

# **Mindehøjtidelighed for LaRouche-bevægelsen Leder Phil Rubinstein**

Vi bringer den smukke mindehøjtidelighed for Phil Rubinstein, som fandt sted i New Jersey, USA, den 4. oktober 2020. Han var et enestående og beskedent menneske og omsorgsfuld leder, med stor indsigt i videnskab, filosofi, historie, økonomi og politik.

Nogle af jer kendte Phil fra møder i Danmark, når han var på besøg i sin hustru Lenis hjemmeland.

Afskrifter af mindetaler af Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Harley Schlanger findes nedenunder.

Her er to LaRouchePAC-film, som Phil medvirkede i.

The Extraordinary Genius of Albert Einstein:

1932: A True History of the United States

## **Helga Zepp-LaRouche Remarks at the Phil Rubinstein Memorial October 4, 2020**

Dear Leni, dear friends of Phil Rubinstein:

We are gathering here today to honor our great companion, teacher, and friend, Phil Rubinstein. I can't help but think that at a moment when the whole human civilization is in such a fragile condition, that the world must suffer the loss of such an exceptional person like Phil, who was one of the very few people who had a deep understanding about the scientific ideas of Lyn, which are so crucial for the world to overcome its present situation.

Lyn always said to me that he thought that Phil was completely integral. He was one of the most reliable persons; he would always try to get at the essence of the scientific ideas, and making them intelligible for everybody. He had no respect for academic formalism or academic personas. He was actually a kind of Socrates, who made it his life's vocation to teach and educate the youth. His writings are very important, but even more important was the direct impact he had on hundreds, and over the decades, thousands of people whom he introduced to scientific ideas which would change their lives, and to Lyn's method of thinking. He was always concerned to look for breakthroughs in real science, and he would not get stuck in questions of mathematics or molecular biology, where science has been stuck for a very long time.

Phil made it his mission to communicate effectively the knowability of Lyn's idea, that creativity per se is the essence and the substance of the universe, because the human mind is not outside the universe, but it is the most developed part of that universe. Phil also had a very clear identity and understanding of the role of imagination in scientific breakthrough. That is because he had no fear of formalism; and especially in the foundation of the organization in the 1970s, he had an absolutely crucial role. It is not an accident that there are still so many people from the original Buffalo local in the organization. He had no respect for scientific bluster, which some people at that time clearly had, and also not for the effort to get lower-level influence. It soon would turn out that those people didn't have the strength to stay within the organization.

Phil played an absolutely crucial role also in the recruitment of the LYM – the LaRouche Youth Movement – on the West Coast and beyond. Phil was, and everybody has funny stories about that, was an absolute expert in the animal kingdom, and he knew the behaviors of many different animals very much in detail. He knew what skills these animals had, but he also

never tired of emphasizing that there is a fundamental difference between all the animal species and the human mind. From the same standpoint, he rejected the idea that it would be possible at any moment that artificial intelligence or computers would bypass human creativity.

If you read the beautiful *Festschrift* which was pulled together for this occasion of the memorial, and actually to pay tribute to Phil's impact on people, you can actually see how much impact he had on people and how much love he caused them to experience for him and for humanity. Phil represented the kind of leadership where he was leading through inspiration, and never emphasizing his rank or his importance. Everybody who knew Phil was convinced and spoke of the absolute deep goodness of his character, the gentleness of his soul. He was incapable of any nastiness. He had a very genial absence of any ego. He was humble in his manners, yet very bold in his intellect.

Together with Leni, they had a very exceptional relationship and marriage. There are many marriages which are good or even excellent, but there are those where the couple is becoming almost one because they are becoming so complementary in the way they think. That is for sure the case about Leni and Phil; that was known around the world from Taiwan to Denmark, from the North to the South. I could name a couple of such extraordinary couples, but without doing that, I want to already put Phil and Leni on such a short list.

It is very clear that we cannot replace Phil, but we can honor his contribution to the LaRouche movement and mankind by striving for scientific and artistic breakthroughs, and reach out to the many young minds around the world with the solemn commitment to pull back the human species from the abyss where it finds itself at this moment.

We will miss you, Phil, but you will always be alive in our fight.

# Harley Schlanger Eulogy for Phil Rubinstein

Oct. 5 (EIRNS) – Eulogy for Phil Rubinstein Memorial Event, by Harley Schlanger, October 4, 2020

Dear Leni, Richard, Dear Friends and Colleagues,

When I think of Phil Rubinstein, our beloved colleague and mentor, friend and counsellor, two Yiddish words keep coming to mind; two words with both a simple meaning when applied to everyday life, but words which also contain within them a shadow of the Infinite.

These two words are TSOURIS and NACHES.

The simple definition of Tsouris is the pain and suffering one experiences in daily life, the troubles, the woes, the grief and aggravation which are often our everyday companion. Tsouris is experienced when we have setbacks, as when our efforts to find solutions to difficult problems are dashed, or when we or others fail to live up to our expectations, or, as today, when we are confronted with the loss of a loved one.

Naches is defined as proud pleasure, or special joy, such as that which accompanies seeing the first glint of understanding in the eyes of a baby, when watching a child learning to read, or play a musical instrument, as there is a glimpse in that moment of a future potential which warms the heart of any sentient adult.

In everyday life, these two emotional states, which seem to be such opposites, often coexist. We learned this from Sholem Aleichem, who provided profound insights into the human condition, through the eyes of his poor dairyman, Tevye. Tevye had seven daughters: for him, this was, on the one hand, a blessing, a source of Naches, as he took delight as he watched them grow; but, on the other hand, it was a source of Tsouris,

for as they grew, he felt helpless when they were confronted by problems, many of which were related to being the daughters of a poor dairyman. An additional source of Tsouris was that he must provide seven dowries, if he wished to see them properly married – “Oy”, one can hear him sigh, from the rickety milk wagon pulled by his lame horse, through the rutted roads of the Russian shtetl of Yehupetz, “what’s a Mensch to do?” followed by a wistful, “Ah, but such is life.”

With Phil, these moments of Tsouris in everyday life involved such perplexing problems as how can we pay the office rent and taxes, and still have enough money to feed the 50 or so youth we have recruited? And Naches resulted when he saw those 50 or so youth recruit another 50 or more – of course, bringing with them, future Tsouris.

But with Phil, the higher meaning of these two concepts was ever-present in his search for the meaning of human existence, which was often the real subject of his classes and briefings. Both contain within them a deep longing for a better world, even as we know that such a world will still contain hardships and even bitter disappointments. But that world is also one which can be changed by human creativity.

To me, it is clear that Phil discovered that there is both Tsouris and Naches in his life-long investigation of the struggle of humans to advance from a simple hunting and gathering society, to our complex world today, a history which includes great tragedies, of awful suffering, many of which could have been avoided, had wisdom prevailed; as well as great universal triumphs, such as the defeat of evil by the allies, under FDR’s leadership, which ended the Second World War, or the footsteps left by American astronauts in the dust on the Moon.

Phil was fascinated by the full scope of the three phase spaces that we know of – the non-living, the living, and the noetic – and by the dynamic interaction between them. His

hunger for discovery was insatiable, to the last days of his life. And he took great pleasure in sharing with others what he had learned, not just as presenting “facts” or “plausible explanations” of historic events or scientific discoveries, but in providing insights into the workings of his mind, as he struggled to get to the inner truths behind these developments. Even as we burst into laughter as he described such things as the war between “eternal enemies” – the hyenas and the lions – and mocked the irony that Californians would turn to an ego-driven Austrian bodybuilder to address a \$30 billion budget deficit – we marvelled at his tenacity in investigating the nature of the concept of the Infinite, his rigor in tackling the difficulties inherent in Gödel’s Proof, or Einstein’s Theory of Relativity, and his patient willingness to provide others with the method of his own discoveries. He didn’t just teach us about Socrates, but provided us with a living example of the Socratic method.

In this process, even as we sometimes had to struggle to grasp the ideas he was presenting, we were moved by his humble nature, and his generosity of spirit. Many have shared their stories of watching Phil at a cadre school, polemically challenging young people long after midnight, by the dying embers of a bonfire in the mountains, passionately demonstrating his commitment to their development.

As in the example of his mentor, Lyndon LaRouche, Phil cared little for the societal norms that defined success. Lyn often teased Phil, referring to him as a “Luft-Mensch,” a type of Jewish scholar who was too thin, as he was too poor to eat, but lived on the air he breathed.

As in the case of Lyn, Phil long ago entered the sacred realm of the Simultaneity of Eternity. If one had an opportunity to spend time with him, you found yourself transported, if only momentarily, into the domain of infinite possibility. For in Phil, as in the case of Lyn, one experienced a profound appreciation for the Leibnizian concept, that “this is the

best of all possible worlds” – this was not a slogan, but a physical, mental and emotional reality, which included a profound challenge to each of us, to make ourselves the best of all possible examples for those who work with us today, and those who will come after us.

