTimes: Isn't sometimes criticism of new ideas and initiatives healthy? It's what we understand here in the West, we don't openly unquestionably accept new things. We do question, and we are a little bit cynical sometimes.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It's superfluous. It's a waste of energy and it distracts people from accomplishing what needs to be accomplished: Namely, to overcome poverty in Africa, in Latin America, even in Europe. You know, Europe has 90 million poor people, and I have not seen a plan by the European Union to overcome poverty by 2010, which China intends to do with its own poor people.

So I think it's a waste of energy, and it comes from what I

call, when people put on geopolitical spectacles and have neocolonial headphones, then they see and hear the world quite differently from what it is, namely, they only project their own views.

GBTimes: Having been writing about China for the last 5-7 years, it has made a dramatic entrance onto the world stage, when I started writing about it many years ago. And the speed of its arrival, the size of the investments, it can scare a lot of countries – just family and friends who don't know much about China, they want to know about my job where I'm introducing China to the West, as this bridge. There's a lot of misunderstandings. Do you think some of it comes from this ignorance? And how could that be changed?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I have the feeling that everybody who was in China, either as a tourist or as a business person, investing or trading, they all come back and they have a very, very positive view. People are impressed about what they see, the really incredible fast train system. Then, if you go in the region of Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Guangdong, Macao, Hong Kong, this is the powerhouse of the world economy, not just the Belt and Road Initiative.

Compare that with the decrepit infrastructure in the United States or many parts of Western Europe, for example. Less than two years ago, I was in Zhuhai at a conference, and we visited this bridge between Hong Kong and Zhuhai and Macao, linking this entire triangular: And this bridge was built, I think, in six years or eight years, including planning! Now, in Germany, we have a famous bridge between Mainz and Wiesbaden, which has been in repair for almost six to eight years, and it's still not ready!

So, I think if people go to China, they come back and they are completely impressed, because they see that in China, people have now virtues, like industriousness, ingenuity, creativity – these are all values we used to have in the West, like when

the Germany economic miracle was made in the postwar reconstruction, these values and virtues were German. But now, no longer. Now, we have all kinds of other crazy ideas, and therefore China is taking the lead.

So the people who go to China come back with a positive image, and those who have not been, naturally, they're scared by the negative reports in the media. So the more people can actually go and form their own image, the better.

GBTimes: I have myself, I've seen a disconnect between China and Chinese society, and then the role of the Chinese government, the more negative side that gets covered about in the Western media. Do you think, for instance, with the BRI is just a way to legitimize the Chinese leadership in the world, and to raise it up to the same level that is given to the other countries? Do you think that's acceptable?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it is a challenge. Some of the Western institutions talked about that there is now a competition of the systems, meaning the Chinese state model and the Western free market model. And in one sense, it is true; the only problem is that if you have the neo-liberal system, especially after the crisis of 2008, only favoring monetarist interests – the banks, the speculators – and the gap between the rich and the poor becomes ever wider, naturally, then, if you have a country where that is not the case, namely, China having a policy which is oriented toward the common good, an increasing well-to-do middle class of 300 million people, which in 5-10 years will be 600 million people, and obviously the vector of development is upward, naturally that is regarded as a threat by the neo-liberal establishment, which only takes care of its own privileges.

So in a certain sense, the challenge does exist, but I think there is the possibility of a learning process, so one can be hopeful that even some elements of the Western elites will recognize that China is doing something right.

GBTimes: What do you think China could learn from the Western mode? And vice versa, what do you think the two could learn from one another?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think China can learn a lot from the West, but I'm afraid to say, not from the present, contemporaries, or, there is very little to learn. Naturally, ESA cooperating with the Chinese space agency, there is a lot of exchange possible. But in terms of general, cultural outlook, I think China has to go back about 200 years to find positive things in Europe, or the United States, for that matter. You know, European Classical culture can be an enormous enrichment for China, but these are composers who are Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, or great poets. But these are all things which, unfortunately are not dominating the cultural outlook of most Europeans and Americans today. So there has to be a dialogue across the centuries, and then both sides can profit from each other.

GBTimes: In a sense, you're very pessimistic about the Western stands at the moment. Do you think China is the only option available to the West at the moment?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No, I'm not pessimistic, I'm just saying that you see that some of the elites, or so-called elites, are hardened in their view. You have others who are absolutely recognizing that the whole mankind needs to cooperate together in new ways, for example, Switzerland. You know the President of Switzerland, who participated in the Belt and Road Forum just signed a memorandum of understanding, not only for Switzerland, but for a whole group of Central and Eastern European countries, which Switzerland is representing in the international organizations.

So there is a big motion. You have Italy signing a memorandum of understanding with China, on the development of Africa. Greece wants to be the gateway between trade from Asia, through the Suez Canal all the way into Europe. Portugal and

Spain want to be the hub for the Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking people around the world.

So there is a lot of dynamics and motions, I'm just referring to some of the monetarist views and those people who talk about the "rules-based order" all the time, but what they really mean is austerity.

So, I'm not talking about the West in general. I think the West – I'm an optimist about the potential of all human beings – I'm only talking about certain parts of the establishment in the West.