It is in this realm of the infinite expanse of time and space, where Phil now dwells. We saw that, even in his struggles with his health in recent years, he gave us everything he had. Along with his Leni, for whom he had an infinite love, he touched many of us, making us better people, as he prepared us to deal with the moments of Tsouris and Naches we will encounter in our lives. I miss you terribly, Phil, but your living presence will remain an inspiration to me, and I know, for many others.

And for that, we shall be eternally, and infinitely, grateful.

---

**Schiller                      Instituttets**  
**videokonference**  
**PANEL III d. 6. sept. video**  
**og engelsk afskrift:**  
**Bælte-      og      Vejinitiativet**  
**bliver til Verdenslandbroen &**  
**Franklin      D.      Roosevelts**

# uafsluttede projekt:

1. Dennis Small (USA), latin-amerikansk redaktør, EIR
  2. Dr. Natalia Vitrenko (Ukraine), præsident for Progressive Socialist Party, tidligere parlamentsmedlem og præsidentkandidat
  3. Michele Geraci (Italien), tidligere minister for økonomisk udvikling
  4. Hassan Daud Butt (Pakistan), tidligere projektdirektør, CPEC; Administrerende direktør for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Provincial Board of Investment & Trade
  5. Marcelo Muñoz (Spanien), grundlægger og præsident emeritus for Cátedra China, dekan for spanske forretningsmænd i Kina
  6. Dr. Björn Peters (Tyskland), fysiker, iværksætter og politisk rådgiver inden for energi, bæredygtighed og råvarer
  7. Spørgsmål og svar, del 1
  8. Dr. Joycelyn Elders (USA), tidligere chef for USA's sundhedsvæsen m.m.
  9. Marlette Kyssama-Nsona (Republikken Congo), farmaceutisk kemiker, politisk leder af Panafrican League UMOJA og specialist i folkesundhedsspørgsmål
  10. Spørgsmål og svar, del 2
-



# **"Aktionsdag": Ungdommen mobiliserer for 1,5 milliarder arbejdspladser verden over med 'LaRouche-planen'**

Den 17. juni (EIRNS) – To positive initiativer skiller sig i dag ud fra den omsiggribende pandemi samt andre voksende kriser. Schiller Instituttets ungdomsafdeling ledte en multinational aktionsdag, som opfordrede lederne fra de fire magter – USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – til at hæve sig over stridighederne og mødes for at igangsætte tiltag for det almene vel, i særdeleshed mht. infrastruktur indenfor sundhed og medicin for at bekæmpe COVID-19, og for at skabe produktivitet i det økonomiske system gennem "LaRouche-planen" for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser, og alt som hører til. For det andet, i samme ånd, blev der i dag afholdt et møde mellem kinesiske og afrikanske ledere, under titlen "Kina-Afrika-Solidaritetstopmøde mod COVID-19", som blev ledet og adresseret af Præsident Xi Jinping og den Afrikanske Unions formand, Cyril Ramaphosa, blandt andre.

Det ekstraordinære topmøde skabte en ny "Platform for medicinske forsyninger til Afrika", for at alle afrikanske nationer de næste seks måneder kunne få adgang til diagnostiske og terapeutiske forsyninger for at bekæmpe pandemien. Ramaphosa, som i den senere tid har påpeget vigtigheden af rumforskning og kernekraft, lagde vægt på tiltag for at tilsidesætte ubetalelig gæld i Afrika i denne nødsituation, for at bekæmpe virusset.

Schiller Instituttets aktionsdag inkluderede henvendelser,

gennem alle former for kommunikation, til hundredvis af individer og organisationer, som har muligheden for at påbegynde de nødvendige initiativer til et nyt økonomisk system, hvis akutte mål er fokuseret på infrastruktur til global sundhed, som overskriften på Schiller Instituttets begæring lyder: "Forsvar Jordens allervigtigste ressource – mennesket!"

Planen for denne aktivering findes i dokumentet: "LaRouche-planen til at genåbne USA's økonomi: Verden har brug for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser". Rapporten, produceret af LaRouchePAC, vil blive diskuteret lørdag d. 20. juni, kl. 20:00 (dansk tid) af landbrugsledere, fagforeningsledere og andre, ved LaRouchePAC's ugentlige, nationale "rådhus", under overskriften: "1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser verden over – hvordan USA's arbejdsstyrke bringes tilbage til videnskabsbaseret produktion". Dette er lyset, som skinner gennem det der ellers kan synes et håbløst mørke af uretfærdighed og lidelse, uden nogen vej imod en produktiv fremtid. Dette er en opfordring til handling.

Det modsatte til denne kampberedte tilgang til et samarbejde om et nyt økonomisk system, blev udstillet i dag i nye amerikanske udenrigspolitiske initiativer mod Syrien, i et modbydeligt skue af britisk imperialistisk geopolitisk taktik for regimeskifte. Det bliver gjort værre af, at sanktionerne bemyndiges og har den samlede støtte fra de neoliberale og neokonservative tosser, der tilføjede det som en paragraf i den seneste Lov for den Nationale Forsvarsmyndighed (National Defense Authorization Act). Udenrigsministeriet bekendtgjorde 39 nye sanktioner mod den syriske præsident, Bashar al-Assad, hans kone, mange familiemedlemmer og andre syriske ledere, hvilket forbyder nogen som helst form for økonomisk støtte til nationen. Dette sker efter at detaljer om den desperate situation med mangel på medicin og fødevarer i Syrien blev formidlet til FN's Sikkerhedsråd den 16. juni, og

gennem advarsler om truende hungersnød i Syrien fra FN's administrerende direktør for Verdens Fødevareprogram, David Beasley, i et interview den 12. juni med dagbladet The National i de Forenede Arabiske Emirater. Mere end 9 millioner mennesker i Syrien har ingen fødevarer sikkerhed (uden tilstrækkelig føde, enten grundet mangler eller forsyninger), og yderligere 2 millioner står på randen.

En del af dette billede inkluderer Libanon, tæt forbundet hermed, hvor banksystemet er brudt sammen. Libanon, en nation med 5 millioner mennesker, har taget imod 1,5 millioner syriske flygtninge. I de seneste dage bliver der taget skridt hen imod et "nyt paradigme" i samarbejde med Kina, med en intervention for udvikling af infrastruktur og mulig understøttelse af Syrien gennem russiske og iranske initiativer.

Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, talte i sit ugentlige webcast i dag, om hvordan det "ikke er tid til geopolitiske spil". Ønsker man at skabe "et regimeskifte i Syrien gennem hungersnød?"

Efter en detaljeret beskrivelse af situationen, samt andre af dagens udviklinger, såsom at Tyskland og USA "driver fra hinanden", sluttede hun af med at understrege den generelle pointe om, hvad der er brug for blandt nationer. "Tyskland og USA bør arbejde sammen for at løse flygtningekrisen, opbygningen af Sydvestasien, overvindelsen af pandemien, samarbejde om industrialiseringen af Afrika – dette er den slags ting, som vi skulle stikke hovederne sammen om. Vi bliver nødt til at have et andet paradigme og en fuldstændig anden måde at tænke på. Fordi nationale interesser er fine – jeg går fuldt ind for nationale interesser, herunder Tysklands. Men som Friedrich Schiller har sagt mange gange, man kan ikke have nationale interesser, som er i konflikt med menneskehedens. Derfor bliver man nødt til at være en patriot og en verdensborger på samme tid."

"Så det er denne ånd som Schiller Instituttet forsøger at vække til live. Dette vil være emnet på vores kommende konference, d. 27. juni". Find indbydelsen til konferencen her:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2020/06/invitation-til-konferenc-evil-menneskeheden-blomstre-op-eller-gaa-til-grundefremtiden-kraever-et-fire-magts-topmoede-nu/>

---

# **VIDEO ARKIV: INTERNATIONAL VIDEOKONFERENCE den 25.-26. april: Menneskehedens eksistens afhænger af etableringen af et nyt paradigme nu!**

HARLEY SCHLANGER d. 22. april, 2020: Jeg opfordrer dig til at slutte dig til os ved denne konference, da vi klart står over for et øjeblik i menneskets historie, hvor din kreative aktivitet, og din stemme er vigtig, fordi du kan nu spille en rolle i historien.