GBTimes: You mentioned Italy and Switzerland. How significant is it that they signed up to the BRI now?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this is extremely important. First of all, Italy, as you know, is the third largest economy in Europe. The north of Italy is highly industrialized and has a lot of industrial capability; many hidden champions actually are in northern Italy. So, if such a country is now, as the first G7 country, officially joining with a memorandum of understanding, this can become the model for all of Europe. And Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte who just participated in the Belt and Road Forum came back and said exactly that: That Italy plans to be the leader in bringing about a better relation between China and Europe. So I think this is extremely important.

And Switzerland, even if it may be a small country, they are independent; they are sovereign, they are not part of the European Union. And President Maurer just declared, or his spokesman, that they do not need advice from the European Union because they can make their own policy. So, I think this is all a new, healthy spirit of self-consciousness and self-assertion, which is very good, and can be indeed a sign of hope for everybody else.

GBTimes: How do you see it impacting Europe, their

participation in the BRI, in the short term, and perhaps in the longer term?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, there are different learning curves: Some are quicker, others are slower. For example, the so-called four big countries – that does not include Italy – that did not send heads of state or government, but only ministers, Spain, France, Germany, and I think Great Britain, by not sending their heads of state sort of expressed their reservation. But then even the German Economic Minister Altmaier, who on the first day of the Belt and Road Forum basically said, “we have to have transparency and rules,” with the usual kind of arguments, but the next day, he said something much more positive. He said: Oh, this was much better than I expected, the Chinese are actually trying to solve problems, and I will come back in June with a large delegation of businessmen. So, I actually find this quite good. It shows that eventually, I think, I hope, reason will prevail.

GBTimes: I think some of the obstacles for Western countries, is like Turkey refusing to participate because of the Uighur problem; that there are other issues that aren't related to the Belt and Road, that China has to overcome first.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: All of these problems will eventually be solved, because I think the key to solving of any regional, ethnic, historical cultural problem is development. If people actually see the advantage of turning non-developed countries or areas into prosperous ones, into having more youth exchange, young people understanding each other, people-to-people exchange, dialogue of cultures, bringing forth the best tradition of each culture; plus, naturally, real improvement of living standards, longevity, I think that even if not all develop with the same speed, we are at a tremendous change of an epoch of human civilization. The idea of these local and regional conflicts will eventually not be there any more.



If I just can point to the fact that now the eight radio-telescopes working together, being able to make, for the first time, images of the black hole in a galaxy which is 55 million light-years away, proving that Einstein's theory of general relativity was actually correct – now, that, for me is the sign of the future: Because this image could not have been made by one country alone. It needed telescopes sited in Chile, in Spain, in the United States, in the Antarctic, and you needed the whole world actually working together to make such a technological breakthrough possible.

I think that that will be the kind of relationship people will have to each other in the future, and I think this is what Xi Jinping really is the kind of thing he means when he says, “a shared community for the one future of humanity.” Because the common interest will eventually come first, and then everything else will fall into place.

GBTimes: Another one of the criticisms was currently “all roads lead back to Beijing” rather than a multilateral approach to BRI, where it's between other country, it always leads back to China at the moment. Do you think that is a problem?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I don't know. First of all, I think Russia has a big influence, I think the African countries are becoming much more knowledgeable and confident about their own role. There are many Africans who speak that, in the future, Africa will be the new China with African characteristics. So, I think it's all changing very quickly, and those people who complain that there is too much Chinese influence, well, then they should bring in their active, creative contribution, and define what the new platform of humanity should be.

And I think China has said many times, and I have absolutely every confidence that that is the case, that they're not trying to export their social model, but that they're just offering the experience of the incredible success of the last

40 years of the form in opening-up, and basically tell developing countries, "Here, if you want to have our help in accomplishing the same thing, we are willing to provide it." And naturally, the countries of the developing sector, which had been neglected, or even treated negatively by colonialism, by the IMF conditionalities, when they now have the absolute, concrete offer to overcome poverty and underdevelopment, why should they not take it?

So, I think all these criticisms are really badly covered efforts to hide their own motives. I really think China is doing the best thing which has happened to humanity for a very long time, and I think the Belt and Road Initiative is the only long-term plan for how to transform the world into a peaceful place. And I think that should be applauded and people should have a cooperative approach.

GBTimes: My next question was going to be, how confident are you that the BRI will pay off for China, but I get the sense that you're very confident.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Oh, I think it already paying off! First of all, it makes it more easy for China to develop its own western and internal regions, because they are now sort of integrated into the Belt and Road transport routes to Europe, to Central Asia, integrating the Belt and Road Initiative with the Eurasian Economic Union, and hopefully eventually also the European Union. So I think it is already bringing benefits to China.

And from an economic standpoint, the more a country exports high technology goods and technologies, the more than becomes a motor to develop one's own industry even to high levels. So it's like a self-inspiration, so to speak, and that is already paying off. That's what any country should do.

GBTimes: You mentioned technology: It's also the digital Silk Road, Digital Belt and Road. Of course, China has a lot of

control over its internet, on the Great Firewall: How much of a barrier do you think that will be for countries to build relationships via the Belt and Road Initiative?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: You mean the G5 question and Huawei?