Der er ingen tvivl om, at vi er ved et vendepunkt. Den kombinerede effekt af coronavirus-pandemien og det økonomiske krak gør, at vi befinder os i ukendt farvand, og vi ser, at der vedtages en politik, som er det nøjagtig modsatte af, hvad der burde gøres. Især i forhold til økonomien, med

redningspakkerne, med den stigende mængde af likviditet der pumpes ud af Federal Reserve, den amerikanske centralbank. Men endnu farligere, som Helga påpegede i vores diskussion i sidste uge, er det rablende anti-kinesiske hysteri, der kommer fra de selvsamme mennesker, der bragte Russiagate, og de selvsamme mennesker som er ansvarlige for den økonomiske krise. Især har vi identificeret Henry Jackson-Selskabet og Atlanterhavsrådet, der havde en konference for to dage siden for at diskutere, hvorfor vi er 'i krig med Kina', og hvorfor vi taber, og nu opfordrer den vestlige alliance til at opgradere dets aktivitet for at besejre Kina.

I stedet for skal vi samarbejde! Stillet over for denne krise bør vi hæve vores blik såvel som vores hjerter til at omfavne menneskeheden, og samarbejde for at komme med løsninger. Og i weekenden 25.-26. april – lørdag og søndag – vil vi præsentere en konference, som er åben for dig her på siden, eller på

Schiller Instituttets internationale hjemmeside

Men lad mig give dig en fornemmelse af programmet, så du kan se, hvad vi skal diskutere, og dets vigtighed. Det vil forresten være online, så det vil være tilgængeligt for alle jer, der har adgang til internettet.

I dag lørdag kl. 16 dansk tid

Panel 1: "Det presserende behov for at erstatte geopolitikken med et nyt paradigme i internationale relationer".

Panel Moderator: Dennis Speed

10:00 USA østkysttid– Opening Remarks & Introduction

Dennis Speed, Schiller Institute

10:15 – Keynote Address

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Founder and Chairman, Schiller Institute

10:55 – Dmitriy Polyanskiy, 1st Deputy Permanent Representative

The Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations

11:10 –H.E. Ambassador Huang Ping

Consul General of the People's Republic of China in New York

“For a Better Future: Proposed Principles Needed to Ensure Peaceful and Productive Relations Between China and the United States”

11:25–12:00 – Q&A with Zepp-LaRouche and representatives of Russia and China

12:00 – Jacques Cheminade

Chairman, Solidarité et Progrès, former French Presidential Candidate

“A Europe Not To Be Ashamed Of”

12:20 – Michele Geraci

Economist from Italy, former Undersecretary to the Development Ministry in Rome

12:35–1:15 – Q&A with Zepp-LaRouche, Cheminade, and Geraci

1:15 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche

“Introducing the LaRouche Legacy Foundation”

1:30–2:00 – Q&A continued

Dette vil tage udfordringen op, som Lyndon LaRouche foreslog for mere end et årti siden, at de fire stormagter – Rusland, Kina, Indien og De Forenede Stater – mødes for at diskutere et nyt paradigme, herunder en Ny Bretton Woods-aftale, og inkluderende et samarbejde om LaRouches Fire Love for at muliggøre en global økonomisk genoplivning. Samarbejde, ikke konfrontation, ikke geopolitik, som er en britisk opfindelse. Vi er nødt til at afslutte regimeskifte, gøre en ende på de uendelige krige og i stedet arbejde sammen. Dette var

præsident Trumps erklærede intention, da han blev valgt; dette er grunden til, at han blev angrebet med Russiagate, og til at der i dag er en samordnet indsats fra begge partierne, fra efterretningssamfundet og fra medierne for at vende præsident Trump mod Kina og mod Xi Jinping. Så i det første panel diskuterer vi, hvordan vi kan overvinde geopolitikken.

I dag lørdag kl. 21.00 dansk tid,

Panel 2: "For en bedre forståelse af hvordan vores univers fungerer."

LaRouchePAC Science Team: Megan Beets, Benjamin Deniston, Jason Ross: "In Defense of the Human Species"

Plus additional experts

Dette er afgørende, fordi vi har set en forandring på områder inden for videnskabelig forskning, i mange tilfælde, som i tilfældet med den såkaldte "grønne" politik, til en anti-videnskabelig tilgang, der igen er designet til at beskytte det finansielle system, men ikke til at skabe fremgang for den menneskelige art. Og så vil vi tage spørgsmål op fra skikkelser som Kepler og Leibniz, Einstein, Vernadsky – hvad er i grunden videnskab? Og hvad er menneskets forhold til universet, det ikke-levende til det levende og det levende til noösfæren, fornuftsfæren, det vil sige domænet for menneskelig kreativitet.

Søndag 26. april kl. 17 dansk tid

Panel 3: "Kreativitet som den markant karakteristiske egenskab ved menneskelig kultur: Behovet for en klassisk renæssance."

Beethoven, An die ferne Geliebte, John Sigerson accompanied by Margaret Greenspan

Lyndon LaRouche "I Have Insisted that Music is Intelligible!"

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and chairwoman, Schiller

Institute

William Warfield, "A Poetic Musical Offering"

John Sigerson, "The Physical Power of Classical Poetry and Music"

Diane Sare, "On the Employment of Chorus in Politics"

and other experts

Sandsynligvis et af de vigtigste paneler, vi nogensinde har haft, Hvis man ser på alt det rænkespind og den dårskab der breder sig, hvilket i store træk ikke er uventet, i betragtning af fordummelsen af befolkningen, og også det virkelige stress og angst, som folk står overfor, idet vi ser civilisationen, som vi kender den, falde sammen, må folk have noget dybere at falde tilbage på for at komme med løsninger. Og en af de ting vi vil gøre, er at se på hvad det var, der gjorde det muligt for Renæssancen at opstå, den håndfuld af enkeltpersoner, videnskabsfolk, kunstnere, digtere, mennesker, der kiggede på menneskets forhold til universet og gjorde fremskridt gennem kreative opdagelser – i et øjeblik af dyb fortvivlelse, fordi Renæssancen kom efter, at den Sorte Pest havde fejet hen over Europa i midten af det 14. århundrede, og udslettet fra en tredjedel til halvdelen af befolkningen på hele kontinentet.

Så i dag, hvor vi står over for lignende kriser, kan vi ikke "vende tilbage til normalen", fordi 'business as usual' var det der fik os ind i denne krise. Så ved at ændre den måde mennesket ser på sig selv, og vi ser på hinanden, som vi ser på andre nationer, at vi legemliggør Schillers princip om, at man skal være en patriot i forhold til ens eget land, men samtidig en verdensborger: Hvis vi ser på dette udtryk gennem kreativitet og musik og kunst, kan vi finde en bedre version af os selv, så vi kan arbejde på at løse disse problemer.



Søndag kl. 21 dansk tid på søndag

Panel 4: "Videnskaben om fysisk økonomi."

Dennis Small, United States, Schiller Institute Director for Ibero-America: "LaRouche's Legacy: Foundation of the Modern Science of Physical Economy."

Sébastien Périmony, France, Schiller Institute representative: "When Africa Looks to the Stars."

Phillip Tsokolibane, South Africa, leader of LaRouche South Africa.

Bob Baker, United States: "Feed the Future: Eating Is a Moral Right—A Dialogue With American Farmers."

and other experts

Dette er LaRouches specielle felt; Lyndon LaRouche var en pioner inden for hele denne idé om fysisk økonomi. Og dette kombinerer videnskab, det kombinerer historie, det kombinerer kultur, psykologi, kan man sige, hvordan det går til, at vi kan opbygge en økonomi, der reflekterer de menneskelige væsener, som vi er.

Dette er en yderst spændende konference. Vi har talere fra hele verden. Vi håber at have deltagere fra hele verden, og jeg forventer, at mange af jer vil tage tiden til at overvinde jeres dysterhed, jeres apati, jeres frustration, jeres vrede, og tænde jeres sind og lytte til diskussionen, deltage om I vil – og for at gøre det, skal man registrere sig, så gå til Schiller Instituttets website og tilmeld dig, så du kan deltage. Det vil finde sted denne weekend, 25.-26. april, og starter kl. 16 i Europa.

Tak fordi du lyttede med. Jeg vender tilbage i næste uge med Helga LaRouche, men jeg forventer at se dig deltage denne weekend i vores konference. Tak, fordi du deltager. Farvel!

---

# Fra arkivet: Video: Grønland og udviklingen af Arktis

Fra 2010

2. del:

3. del:

---

## Se foredragsrækken om LaRouches liv: Jordens sidste 50 år og Jordens næste 50 år

**# 1: Oversigt: Den enkeltes rolle i historien. [Klik her.](#)**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche. En person kan ændre historien, og den mest magtfulde kraft i historien er ikke våben, penge eller hæere: 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 Helga 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 en forståelse af den nødvendige renæssance.

## **# 2: LaRouches ufuldendte krig for en ny økonomisk verdensorden. Klik her.**

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.

Han påviste, at denne politik ville være til gavn for både nord og syd. Hans metode var 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.