GBTimes: Well, partly that, too, but also the control of the internet inside of China, which is difficult for Western companies to do business, to establish themselves, as there are a lot of controls there. Do you think that could be a barrier, as part of the digital Belt and Road, that's also being discussed.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think there can be ways of making arrangements which are satisfying to everybody. This whole question of "digital control" and so forth, is highly exaggerated, because, if you look at who is controlling the internet, you have the big firms, Apple, Google, Facebook, and they are very linked with the Western government's. You know, in a certain sense, after the scandal of the NSA listening into everybody's discussions, which erupted a couple of years ago and which was never changed or remedied or anything, we are living in a world where that already happening. And I think China is not doing anything more than the NSA or the already mentioned GCHQ doing that in the West.

So I think the fact that China has a competitive system, to this Western system is what causes all of this debate. Because the people who had the control of the internet first, they should like to keep it that way, and they regard China as a competitor, which they don't like, but that's a fact of reality now.

GBTimes: One question I have is why do you think the Belt and Road Initiative is needed, when there's the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, now? Do you think the two are mutually exclusive, or do they work together?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No, I think the Belt and Road Initiative has

many financing mechanisms. You have the AIIB, you have the New Silk Road Fund, you have a lot of the Chinese banks themselves which are doing the investment. I have been advocating for a very long time, that the West should modify its own credit institutions to work on a similar principle. Now, that would be actually very possible, because the American System of economy as it was developed by Alexander Hamilton, who created the first National Bank as an institution for issuing credit, that is actually very close to what China is doing. As a matter of fact, I would even go so far as to say, that the Chinese economic model is much closer to the American System, as it was developed by Alexander Hamilton, and then revived by Lincoln, by Henry C. Carey, by Franklin D. Roosevelt; so if the United States would say, we create our own national bank; and Germany, for example, would say, we go back to the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, the Credit Institution for Reconstruction, which was used for the reconstruction of Germany in the postwar period, which was also a state bank, – or it still is a state bank – then you could have a new credit system, whereby each country would have their own national bank; you would have clearing houses in between them to compensate for duration of investment, or the differences between small and large countries with lots of raw materials, or not so much – you need these clearinghouses. But you could create a new credit system, a New Bretton Woods system with fixed exchange rates, having a stability in the system which the Western system presently does not have.

So, I think that the more countries go to these kinds of credit financing of projects the more stable this new system will become.

GBTimes: Do you think the United States will ever become part of the Belt and Road Initiative, under the Presidency of Donald Trump, or perhaps whoever is voted in next

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: That's actually the big question, you know: Will the rise of China be answered by the United States,

either with a war, the Thucydides trap which some people have mentioned as a danger? There were in history twelve cases where a rising power overtook the dominant power up to that point, and it led to war; and there were four cases where it happened in a peaceful way. Now, China, first of all, has offered that neither of these two options should occur, but they have offered a special great power special relationship model, based on the acceptance of the other social model's sovereignty, non-interference. And I think Trump with his America, First policy is more inclined to respond to such a model than the previous administrations of Obama and Bush, who had these interventionist wars in the Middle East and everywhere else for exporting their system of so-called "democracy" and human rights.

So I think President Trump has said very clearly that he wants to have a good relationship with China. He calls President Xi Jinping his friend all the time. And I think the present trade negotiations actually, in my view, demonstrate that the United States would suffer tremendously, if they would try to decouple from the Chinese economy. They probably would suffer more than China, because China is much more capable, in my view, to compensate for the loss of the relationship with the United States.

But I think that the hopefully reasonable way would be to say, "OK, let's use the foreign exchange reserves of China which they have in terms of U.S. Treasuries; let's invest them through an infrastructure bank in the United States, to help to modernize American infrastructure." And that would be an urgent need, because if you look at the U.S. infrastructure, it's really in a terrible condition, and President Trump, who is talking today, I think, with the leading Democrats Pelosi and Schumer on a new infrastructure legislation; the sums which are discussed here, from what I have heard so far, are so small! First of all, the Republicans don't want to have Federal spending; the Democrats are talking only about

“repair,” and small issues.

So, what is lacking in these discussions is a grand design, where you would take the approach China has taken for the modernization of its infrastructure: To have fast train systems among all the major cities, to have slow-speed maglev trains for intra-urban transport. Now, you could take that same approach and modernize the entire infrastructure of the United States. And if China would, in turn, off that U.S. companies would integrate more into the projects of the Belt and Road around the world, it would be beneficial for both. Some American companies are already doing that, like Caterpillar, General Electric, Honeywell, but that could be a real incentive for the United States to go in this direction.

Hopefully it will happen that way, because if not, I think a clash between the two largest economies would be a catastrophe for the whole world: So, let's hope that the forces of good will all work together to get to this positive end.