## **#3: Lyndon LaRouches unikke bidrag til videnskaben om universel historie. Klik her.**

Will Wertz. I et essay han skrev, som blev udgivet i foråret 1993 med titlen »Om Gud«, skrev han: »Hvis vi måler historien med standarden, at hver person er imago viva Dei, får vi en komplet anderledes opfattelse af historien, end det, som er beskrevet i vores tåbelige lærebøger fra universiteterne og lignende steder«. I et efterfølgende essay, udgivet i tidsskriftet Fidelio i efteråret 1993 med titlen »Historie som videnskab«, fortsatte Lyndon LaRouche: En rigoristisk

definition af begrebet »historie« begynder med det faktum, at den fortsatte eksistens af den menneskelige art er styret af et princip, som ikke eksisterer for andre arter.«

#### **#4 (18. maj): Italiensk Videnskab og Kultur. Klik her.**

Liliana Gorini og John Sigerson. LaRouches ideer afspejler i Italien et fremskridt for den videnskabelige og kunstneriske revolution i det 15. århundredes florentinske renæssance. Dette fremskridt omfatter en tilbagevenden til en naturlig musikalsk stemning, hvilket Giuseppe Verdi krævede for mere end et århundrede siden; Italiens nylige skridt til at gennemføre LaRouches forslag om en Glass/Steagall-banklovgivning, en tilbagevenden til Hamiltons principper om økonomisk politik; og Italiens dristige beslutning om at tilslutte sig Kinas Bælte og Vejinitiativ for verdens udvikling.

Klassisk musik: Den tyske dirigent Furtwängler blev den ledende inspiration for LaRouches insisteren på at musik ikke udfoldes i lyd, men i det riemannske komplekse domæne.

#### **5. Det amerikanske system, LaRouche-Riemannsk økonomi, og et Måne-Mars projekt. Klik her. Den findes nederste på siden.**

Ben Deniston og Paul Gallagher. Den 23. marts 1983 traf præsident Reagan en beslutning – trods stærk modstand fra sine rådgivere – om at gøre LaRouches strategiske forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) til USA's politik. Det var en del af LaRouches rumprojektforeslag for en ny æra af potentielt set ubegrænset fremskridt.

Alle kan også ses på LaRouchePAC's hjemmeside. Klik her.

---

**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 LAROCHE: 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]

---

**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.

---

**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.

---

## **Ny LaRouchePAC foredragsrække: Koncepterne bag Lyndon LaRouches internationale Nye Bretton Woods-kreditsystem**

Muligheden for, at LaRouches koncepter for, hvordan samarbejdet mellem nationer bør udfoldes, bliver gjort til virkelighed, er større end nogensinde. Samtidig har disse koncepter aldrig været mere nødvendige end nu. De kan blive til virkelighed gennem det fremspirende samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre ledende økonomiske magter.



Foredragstitlerne er følgende:

1. Det menneskelige sinds kreative ånd reflekterer universets underliggende kreative princip.
2. Nøglen til at forstå økonomi er videnskab og ikke matematik.
3. Eksistensen af nationalstater er en nødvendighed.
4. Hvad er kreativitet nøjagtigt, som er den sande kilde til økonomisk vækst?
5. Friedrich Schiller, frihedens digter.
6. Vladimir Vernadsky, Biosphæren og Noosphæren.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

```
<iframe width="560" height="315"
src="https://www.youtube.com/embed/cyGJstd52-4"
frameborder="0" allow="accelerometer; autoplay; encrypted-
media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture"
allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

---

# **Vil amerikanske styrker hjælpe Al-Qaida i Syrien på årsdagen den 11. september ?**

LaRouchePAC den 9. september 2018 – Senator Richard Black fra Virginia rapporterer om hans netop afsluttede 6-dages tur til Syrien, herunder hans møde med præsident Bashar al Assad. Black siger, at hvis USA, Storbritannien og Frankrig afstår fra deres position, hvor de hjælper og bevæbner al-Qaida-terroristerne i deres forsøg på at vælte Assad, kunne krigen i Syrien bringes til ophør inden årets udgang.

---

# **Schiller Instituttet holder Kulturaften i Dresden, Tyskland. Med Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

---

# Lyndon LaRouche: Martin Luther Kings liv og mission

*... den store leder, som Martin, stiger til et højere niveau. De tænker på deres liv, som evangeliet fremlægger det, som en talent (mønt); livet er en talent, man har fået givet. Man fødes, og man dør. Det er ens talent; hvad man har i denne tidsperiode. Spørgsmålet er, man vil under alle omstændigheder give den ud; hvordan vil man give den ud? Hvad vil man bruge den til at sikre, i al evighed? Hvad vil man gøre, som en mission, som vil gøre én fortjent til den plads, man ønsker at have i evigheden?*

*Martin havde en klar fornemmelse af dette. Denne 'bjergtopstale' for mig, slog mig ligesom en klar forståelse af, hvad han sagde, hvad han sagde til andre.[1]*

*Livet er en talent. Det er ikke, hvad man 'får ud af' livet. Det er, hvad man lægger ind i det, der tæller. Martin havde dette.*

»Vi har, mener jeg, to problemer, som bør være grundlag for at reflektere over Martins liv i dag. 1) Vi har en national krise. Jeg vil ikke lægge fingrene imellem eller tale ud fra det politiske partiapparat (Demokraterne); men kendsgerningerne skal frem: Denne nationaløkonomi er ved at kollapse. Situationen, med hensyn til USA's grundlæggende økonomiske infrastruktur i dag, er relativt set værre end i 1933, hvor Roosevelt i marts måned kom ind i Det Hvide Hus. Det vil sige, hvis man undersøger infrastruktur, energi osv., livsbetingelserne for vort folk og i hele verden – lad være med at se på de store byer, hvor de går rundt med en facade og siger, alt går godt; men se på lokalsamfundene; Detroit, f.eks., har nu halvdelen af det indbyggertal, byen plejede at

have. En industriby er forsvundet. Se på Birmingham, man ser det samme rapporteret; det var aldrig rigt, men deres oplevelse af tab, tab, tab; det er situationen i USA. Og der er en ligegyldighed over for USA's problemer. Mindst 48 af de 50 stater er bankerot, håbløst bankerot; dvs., at staterne umuligt kan øge skatteindtægterne uden at sænke økonomien yderligere, for at imødekomme regeringens essentielle forpligtelser. Det er karakteristisk for mindst 48 stater, og det bliver værre. Hvis man ser på leveomkostningerne, stigningen i leveomkostningerne i forhold til det, der officielt rapporteres, se på priserne for mad hos købmanden hen over de seneste 6 måneder i USA. Se på det faktum, at den amerikanske dollar, som for ikke så længe siden kunne købe en euro for 83 cents; i dag koster det 1 dollar 26-28 cents at købe en euro. Den amerikanske dollar er ved at kollapse i værdi; det, der stiger, er den pengemængde, der associeres til hasardspil, og den mest omfangsrige form for hasardspil finder sted på Wall Street. Pengene går, for rent spekulative formål, til at drive separate hasardspilsindsatser på sidelinjen i økonomien i vejret, for at drive værdien af aktiepriserne op for visse selskaber; og så snart et eller andet selskab bliver rigt, kommer lederne af selskaberne i fængsel, ligesom i Enron; for vi er gået fra 'stålindustrien' til 'stjæleindustrien'! Det er arten af nationaløkonomien.

Vi er i vanskeligheder. Vi er i vanskeligheder på global skala. Siden januar 2002, da den nuværende præsident holdt en uheldig tale, i sin 'State of the Union'-tale. Holdningen over for USA er faldet hastigt, til det laveste niveau, jeg nogensinde har set; fra nationer i hele verden. I hele Eurasien; i de amerikanske lande, er USA nu foragtet, hvor det i det mindste var respekteret, eller endda elsket, før. Vi er i vanskeligheder. Og se på verden. Verden konfronteres med en stor krise; USA konfronteres med en stor krise, med den måde, det behandler verden på. De største befolkningskoncentrationer i verden, i Kina, f.eks., 1,3 mia. eller mere; Indien, Pakistan, Bangladesh og landene i Sydøstasien; dette er den

største befolkningskoncentration på planeten. Det er en fremvoksende del af verden; spørgsmålet er, hvad er USA's relation til disse asiatiske folkeslag, der i det store og hele repræsenterer forskellige kulturelle baggrunde i forhold til USA og Vesteuropa. Hvordan skal vi finde fred i en urolig verden; hvordan skal vi finde forsoning i en verden i vanskeligheder med lande, der har vendt sig mod os pga. Cheneys og et par andres krigspolitikker?

Vi står altså over for en situation. Lad os gå lidt tilbage til det tidspunkt, hvor Bill Clintons blev indsat som præsident. Tænk nu over noget, nogle af jer ved noget om; tænk på den sorte vælgerskares status, den lovgivende, sorte forsamling ... i 1993, da Bill Clinton kom ind i Det Hvide Hus. Gå nu igennem listen over navnene; hvor er disse mennesker, og deres erstatninger, i dag? Der har været en udvælgelse af de politiske præstationer i hele landet af de sorte vælgerkredse/folkevalgte. Det er dette problem, jeg konstant konfronteres med, og fra 1996 blev det værre, accelererede brutalt.

Så vi konfronteres altså ikke med et nyt problem i dag, men med det samme problem, principielt, som Martin med succes konfronterede, og jeg vil fremføre, at, i arven efter Martin Luther King og hans liv, er der noget, vi kan lære i dag, som bringer ham tilbage i live, som om han stod her i dag, i live. Der er noget særligt ved hans liv, hans udvikling, som vi i dag bør indfange, ikke alene med hensyn til at adressere vor nations problemer, som er ved at blive forfærdelige, men problemerne med vore relationer med verden som helhed. Hvordan skal vi agere over for disse kulturer, der er forskellige fra vore egne? Med asiatiske kulturer, der er forskellige fra vore egne; med muslimske kulturer, der er over 1 mia. muslimer i hele verden; med Kinas kultur, der er forskellig fra vores; med kulturen i Sydøstasien, der er forskellig fra vores? De er alle mennesker, der har alle de samme krav og behov, men de er forskellige kulturer, de tænker anderledes, de responderer til

andre (kan ikke høres) end vi gør. Men vi må have fredeligt samarbejde med disse mennesker, for at løse globale problemer. Så begynder man at tænke over en person som Martin, og jeg vil indikere, i denne sammenhæng, hvad Martins betydning er i dag.

Vi havde ingen erstatning for Martin. Første lektie. Martin var en enestående person; han var ikke en talentfuld person, der tilfældigvis snublede over lederskab og let kunne erstattes af andre ledere, der havde lært jobbet og kunne tage over bagefter. Han havde ingen efterfølger; der var ingen, som befandt sig i en position til at efterfølge ham. Mange ønskede det; de havde det ikke.

Hvad var det, Martin havde? Hvad var essensen af Martin, der gjorde ham til noget specielt?

Lad os sammenligne tre tilfælde for forstå dette. Et tilfælde, Martin selv. Det andet er tilfældet med Frankrigs berømte heltinde Jeanne d'Arc, og jeg er godt bekendt med den faktiske historie af Jeanne d'Arcs tilfælde, som på en måde er sammenligneligt, på en særlig måde, med Martins tilfælde. Og så også med et fiktivt tilfælde, som peger på det problem, vi står overfor, tilfældet med Shakespeares Hamlet; især Hamlets monolog i 3. akt.

Hvad handlede det om? Martin var en sand Guds mand, på en måde, som meget få mennesker kan virkeliggøre i deres livstid. Det var ikke alene det, at han var en Guds mand, men at han voksede op til fuldstændigt at forstå, hvad det ville sige. Hans billede var selvfølgelig Kristus og Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Det var hans kilde til styrke. Han levede det. Han havde bestegit bjergets top, på et tidspunkt, hvor han vidste, hans liv var truet af magtfulde kræfter internt i USA. Og han sagde, 'jeg vil ikke vige tilbage fra denne mission, om de så dræber mig'; præcis som Kristus sagde, og jeg er sikker på, Martin tænkte på dette, på dette tidspunkt. Kristi korsfæstelsespassion er det billede, der er essensen af kristendom. Det er et billede i f.eks. Tyskland og

andre steder, hvor Bachs Mattæus-passion opføres, en ca. to timer lang forestilling. Og i disse to timer genlever publikum, menigheden, sangerne, musikerne på en kraftfuld måde Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Dette har altid været vigtigt, at genleve dette; at indfange essensen af, hvad Kristus betyder for alle kristne, og Martin viste dette.