GBTimes: Let's talk about the Schiller Institute itself as a think tank. What is your day-to-day role in the promotion of the Belt and Road Initiative? How do you work to support it?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Oh, you know, this all goes back to the life's work of my husband, who died recently: Mr. Lyndon LaRouche; who spent, actually, the last 50 years, to work on very concrete development projects. The first such project we presented in '76 in Paris. This was a comprehensive plan for the infrastructure development of all of Africa. Then we worked together with the President of Mexico José López Portillo on a Latin American development plan – this was '82. We worked with Indira Gandhi on a 40-year development plan, and also in the beginning of the '80s, we developed a 50-year development plan for the Pacific Basin. And then, when the Berlin Wall came down, and the Soviet Union disintegrated, we proposed to connect the European and Asian population and industrial centers through development corridors, and we

called that the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

So we have been engaged in these kinds of big projects for the transformation of the world economy for the last decades, and naturally, we proposed it to China in the beginning of the '90s. I attended a big conference in '96 in Beijing, which had the title, "The Development of the Regions along the Eurasian Land-Bridge." And China, at that time, declared the building of the Eurasian Land-Bridge the long-term strategic aim of China by 2010. Then, naturally, came the Asia crisis in '97, so the whole thing go interrupted.

We were very happy when Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road in 2013, because, in the meantime, we had kept working for this. We had {many} conferences, actually hundreds of conferences and seminars all over the world. So this is has been one major point of what the Schiller Institute has been doing for the last decades. So naturally, we are very happy that now, what was only planning on our side is now being realized by the second largest economy in the world, and therefore, it becomes reality: And that makes quite happy.

GBTimes: Is there anything else you'd like to add? I've asked my questions and a lot more. Is there anything we haven't touched upon, you'd like to talk about?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: We could talk a little bit more about the culture of the New Silk Road.

GBTimes: Please – in what way?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that the New Silk Road, or the Belt and Road Initiative, it's not just about economics and infrastructure. But I think equally important, if not more important, in my view, is the cultural side of it: That it could lead and will hopefully lead to an exchange of the best traditions of all cultures of this world. And by reviving the best traditions, like Confucianism in China, Beethoven in Germany, and Schiller; Verdi in Italy, and so forth and so on,

it will ennoble the souls of the people, and I think that that is the most important question right now, because I agree with Friedrich Schiller, according to whom this institute is named: That any improvement in the political realm can only come from the moral improvement of the people. And therefore, I think it's also very interesting to me that President Xi Jinping has emphasized the aesthetical education as extremely important, because the goal of this is the beautiful mind of the pupil, of the student.

Now, that is exactly what Friedrich Schiller said, who in the response to the Jacobin Terror in the French Revolution, wrote his {Aesthetical Letters} in which he develops his aesthetical theory, which I find is in great cohesion with what Xi Jinping is saying; and that has also to do with the fact that the first education minister of the Chinese Republic studied in Germany, and he studied Schiller and Humboldt; his name was Cai Yuanpei – I'm probably pronouncing it wrong again – but he was the first president of the Beijing University, and I think there is a great affinity, a much greater affinity between the thinking of the aesthetical education as it is discussed by Xi Jinping and as it does exist in the Schiller-Humboldt tradition in Germany, in particular. I would just hope that that kind of a dialogue could be intensified, because then I think a lot of the prejudices and insecurities about the other culture would disappear, and you would bring back and bring forth the best of all sides.

GBTimes: How could this be accomplished, do you think? What sort of forms?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: You can organize conferences, you can more consciously make the poetry known – I think poetry is very, very important, which is naturally not so easy, because as Schiller said, you have to be a poet in two languages to do justice to the poetry of one language. You could have more conscious theater performances, not just as an entertainment but involving students, children, adults, and make more



exhibitions, make more deep-level understanding of the other culture.

I think China is doing an enormous amount of that, but I would have still some suggestions to make it more than entertainment, because many people go to these things, and they don't quite "get it" what it's all about; and then, it was nice, but the deeper philosophical, poetical, musical meaning could be made more pedagogically intelligible, and I think that would be a way of opening the hearts of more people, because they would recognize what treasures are there to be discovered.

GBTimes: Do you have any closing words on the Belt and Road you'd like to share with our readers?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think we are probably the generation on whom later generations will look back to, and say, "Oh! This was really a fascinating time, because it was a change from an epoch to another one." And I have an image of that, which is, this change that we are experiencing right now, is probably going to be bigger than the change in Europe between the Middle Ages and modern times. In the Middle Ages you had people believing in a whole bunch of axioms, the scholastics, Aristotelianism, witchcraft – all kinds of strange beliefs – and then, because of the influx of such thinkers as Nicholas of Cusa, or the Italian Renaissance, the modern image of man, of science and technology, of the sovereign nation-state, all these changes happened, and they created a completely different view of the image of man and of nature, and the universe, and everything we call "modern society" was the result of this change.

Now, I think we are in front, or the middle of such an epochal change, where the next era of mankind will be much, much more creative than the present one, and that's something to look forward to, because we can actually shape it, and we can bring our own creative input into it. And there are not many periods

in history when that is the case: So we are actually lucky.

Se interviewet på GBTimes.coms hjemmeside her.

---

# **Mens statsanklagere retter blikket mod briternes og Obamas gerningsmænd bag Russiagate, går krigspartiet grassat. Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 9. maj 2019**

Den seneste afsløring fra en aktindsigt (FOIA – Freedom Of Information Act) om Christopher Steeles beskidte handlinger er endnu en 'bombe' der viser, at man skal holde briterne ansvarlige for det farlige kupforsøg mod præsident Trump. Og i takt med at der dagligt dukker flere beviser op på den britiske rolle, i direkte koordinering med Obamas efterretningsteam, hvor skal USA's udenrigsminister Pompeo gå hen for at piske en anti-russisk, anti-kinesisk stemning op? Til London, selvfølgelig, hvor han proklamerede, at 'det særlige forhold' (Special Relationship) mellem USA og U.K. blomstrede!

I denne uges webcast gennemgår Helga Zepp LaRouche optrapningen af 'brændpunkterne', af især Pompeo og Bolton, der agerer i modstrid med præsident Trumps ofte gentagne ønske om at have gode samarbejdsrelationer med de to nationer. Idet hun betegner de rablende anti-kinesiske beskyldninger fra efterretningsfolk, kongresmedlemmer og medier som et 'raserianfald mod den gule fare', understreger hun betydningen af at få handelsforhandlingerne mellem USA og Kina tilbage på sporet, som et skridt i retning af USA's deltagelse i Bælte- og Vejinitiativet.

---

## **Hvorfor vi skal stemmes ind i Folketinget. Tom Gillesberg kandidat uden for partierne i København fra Schiller Instituttets Venner**

Se også Schiller Instituttets Venners hjemmeside [www.sive.dk](http://www.sive.dk)

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING og Schiller Instituttets Venners VALGMØDE med Tom Gillesberg (København) og Hans Frederik Brobjerg (Nordsjælland) den 9. maj 2019**

Med Schiller Instituttets formand Tom Gillesberg, og Schiller Instituttets Venners kandidater uden for partierne Tom Gillesberg i Københavns storkreds og Hans Frederik Brobjerg i Nordsjællands storkreds.

Lyd:

---

## **Jordens næste 50 år – Foredrag # 2 (4. maj): LaRouches ufuldendte krig for en ny økonomisk verdensorden Udvalgt taler: Dennis Small**

Historien om kampen for en retfærdig, ny økonomisk verdensorden (NWE0), baseret på nord-syd-samarbejde og udvikling, er et perfekt eksempel på hvordan ideer, og faktisk udelukkende ideer, skaber historien. De ideer, omkring hvilke

de første kampe for en NWE0 blev udkæmpet, især i perioden 1979-1983, og begrebet om hvordan man fører denne krig, blev udviklet af Lyndon LaRouche. Hans tilgang var ikke blot at foreslå ideen, og at påvise at denne politik ville være til gavn for både nord og syd. Hans metode var faktisk at fremlægge de underliggende filosofiske begreber og det videnskabelige fysisk-økonomiske grundlag for at bevise, at en sådan tilgang rent faktisk kan fungere. De politiske relationer mellem de store hovedpersoner i denne kamp, Mexicos José López Portillo og Indiens Indira Gandhi, blev også bevidst fremmet af LaRouche. Og da en flanke opstod, da Ronald Reagan overtog præsidentskabet i USA i januar 1981, kastede LaRouche sig over den for at bringe de kræfter, der rent faktisk kunne besejre fjenden og vinde den strategiske krig, ind i kampen. Dette er genstand for en lektion i uafsluttet krig.

---

**Vær optimistiske! Samtalen mellem Trump og Putin fremskynder det nye paradigme.**

**Schiller Instituttets webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den**

## 5. maj 2019.

Det 90 minutters lange opkald mellem præsident Trump og Putin blev hilst velkommen af Helga Zepp LaRouche som "en rigtig god nyhed", da hun gennemgik de omfattende strategiske konsekvenser af den nye situation, der er opstået efter Russiagate.

Disse omfatter:

- Betydningen af Trump-Putin-diskussionen om økonomisk og strategisk samarbejde, herunder at afhjælpe situationerne i Venezuela, Ukraine og Nordkorea;
- Det positive potentiale for samarbejde mellem USA og Kina, med endnu et møde om handelsforhandlinger planlagt – dette foregår på trods af de britisk dirigerede neokonservatives bestræbelser på at sabotere det;
- En bredere anerkendelse af det attraktive ved at samarbejde med BVI efter det andet BVI-forum, som det fremgår i flere aktuelle rapporter, der er udgivet i Tyskland;
- Betydningen af mødet om infrastrukturen mellem Trump og de Demokratiske ledere af Kongressen, der fremhæver splittelsen blandt Demokraterne mellem de vanvittige, som stadig er fokuserede på en rigsretssag og Green New Deal, og Pelosi og hendes netværk, der erkender behovet for at opnå noget positivt;
- Voksende erkendelse af den britiske rolle i iscenesættelsen af Russiagate.

Kampen for at frifinde Lyndon LaRouche udgør den bedste køreplan for at forstå hvem der styrede Russiagate og de strategiske årsager hertil. LaRouches rolle viser den enkeltes evne til at ændre historien og bør være en kilde til optimisme, et afgørende behov for at vinde kampen for det nye

paradigme.

---

# **LaRouchePAC foredrag # 1 (27. april):      Oversigt:      Den enkeltes rolle i historien. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller Instituttet**

En person kan ændre historien, og den mest magtfulde kraft i historien er ikke våben, penge eller hære: det er ideer. Lyndon LaRouche udnyttede denne indsigt og brugte den til at ændre verden. I dag ses frugterne af hans årtier lange organisering, sammen med mange kolleger og hans kone (læreren i denne klasse) i potentialet for internationalt samarbejde, som eksemplificeret af det kinesiske Bælte- og Vejinitiativ. For at undgå den truende mørke tidsalder, som atomkonflikten mellem USA og Rusland udgør, er det vigtigt med et begreb om den nødvendige renæssance.