Forskellen er det følgende; og jeg vil vende tilbage til Jeanne d'Arc; de fleste mennesker er tilbøjelige til at tro, jo, jeg vil gerne i himmelen, eller noget i den retning. Eller også er de ikke, de er ligeglade. Men de leder efter svar inden for rammerne af deres dødelige liv. De tænker på kødets tilfredsstillelse, den sikkerhed, de vil nyde godt af, mellem grænserne for fødsel og død; hvorimod den store leder, som Martin, stiger til et højere niveau. De tænker på deres liv, som evangeliet fremlægger det, som en talent (mønt); livet er en talent, man har fået givet. Man fødes, og man dør. Det er ens talent; hvad man har i denne tidsperiode. Spørgsmålet er, man vil under alle omstændigheder give den ud; hvordan vil man give den ud? Hvad vil man bruge den til at sikre, i al evighed? Hvad vil man gøre, som en mission, som vil gøre én fortjent til den plads, man ønsker at have i evigheden?

Martin havde en klar fornemmelse af dette. Denne 'bjergtopstale' for mig, slog mig ligesom en klar forståelse af, hvad han sagde, hvad han sagde til andre.[1]

Livet er en talent. Det er ikke, hvad man 'får ud af' livet. Det er, hvad man lægger ind i det, der tæller. Martin havde dette. Der er derfor, han var en leder, og jeg har kendt de andre ledere, der var med ham i denne periode. De havde ikke helt den samme gnist. De accepterede måske ideen, de troede måske på den, men det greb dem ikke på samme måde, som det greb Martin. Og det greb ham mere og mere, er jeg sikker på, i takt med, at han påtog sig større og større ansvar; som en leder føler man dette, man ser sit folk, man ser, hvad man må håndtere, man ser lidelserne, man ser farerne, og man må finde i sig selv styrken til ikke at vige tilbage, ikke gå på

kompromis.

Lad os tage tilfældet Jeanne d'Arc, til sammenligning. Dette er den sande historie; hun var en så signifikant person i det 15. århundrede, historien blev grundigt dokumenteret dengang og er blevet krydstjekket osv. Hun var en person i hele kristendommen; hun er en hovedperson i Frankrigs historie. Her er hun så, en ung kvinde (17), der kom fra bondestanden, og som havde forhåbninger om, at Frankrig måtte befries fra de normanniske ridders forfærdelige besættelse; at Frankrig måtte blive en sand nation, og at det måtte løftes ud af sin tilstand og blive en nation for at tage sig af disse problemer; at Gud ønskede, dette skulle ske. Så, gennem flere hændelser, henvendte hun sig til en prins, som var den nominelle arving til Frankrigs trone, og hun sagde til denne prins – jeg har glemt, der var diverse akkreditiver – 'Gud ønsker, at du skal blive konge'. Og han så på hende og sagde, 'Hvad ønsker du af mig?' Hun svarede, 'jeg ønsker ingenting af dig; Gud ønsker, at du skal være konge'. Og, på grund af hendes kraftfulde personlighed og hendes mission, gav kongen hende kommando over nogle soldater til en meget alvorlig kamp på det tidspunkt, idet han formodede, hun ville blive dræbt som leder af disse soldater, og det ville løse problemet. Men hun blev ikke dræbt, hun vandt slaget, som hun personligt anførte. Og Frankrig blev mobiliseret til sin uafhængighed; ideen var dets uafhængighed i det store og hele som et resultat. Så kom tidspunktet, hvor kongen blev kronet, prinsen blev kronet til konge: men så forrådte kongen hende, til Frankrigs fjender, til briterne, normannerne. Og hun blev retsforfulgt af inkquisitionen, som var en rædselsfuld ting, den værste form for uretfærdighed man kan forestille sig. Og under retssagen blev hun tilbudt lokkemad; hvis du trækker dig lidt, vil vi ikke brænde dig levende på bålet. Hun sagde nej; hun veg tilbage; måske skulle jeg gå på kompromis, hun havde præster, der forsøgte at få hende til at gå på kompromis. Hun sagde, 'jeg vil ikke gå på kompromis. Jeg kan ikke forråde min mission'. Hun havde besteget bjergets top; jeg vil ikke



forråde min mission; jeg vil fastholde min kurs. Så de tog hende og bandt hende til en pæl; de stablede brændet op om pælen; de satte ild til bålet, mens hun var i live og kogte hende ihjel. Så åbnede de brændestakken for at se, om hun var i live eller ej og fandt, at hun var død, og så fortsatte de processen og genantændte bålet og brændte hende til aske (hun var da 19, -red.)

Men ud af dette skete der to ting: Frankrig blev genoplivet og fik sin uafhængighed og fik senere den første, moderne nationalstat, under Louis 11 af Frankrig.

Betydningen af dette for os i dag, er, at pga. denne sejr, pga. det, der skete med Louis 11 af Frankrig, fik vi den første europæiske stat, i hvilken *hele* regeringen var ansvarlig for *hele* folkets almene vel. Det almene vel betyder præcis det, det betyder i 1. korintherbrev, kap. 13, hvor Paulus skriver om agápe, undertiden kaldet kærlighed eller godgørenhed. Det er denne egenskab; det er ikke loven, det er ikke lovbogen, der tæller; det er ens kærlighed til menneskeheden, der tæller; at man altid må leve for ens kærlighed til menneskeheden. Og derfor er en regering ikke legitim, undtagen som en regering, der officielt er forpligtet over for ikke alene det almene velfærd for *hele* folket, men også over for forbedringen af livsbetingelserne for deres efterkommere. Og for første gang i Frankrig, i denne stat, [fik man] princippet om forfatningsmæssig lov; at en regering ikke kan behandle nogle blandt befolkningen som menneskeligt kvæg. Det er ikke lovligt, det er ikke en nation, hvis den behandler nogle blandt sin befolkning som menneskeligt kvæg. Man skal tænke på *hele* befolkningens almene velfærd; det må være indfanget i forpligtelse over for *hele* folket, og over for deres efterkommere. For vi er alle dødelige, og for at vække i os selv de passioner, mens vi er i live, som vil tilskynde os til at gøre det gode, må vi have en følelse af, at forbruget af vort liv, brugen af vor talent, vil betyde noget for de kommende generationer. De bedste mennesker ser

efter ting, ligesom Moses, som vil finde sted, når han ikke længere selv er der til at nyde dem! Denne fornemmelse for udødelighed er det, som de bedste forældre opofrer for deres børn; det er det, som lokalsamfund opofrer for uddannelse til deres børn, for deres børns muligheder. Man gennemgår pinen ved lidelser og mangel, men man har en følelse af, at man er på vej fremad, at ens liv vil betyde noget, at man kan dø med et smil på læben; man har overvundet døden, man har brugt sin talent vist, hvorfor livet vil betyde noget bedre for de kommende generationer. Det var princippet. Det princip inspirerede den mand, der blev kong Henrik 7 af England, til at gøre det samme imod den onde kong Richard 3, og til at etablere England på det tidspunkt som den anden, moderne nationalstat. Det var på en måde, hvad Martin gjorde. Samme form for proces.

Men lad os nu tage den anden side af sagen. Lad os tage tilfældet Hamlet. Hamlet siger, vi har muligheden for at kæmpe og befri os selv fra forfærdelige tilstande, men, men – hvad sker der, når vi dør? Hvad sker der efter døden? Det er frygten for, hvad der sker efter døden, som gør folk til krystere. Og det er vores problem i USA i dag. Det er problemet med vores lederskab i det Demokratiske Parti; det er problemet med det Republikanske Parti, for det er ikke alle i det Republikanske Parti, der er dårlige, nogle af dem er meget gode, og jeg har til hensigt at inkorporere nogle af dem i min regering; jeg er ikke særlig partisk, når det drejer sig om regeringen. Jeg er partisk med hensyn til at få den etableret.

Det er pointen. Problemet her er det følgende: Tror vi rent faktisk på, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyrene? Tror I på, at, i skolerne i dag, i aviserne i dag; tror I på, at amerikanere tror på, på nogen som helst signifikant måde, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyret? Det er ikke det, vi underviser; se på vores standardpensum. Mange af jer ved noget om uddannelse. Vores uddannelsespolitik er en national forbrydelse. Man lærer ingenting; man lærer at bestå en prøve.

Man spørger sig selv, om de, der udarbejder prøven, ved, hvad de taler om. Man har prøver at bestå i forskellige steder i landet, ikke for at teste, hvad man har gjort ved eleverne med hensyn til, hvad de ved; undertiden kommer eleverne og siger, 'jeg ved ingenting, i mine skoleår lærte jeg ingenting'. Sådan, som man underviser nu. Det, man tester, er elevernes lydighedstræning i dette skoledistrikt eller den del af landet, målt ud fra underlødighed. Distrikterne konkurrerer om penge! Og præstationerne, som skoleelevernes hundetræning, bliver en standard for, hvor mange penge, og hvor mange udmærkelser, dette distrikt vil modtage det følgende år. Vi er ikke længere interesseret ... Vi tror som nation ikke længere på at udvikle mennesker! Vi er, ligesom det gamle Rom, blevet et samfund for 'brød og cirkus'; få din krumme, og lad dig underholde! Og underholdningen bliver mere og mere ond, som det skrider frem. F.eks., arbejder folk i dag; er deres mentalitet, at de skal arbejde? Tror de på arbejde, tror de på, at samfundet giver dem mulighed for at arbejde? Nej, det gør det ikke. Det giver dem mulighed for at få fat i nogle penge. Hvad er den største vækstindustri i USA? Hasardspil! Hvad er Wall Street? Hasardspil. Hvad er Enron? Hasardspil. Hvad er disse fyre, der kommer i fængsel i New York? Hasardspillere. Mentaliteten i landet er, at, hvis du sidder i held og vinder i lotteriet og vinder på væddeløbsbanen, så går det fremad for dig. Til trods for, at ens industri er ved at kollapse, ens landbrug er væk, byrådet ikke længere har råd til at sørge for centrale behov; vi er blevet et hasardspilssamfund. Vi er afhængige af hvad? Masseunderholdning. Hvilken form for masseunderholdning? Er dette noget, man i realiteten bør skamme sig over?

Vi anser ikke længere mennesker for at være mennesker. Vi forstår ikke længere, hvad menneskeligt er.

Jeg startede en ungdomsbevægelse for henved 4 år siden, der fokuserer på unge mennesker, 18-25 årige, dvs. aldersgruppen for universitetsstuderende. Som I ved, når folk bliver omkring

18 til 25 år, under normale betingelser, er de gået videre end til at tænke på sig selv som unge mennesker, halvt voksne, halvt børn, og til at blive voksne mennesker. De har den voksnes selvtillid, den voksnes impulser osv. De er klar til at påtage sig ansvar i samfundet. I et velordnet samfund, ville alle have adgang til en kvalitetsuniversitetsuddannelse, for at udvikle den enkeltes talenter for at finde ud af, hvad deres mission i livet skal være, hvilken form for karriere, de skal satse på, og man giver dem muligheden for at gennemarbejde dette, finde ud af dette, finde ud af, hvem, der virkelig er som voksen, og at vælge deres fremtidige profession i livet på denne basis. Det, jeg understreger med denne træning, er, forstå forskellen mellem menneske og dyr.

Jeg bliver lidt teknisk omkring dette, for det er et vigtigt punkt. Hvad er forskellen mellem menneske og dyr? Kan man bevise, at mennesket ikke blot er et dyr? Og hvordan kan man bevise det? Hvis mennesket var en abe, f.eks., ville det menneskelige befolkningstal på denne planet aldrig have oversteget et par millioner individer. Så lad være med at gøre mennesket til en abekat (et fjols). Vi har nu over 6 mia. mennesker, vi skal sørge for, på denne planet, og tallet vokser. Pointen er, at mennesket har været i stand til at opdage, hvad intet dyr kan gøre, at opdage universelle, fysiske principper i universet, og at anvende disse opdagede principper til at frembringe forbedringer i samfundet, som øger menneskets magt over naturen; præcis, som man kan læse i Skabelsesberetningen i 1. Mosebog: mand og kvinde skabt i Skaberens billede, efter hans lignelse; og ansvarlige for denne funktion. Det er, hvad vi er. Når vi underviser i fysisk videnskab; når vi underviser i klassisk kunst og den slags ting, når vi underviser i historie ud fra dette standpunkt, formidler vi i realiteten en fornemmelse af deres menneskelighed. De er i stand til at genopføre fortidens store principper, det være sig inden for kunst eller inden for fysisk videnskab. Når de kender dette, kender de forskellen på sig selv og dyret; de bryster sig af dette og siger, vi er

menneskelige. Og de kan se på hinanden med kærlighed, en form for kærlighed, der kommer til udtryk inden for uddannelse med den rigtige form for undervisning, hvor eleverne er delagtige i processen med at kæmpe sig igennem handlingen for sig selv at opdage et princip, der præsenteres for dem som en udfordring og et paradoks. Det vil sige, en kærlig relation, en klasse med typisk 15-25 universitets- eller skoleelever, hvor eleverne gives ansvaret for, gives en udfordring med at kæmpe sig igennem det for sig selv, og den gode lærer forsøger at fremkalde denne form for respons blandt eleverne; finde to til tre i klassen, der kan starte diskussionen og få hele klassen involveret i diskussionen, så det, der kommer ud af det, ikke er udenadslære fra en lærebog, men at det, der kommer ud af det, er en proces, hvor man i en social oplevelse opdager betydningen af et princip, som om de selv havde gjort den oprindelige opdagelse. Dette gøres, ikke ved at undervise den enkelte elev, selv om det nogen gange virker, men ved at få eleverne til at interagere i diskussionsprocessen. Det er derfor, man helst skal have en klassestørrelse på mellem 15-25 elever. Ikke for mange, som kan udelukke muligheden for, at alle kan deltage. Og ikke for få, så man ikke får stimulering til at starte diskussionen. Det er denne sociale proces med en relation mellem mennesker, der elsker hinanden i en højere forstand, fordi de har været fælles om processen med at opdage et princip. Eller ... noget om historie; men de var fælles om det, og ideen om at være fælles om menneskelig viden, som menneskelig viden, er den essentielle kærlighedshandling. Man elsker menneskeheden og er tilfreds med menneskeheden, når man har arbejdet sammen for at gøre en opdagelse sammen. Og man indser, man kan regne med dem til denne form for metode – har man et problem med dem? Gå tilbage til metoden. Tal med dem på samme måde, som man gør i klasseværelset. Og man kæmper sammen igennem det, disse unge mennesker kæmper til kl.3-4 om morgenen. Når jeg holder foredrag for disse fyre, er de over mig i henved fire timer. Jeg holder en præsentation på en times tid, de er over mig konstant. Men det er smukt, det er vidunderligt. Jeg tror, at alle, der har arbejdet med

undervisning, ved, hvad jeg taler om. Det er smukt; det er vidunderligt.

Så problemet er dette: Vi har en befolkning, vi har en verden, der har en mangel på mennesker, der rent faktisk fuldt ud forstår forskellen mellem menneske og dyr; at mennesket, som det defineres i Skabelsesberetningen i 1. Mosebog, er et væsen, der er skabt i universets Skabers billede. Det er os. Fordi vi overfører disse ideer, fordi vi overfører dette arbejde, som intet dyr kan, elsker vi hinanden; vi elsker de mennesker, der var før os; vi elsker dem, der kommer efter. Vi kerer os om dem, på en meget selvisk måde, for, idet vi bruger vores talent her i livet, vores skønhedssans beror på, hvad der kommer ud af vores liv, i de kommende generationer. Vi elsker børn af denne grund. Der er børn; vi elsker børnebørn endnu mere end børnene, undertiden, fordi vore børn var i stand til at producere disse børn, det er fantastisk! Man elsker dem især, for dem, der bliver bedsteforældre, de elsker specielt disse børnebørn af denne grund.

Men denne form for kærlighed mangler generelt i befolkningen, hos ledere.

Martin havde selvfølgelig dette. Martin var ét af de sjældne mennesker, på hans tid, som havde en dybtgående følelse af, hvad det vil sige at være et menneske; som havde en dybtgående forståelse af læren fra Kristi passion på korset. Han var i stand til at bringe dette ind i politik – han kom ikke ind i det som politik som sådan – han var en naturlig leder. En naturlig leder er ikke én, der kommer ud af den politiske proces som sådan, men ud af folket. Martin opnåede aldrig et politisk hverv. Og alligevel var han sandsynligvis en lige så betydningsfuld person i USA som nogen moderne præsident var. Det opnåede han. Hans myndighed som en leder kom fra folket. Han kæmpede mod folket og med folket for at befri dem. Han var en leder i ordets sande betydning. Hans indflydelse som en politisk kraft i nationen og i verden kom fra hans forhold til folket.

Og det er vores situation i dag, og grunden til, at jeg er så glad for denne lejlighed til at være sammen med jer, for I typificerer dem, der kæmper med vanskeligheder, i dette land og uden for dette land, for den såkaldte 'glemte mand'; som Franklin Roosevelt, der i 1933 blev indkaldt til at være præsident. 80 % af befolkningen i USA i særdeleshed, og mange i hele verden, er den glemte mand og kvinde. Der er ikke rigtig nogen, der kerer sig om dem. Tag eksemplet med historien om sundhedssektoren; tag eksemplet med alle mulige ting. Den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan forny en nation, som Martin ydede et stort bidrag til en fornyelse af USA, er, at man må gå til den glemte mand og kvinde; især til de ubemidlede, og hvis man kan udtrykke en kærlig holdning over for problemet med de ubemidlede, dem, der befinder sig på den laveste side i livet, så er man i stand til at repræsentere det princip, på hvilket moderne regeringsførelse bør baseres; det samme princip, som Jeanne d'Arc på sin vis muliggjorde gennem sit bidrag til Frankrig som den første, moderne nationalstat, der var helliget det almene velfærd. Hvis man vil være en ægte politiker, må man være forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Man må være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, og for at være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, må man se på det menneske, der befinder sig i de værste omstændigheder, generelt, og løfte dem op. Så har man virkelig bevist, at man kerer sig om det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke går til disse mennesker, er man ikke *med* det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke har sine rødder i kampen for det almene velfærd, er man ikke i stand til at lede vores nation, som er en nation, der forfatningsmæssigt er forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Martin havde dette. Alle de store ledere i historien er som regel kommet fra denne form for baggrund; de fødtes ikke til at være ledere, de blev ikke valgt som ledere; nogle blev valgt i løbet af livet, men de startede ikke med at etablere deres lederskab ved at blive valgt. De etablerede deres lederskab ved at finde deres rødder i kampen for menneskehedens velfærd. De blev repræsentanter for en eller anden gruppe, der kæmpede for deres rettigheder, eller de blev

fortalere for denne gruppe, der kæmpede for sine rettigheder. Og de kom frem til en lederposition, fordi de havde en indbygget, moralsk karakter, i billedet af Kristi passion og korsfæstelse. Og jo mere, de kommer ind i det, og jo farligere, det bliver, i takt med, at de vinder mere indflydelse – livet *bliver* farligere i takt med, at man vinder mere indflydelse – så indser de, at de sætter deres liv på spil, og de må spørge sig selv: hvad er det, jeg vil risikere mit liv for; hvad er det for en sag, jeg ikke vil forråde, selv, hvis prisen er, at det koster mig mit liv? Og han kastes direkte tilbage til Kristi korsfæstelse og passion. Og dér er vi i dag. Martin havde dette; og problemet med USA og bevægelsen i dag, er, at bevægelsen er blevet, skal vi sige, for 'civiliseret' med hensyn til at bøje af for at komme ud af det med det politiske *establishment*, og hvor den tenderer mod at tro på, at vejen til succes er at bøje af for at komme ud af det med dem. Man fortaber passionen, som bør motivere den sande, politiske leder. Og passionen er denne helligelse; man har en talent, man har en fornemmelse af, hvad ens liv betyder, man har en fornemmelse af forpligtelse, af en mission i livet, for at opløfte nationen ved at løfte en bestemt del af befolkningen, eller hele befolkningen. Og man vil *ikke gøre noget som helst* for at forråde dette. Det giver én kraft. Det giver én kraft til at være et menneske, der er skabt i den levende Skabers billede. Man tapper ind i det. Martin tappede ind i det. Han var en Guds mand, ikke kun af Gud, men en Guds mand. Han var en mand, som, i løbet af livet, af skæbnen fik givet missionen at være en Guds mand. Og han havde styrken til at gøre det. Han havde styrken til at gå i Kristi fodspor; til at gennemleve Gethsemane; til at gennemgå korsfæstelsen. Han havde denne styrke. Som Jeanne havde på sin måde.