---

**Det andet Bælte- og Vejforum  
bringer verdensøkonomien ind  
i en ny dimension.**

**Schiller                      Instituttets  
ugentlige webcast med Helga  
Zepp-Larouche den 28. april  
2019**

Idet hun erklærede det netop afsluttede Bælte- og Vejforum i Beijing for en stor succes, rapporterede Helga Zepp LaRouche om den globale deltagelse i arrangementet og det udvidede omfang af BVI-aftaler. Hun betegnede den aktive inddragelse af en række europæiske ledere som “meget interessant”. Med henvisning til hendes LaRouchePAC-studiekreds aftenen før, opfordrede hun seerne til at se det klip hun brugte med Lyndon LaRouches tale fra 1997, hvor han insisterede på at USA måtte tage del i den Eurasiske Landbro – og med henblik på hvad der lige er sket i Beijing, sagde hun, at man igen ser, hvor profetisk han var med hensyn til at imødekomme menneskehedens fremtidige behov.

Nu, hvor Trump åbenlyst identificerer Russiagate som et “kup”, der er udtænkt til at drive ham ud af embedet – hvilket medierne, hvor utroligt det end måtte være, praktisk talt har ignoreret, – er det klart, at den britiske rolle i organiseringen af kuppet vil komme ud, sammen med deres rolle i at angribe BVI. Hun understregede, at i betragtning af at de der står bag kuppet kommer fra de samme netværk, som engagerede sig i de massive bagvaskelser af Lyndon LaRouche, er kampen for hans frifindelse afgørende for USA’s overlevelse.



Ligesom Cusas genoplivelse af Platons værker var afgørende for at skabe Den italienske Renæssance, er en fordybelse i LaRouches videnskabelige og filosofiske værker ligeledes afgørende for at sikre succes for det nye paradigme i dag. Den ekstraordinære internationale indsats der var involveret i de fantastiske fotografier taget af et "sort hul" er en anden demonstration af dette princip: at det er vigtigt at udfordre alle aksiomerne fra et højere synspunkt. Internationalt samarbejde i rummet er afgørende for at inspirere dagens ungdom til at favne ægte videnskab for at skabe en bedre fremtid.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 25.  
april 2019.**

**Nyt Bælte og Vej-Forum i  
Beijing viser vejen for det  
nye paradigme**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. april 2019: USA melder sig ind i det nye rumkapløb. Kinas Bælte- og Vej-Initiativ vinder frem**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Inklusiv:

Trumps nye Måne-Mars-program kan øge det internationale rumsamarbejde både på Månen og på menneskets færd ud i solsystemet og resten af Galaksen.

Den amerikanske justitsminister Barr lægger op til en undersøgelse af iværksættelsen af anklagerne imod Trump om sammensværgelse med Rusland, inkl. de amerikanske efterretningstjenesters spionage imod Trump og hans folk.

Vil Trump stoppe sabotagen af hans politik fra sikkerhedsrådgiver Bolton, udenrigsminister Pompeo og vicepræsident Pence?

Italien tilslutter sig Kinas Bælte og Vej-Initiativ, og Xi Jinping forsøgte på mødet i Paris med Macron, Merkel og Junker at få skeptikerne i EU med.

Panda-diplomatiet mellem Kina og Danmark.

Brexit: Theresa May byder op til den samme dans en gang til.

Videoen ovenover:

Grundet tekniske problemer mangler de første minutter af

udsendelsen. Derudover er lyd og billede ikke sammen før 3:25. Vi beklager. En fuldstændig lydoptagelse findes her:

Lyd:

---

**Succes for det nye paradigme kræver fuld afsløring af Russiagates britiske "karakter".**

**Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 4. april 2019**

Under gennemgang af de vigtigste begivenheder i ugen kom Helga Zepp-LaRouche gentagne gange tilbage til den uforenelige opsplitning mellem den imperialistiske natur af det kollapsende system, som driver verden mod krig, og det nye paradigme, der over de sidste halvtreds år er blevet bragt i fokus af Lyndon LaRouche. Dette kan ses tydeligt i NATO's leder Stoltenbergs pro-krigsaktiviteter, i hans bestræbelser på at få Trump til at angribe Rusland og Kina – hvilket Trump ikke gjorde – og senere hans tågetale til Kongressen, som blev modtaget entusiastisk af depraverede kongresmedlemmer; i modsætning til talrige tegn på øget samarbejde indenfor den nye 4-magts-konstellation: for eksempel fremskridtene for Bælte- og Vejinitiativet, præsident Xis seneste besøg i

Italien og Putins kommende besøg der, samt i samarbejdet i rummet, herunder at Trump genoptager en Måne-Mars-mission for USA.

For at uddybe pegede Helga på flere ironiske sammenstillinger: Trump der arbejder for en handelsaftale med Kina, mens krigspartiet i USA optrapper sit pres mod Kina; opfordringen fra den franske finansminister LeMaire til at Europa bliver det "nye imperium", mens EU står over for en række eksistentielle kriser, fra Brexit til faldende produktionstal, der netop er blevet udgivet i Tyskland, og håbløst bankerotte finansielle institutioner.

Alt imens anti-Trump-kupmagerne fortsætter deres bestræbelser på at fjerne præsidenten med uendelige undersøgelser, understregede Helga betydningen af at afsløre den britiske karakter bag Russiagate som det mest effektive middel til at tydeliggøre denne kamp, og til at bringe flere borgere ind i organisationsprocessen.

---

**‘Russiagates’ sammenbrud  
afslører de britiske  
gerningsmænd:  
Gør det af med dem, så  
menneskeheden kan gå til det**

# nye paradigme

Schiller Instituttets internationale webcast den 28. marts, 2019 med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Frigivelsen af den særlige anklager Muellers rapport, hvori han blev tvunget til at indrømme, at der ikke var tegn på at præsident Trump eller hans kampagnestab samarbejdede med Rusland, og intet bevis for at anklage ham for obstruktion fører til spørgsmålet, hvem stod bag det, og hvorfor? Dette må forfølges, som rep. Nunes meddelte, at han planlægger at gøre, og som Trump selv i sine tweets i sidste uge har gjort klart skal gøres; Trumps tweets identificerede den britiske rolle i lanceringen af Russiagate for at forhindre et bedre forhold mellem USA og Rusland og Kina. Frigivelsen af rapporten har åbnet op for 'regnskabets time'.

Det fremgår klart af anti-Trump-styrkernes reaktion, at de ikke vil stoppe. Helga Zepp-LaRouche pegede på optrapningen mod Venezuelas regering som 'en fortsættelse af kuppet mod Trump i 'en ny forklædning'.

Reorganiseringen af den geopolitiske institution, Komitéen om den Nuværende Fare – Kina, er et andet eksempel på samme hensigt.

Men hun tilføjede, at dette ikke vil stoppe fremkomsten af det nye paradigme, som den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings tur til Europa i denne uge viser. Italienerne trodsede de bankerotte diktatorer 'in spe" i EU, og Macron, der underskrev talrige aftaler med Xi, og Merkel blev tvunget til at erkende, at momentum er på Kinas side.

Hun konkluderede med at sige, at eftersom Lyndon LaRouches livsværk bliver realiseret i og med fremgangen for det nye paradigme, ville hans frifindelse give et afgørende skub til at bringe USA ind i mobiliseringen for at virkeliggøre menneskehedens fælles interesser.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 21.  
marts 2019:  
Italien bliver bindeled  
mellem Kina og Europa –  
Europa og Afrika.  
Brexitdrama fortsætter.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

---

**Afskrift: Mens  
neokonservative forsøger at  
inddæmme Trump,  
peger udvikling i Italien på**

# vejen til det nye paradigme. Schiller Instituttets internationale webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 15. marts 2019

Her er begyndelsen af Helga Zepp-LaRouches webcast:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Goddag, jeg er Harley Schlanger fra Schiller Instituttet. Velkommen til vores ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og præsident. I dag skriver vi den 15. marts, »idus martiae.« Der sker meget i Italien og der tales om »idus martiae« og Julius Cæsar. Italienerne satser stærkt på at arbejde med Kina. Helga, du deltog i denne uge i en meget betydningsfuld konference med repræsentation fra den kommercielle sektor i Italien, men også fra regeringen. Jeg synes vi skal starte der, fordi dette har givet anledning til en fortsat panik blandt unilaterale, geopolitiske kræfter i Den Europæiske Union, der forsøger at holde Kina ude. Så hvad laver italienerne? Hvad er det, der foregår?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Som du måske ved, kommer præsident Xi Jinping på officielt besøg i Italien den 22. og 23., altså i næste uge. Det er kommet frem, at italienerne og kineserne i anledning af dette besøg vil underskrive en hensigtserklæring (MoU) om at samarbejde omkring Bælte og Vej Initiativet (BRI). Dette har forårsaget stor uro; Financial Times flippede ud, Garrett Marcus – som på en eller anden måde står [USA's nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver John] Bolton nær i Det Hvide Hus – sagde i hovedtræk, at italienerne absolut ingen gavn vil have af dette, og at det vil ødelægge deres image i verden i meget lang tid fremover. Så det kom temmelig rettidigt, at vi

havde denne begivenhed i Milano, som var en begivenhed arrangeret i fællesskab mellem Movisol, som er Movimento Solidarita – LaRouchebevægelsens italienske søsterorganisation, ledt an af Liliana Gorini – og regionen Lombardiet. Emnet var netop Italiens samarbejde med Bælte og Vej Initiativet. Arrangementet havde længe været planlagt, så det er helt tilfældigt, at det fandt sted lige før Xi Jinpings statsbesøg.

Den første taler ved denne begivenhed var Michele Geraci, som er ministersekretær i ministeriet for økonomisk udvikling, og han er en person, der ved meget om Kina, hvor han i ti år virkede som professor. Han er nu leder af den italienske regerings ekspertgruppe angående Kina. Han gav en præsentation, hvor han nedtonede postyret omkring denne hensigtserklæring ved at gøre opmærksom på, at den ikke vil ændre noget; den vil ikke ændre Italiens alliance med NATO eller EU. Den betyder blot, at Italien vil få øgede eksportmuligheder på det hurtigst voksende økonomiske marked i verden, som udgøres af Kina. Italien prøver udelukkende at indhente det forsømte i forhold til andre europæiske lande, som Tyskland og Frankrig, der allerede har meget mere handel med Kina. Så han gav et meget roligt og optimistisk billede af, hvordan dette vil gavne udviklingen af havnene Trieste, Genova, Palermo – samt udviklingen af anden infrastruktur. Han sagde, at det ikke betyder, at Italien opgiver andre projekter, fordi disse alle er nye investeringer. Kineserne vil bygge nye kajpladser i nogle af disse havne, så kineserne investerer i ny-etableringer, som vil øge den italienske økonomis produktivitet; der er altså ingen grund til at være bekymret. Så efter min mening var det meget informativt.

Efterfølgende holdt jeg en tale, hvor jeg i hovedtræk sagde, at alt dette foregår i en større sammenhæng, fordi det, der sker, tydeligvis er, at den kinesiske regering forsøger at skabe et nyt paradigme, som Xi Jinping altid kalder »et samfund med en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden« eller



»menneskeheds skæbnefællesskab« (□□□□□□□□ – red.). Og de forsøger at opbygge et nyt sæt internationale relationer, som vil overvinde geopolitik. Jeg nævnte det faktum, at der historisk findes 16 tilfælde, hvor en sekundær magt ville overtage den hidtidigt dominerende magts rolle, at det i 12 tilfælde førte til krig, og at det i 4 tilfælde betød, at den anden magt trådte i stedet for den første magt og overgik den uden krig. Jeg understregede det faktum, at den kinesiske regering og især Xi Jinping har gjort det klart adskillige gange, at det ikke er intentionen at erstatte USA's dominerende rolle i verden, og at de naturligvis heller ikke vil have en krig; men at de tilbyder en helt ny måde at relatere til hinanden på, som grunder på hensyntagen til den andens suveræniteten, på hensyntagen til forskellen mellem de sociale systemer, og på simpelthen at samarbejde på win-win basis.

Jeg udpegede følgende bemærkelsesværdige fænomen; efter Xi Jinping for omkring fire år siden annoncerede Bælte og Vej Initiativet i september 2013 i Kasakhstan, har dette verdens største infrastrukturprogram udviklet sig meget hurtigt. Nu er der 112 lande, der har forskellige grader af samarbejde og yderligere 30-40 internationale institutioner. I omkring fire år skrev de vestlige medier og de store tænketanke nærmest intet derom; de forbigik det eller lod som om, at dette verdens største infrastrukturprojekt ikke var til. Derefter, efter omkring fire år, begyndte alle medier og alle tænketanke på en tydeligvis koordineret måde pludselig et angreb mod Kina, hvor det udlagde BRI som ren kinesisk imperialisme: kineserne forsøger bare at få landene ind i gældsfælden; det er et autoritært system. I en vis forstand er det meget klart, at dette er en geopolitisk refleks, der er udløst af, at verden er i hastig forandring, og at magtcentret allerede er flyttet til Asien, idet Kina har påtaget sig lederskabsrollen i denne udvikling.

Så jeg synes, at den indlysende løsning på denne krise – og en

stor beskyldning er naturligvis også, at Kina splitter EU, opdeler EU. Der er faktisk allerede 13 EU-lande, som har underskrevet MoU'er med Kina, og Italien bliver det første G7 land. Det er derfor, at de er så rystende nervøse over det. Det er klart, da det er den tredjestørste økonomi på kontinentet. Jeg understregede kraftigt, at de ikke behøvede Kina til at opdele EU; Den Europæiske Union er opdelt helt af sig selv. Se på splittelsen mellem nord og syd på grund af EU-Kommissions brutale nedskæringspolitik, som helt forarmede Grækenland, Italien, Spanien og Portugal. Der er en åbenlys kløft på dette punkt og en anden omkring problemet med immigration, som Øst- og Vesteuropa er helt uenige om. Faktisk har Kina mange gange argumentet for – og jeg er helt enig – at et samarbejde omkring Bælte og Vej Initiativet faktisk er måden, hvorpå Europa kan forenes, forudsat at f.eks. Frankrig og Tyskland ville anerkende, at det også er ensbetydende med en enorm forretningsmulighed for dem at deltage.

Hvis alle disse europæiske lande kort sagt ville sige, at det er i vores bedste interesse at samarbejde, ikke kun i multilaterale handels- og investeringsaftaler på det eurasiske kontinent, men især om at udvikle Afrika sammen, som er den eneste menneskelige måde at håndtere flygtningekrisen på – det kunne føre til en meget god udvikling. Men EU vil holde et topmøde om dette emne den 21. marts, og man har allerede udarbejdet en 10-punkts handlingsplan; det er klart en indsats for at imødegå denne indflydelse fra Kina. Så vil man holde et topmøde mellem EU og Kina i begyndelsen af april, og det er meget klart, at EU-Kommissionen er på en helt anden kurs end Italien. Men lad os nu se. Jeg tror, at Xi Jinpings besøget vil lykkes, og det på ny vil vise enhver, hvordan et samarbejde er i alles bedste interesse...

Se mere i videoen ovenover.