Og det er den lektie, jeg mener, må undervises, må blive forstået, hvis vi skal redde denne nation. Vi må tappe ind i denne kraft. Og som jeg siger, blandt alle de billeder af nylige, politiske ledere i USA, er Martin, både som en national leder og som en global leder, hvilket han også var



med hensyn til sin indflydelse, det bedste eksempel på den form for personlighed, vi må have og må udvikle for at komme ud at det forfærdelige, frygtindgydende rod, der i dag truer os.

Mange tak.«

[1] Hør hele Martin Luther Kings sidste tale, 'I have been to the mountain top', her <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ixfwGLxRJU8>

---

# Lyndon LaRouche: Det britiske Imperium er stadig den civiliserede verdens fjende nr. 1

*Jason Ross: Ingen forstår briterne bedre end Lyndon LaRouche. Alt imens Storbritannien ikke længere hersker over havene eller verden med skibe, fly og imperiehære, så inficerer deres måde at tænke på kulturer i hele verden og former den måde, hvorpå folk analyserer og opfatter virkeligheden. Storbritannien udøver også magtfuld kontrol over verdens finanssystem gennem City of London og deres indflydelse over Wall Street. De har haft utrolig succes med at bondefange vore eliter til at være overbevist om, at amerikansk råstyrke med britisk hjerne bør kontrollere verden.*

*Men, hvor mange flere amerikanske liv skal ofres, og hvor mange flere ofre for unødvendige, geopolitiske krige skal dø og lide i hele verden på vegne af britiske, geopolitiske strategier, før vi udrydder dette barbariske system?*

Lad os lytte til LaRouche:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **BÆLT & VEJ-INITIATIVET: VORT ÅRHUNDREDES AFGØRENDE PROJEKT**

EIR-video, 9. maj, 2017:

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche: 'Hvis vi kan overbevise præsident Trump om at tage imod tilbuddet om at gå sammen med Kina og de andre nationer omkring den Nye Silkevej, så kan han blive en af de største præsidenter i USA's historie.' Dette initiativ, Bælt & Vej-initiativet, blev officielt lanceret af Kina i 2013. Det er en politik for gensidigt fordelagtig infrastrukturkonnektivitet, for fælles udviklingsprogrammer. Foreløbig omfatter programmerne og de igangværende arbejder flere end 60 nationer og berører flere end 4 milliard mennesker – flertallet af menneskeheden – og med planer om infrastrukturinvesteringer til \$20 billion. Dette er et enormt projekt. Disse programmer har potentialet til at fjerne fattigdom på planeten inden for én generation; fuldstændigt og totalt at fjerne lokal fattigdom overalt.*

Jason Ross:

»Det ville være den største fejltagelse nogensinde, hvis USA ikke benyttede sig af Bælt & Vej Forum, der finder sted i Beijing, Kina, om en uge (14.-15. maj) – den største fejltagelse nogensinde. Denne begivenhed vil samle repræsentanter fra over 100 nationer, inkl. den direkte deltagelse af næsten 30 statsoverhoveder, og man vil diskutere vor generations største projekt: Bælt & Vej-initiativet.

Foreløbig er der ingen meddelelse om, eller noget, der peger på, at præsident Trump eller andre repræsentanter for USA vil deltage, men:

(Helga Zepp-LaRouche)

*'Hvis vi kan overbevise præsident Trump om at tage imod tilbuddet om at gå sammen med Kina og de andre nationer omkring den Nye Silkevej, så kan han blive en af de største præsidenter i USA's historie.'*

Dette initiativ, Bælt & Vej-initiativet, blev officielt lanceret af Kina i 2013. Det er en politik for gensidigt fordelagtig infrastruktur-konnektivitet, for fælles udviklingsprogrammer. Foreløbig omfatter programmerne og de igangværende arbejder flere end 60 nationer og berører flere end 4 milliard mennesker – flertallet af menneskeheden – og med planer om infrastrukturinvesteringer til \$20 billion. Det udgør 2 til 3 gange den investering, det ville kræve totalt at genoplive den amerikanske infrastruktur. Det udgør 20 gange de \$1 billion, som Trump foreløbig har krævet. Dette er et enormt projekt. Disse programmer har potentialet til at fjerne fattigdom på planeten inden for én generation; fuldstændigt og totalt at fjerne lokal fattigdom overalt. I løbet af de seneste par årtier har Kina allerede undergået en fænomenal udvikling,

(udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson)

*'Kina begyndte virkelig at føle sig entusiastisk på det tidspunkt, og med rette, de har opnået meget; de har flyttet*

*500 millioner kinesere væk fra fattigdom og ind  
middelklassestatus.'*

(præsident Trump)

*'Og jeg havde et langt møde med Kinas præsident i Florida, og  
vi havde lange, lange diskussioner, i mange, mange timer. Han  
er en god mand.'*

Kina springer fremad med sin egen udvikling og arbejder sammen med sine naboer gennem kinesiske investeringer, gennem staten, gennem foretagender, og gennem ny finansiering gennem institutioner som Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB), Den Nye Udviklingsbank (BRICS-banken) og Silkevejsfonden, som alle er mekanismer, der er skabt efter 2013; og store projekter i enorm skala er nu mulige.

(Richard Trifan)

*'Dette er et historisk projekt, som I alle ved; det er  
sandsynligvis den største, globale præstation, der er analog  
med vores ekspansion ud i rummet og til Månen og andre  
planeter. Det er sandsynligvis det mest omfattende initiativ,  
som mange nationer vil samarbejde omkring.'*

Lad os foretage en rundtur. Med udgangspunkt i Asien er der seks udviklingskorridorer, som Kina har foreslået, for veje, jernbaner, vandveje, elektricitet, kommunikation, sammen med blød kommunikation, såsom uddannelse, fælles toldsatser og kulturelle udvekslinger. Disse korridorer er i øjeblikket under opførelse i varierende grader. Lad os f. eks. se på den Økonomiske Kina-Pakistan-korridor: den er i øjeblikket under massiv opbygning; den vil bringe 10 gigawatt elektricitet til Pakistan – det rækker til millioner af mennesker, 10 millioner eller mere – en ny havn i Gwadar (ud til Oman Golfen), med hundrede tusinder af jobs undervejs, blot for dette ene byggeprojekt, og generelt mere udenlandsk investering i Pakistan, end denne nation samlet set har fået i de sidste par årtier.

Lad os se på havet: Det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, som bl.a. omfatter at udgrave en kanal gennem Kra-landtangen i Thailand. Dette er et enormt og nødvendigt projekt for at aflaste det overtrafikerede Malaccastræde, og for at bringe økonomiske muligheder til Thailand og Sydøstasien generelt. Denne idé, der har været foreslået i årtier, har nu en reel mulighed for at blive bygget inden for det nuværende årti.

Den Eurasiske Landbro, der når til Europa, transporterer stadigt voksende mængder af jernbanegods, med togafgange for godstog mod vest, der dagligt ankommer i Europa og vender tilbage til Kina med europæiske varer.

Hvis vi ser på Afrika, så har vi for nylig set åbningen af Addis Abeba-Djibouti jernbanen som blot et enkelt eksempel på den meget påtrængende nødvendige udvikling, som nu er mulig; som nu finder sted i Afrika, hvor investering i infrastruktur og industri og landbrug nu når nye højder, det meste af det fra Kina.

Hvis vi bevæger os mod øst, krydser vi Beringstrædet og bevæger os fra Asien og ind i Nordamerika, fra Rusland til Alaska. En rute over land, der muliggøres af denne Beringstrædeforbindelse, vil være hurtigere end transport med skib, og gør det muligt at udvikle området langs ruten. Det Arktiske Område har enorme resurser, der i øjeblikket er næsten fuldstændigt utilgængelige. Byggeriet af den nødvendige infrastruktur og selveste Beringstrædeforbindelsen vil være en storstilet infrastrukturpræstation. Dernæst vil et genopbygget, amerikansk infrastrukturfundament, et netværk af jernbaner, veje, en platform med ny, højdensitetskraftværker, kernekraft; havne, sluser, dæmninger; skoler og andre offentlige bygninger og offentlige værker, gøre det muligt for USA at opnå et nyt produktivitetsniveau, og have mere at bidrage med til verdenssamfundet og få fordel af verdenssamfundet.

Hvis vi nu bevæger os sydpå, så er der p.t. ingen

transportmuligheder over land fra Nord- til Sydamerika. Man kan ikke køre til Sydamerika – det er ikke muligt. Der er en afbrydelse, kendt som Darien Gap. Når vi endelig får bygget denne forbindelse på blot nogle få dusin mil, vil vi endelig forbinde de amerikanske kontinenter som helhed. I Mellemerika er ny finansiering, også fra Kina, ligeledes i færd med at muliggøre en sekundær Panamakanal, kunne man sige, med igangværende byggeri og forberedelse i Nicaragua.

I Sydamerika er en bi-oceanisk korridor, der strækker sig fra Peru til Brasilien, fra Stillehavet til Atlanterhavet via Bolivia, på planlægningsstadiet.

Så stor en del af verden arbejder i øjeblikket sammen, med fælles udvikling og en fælles fremtid med fremgang, værdighed og videnskabelige præstationer som mål. Vil USA tilslutte sig? Vi er blevet inviteret med åbne arme:

(Meifang Zhang)

*'Sidst, men ikke mindst, vil jeg gerne citere Xi for at sige, at Kina byder USA velkommen til at deltage i samarbejdet inden for rammerne af Bælt & Vej-initiativet ... Begge lande bør virkelig gribe disse muligheder.'*

Lad os tage imod denne invitation. Om et hundrede år vil USA i tilbageblik være så lykkelig for, at vi gjorde det.«

---

## **Præsident Xi Jinping: Hvorfor jeg foreslog**

# Bælt & Vej

Dansk udskrift, engelske undertekster.

Verden ser på Kina, der gør klar til at være vært for Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde midt i maj, 2017.

Xi: Under mit besøg til Kasakhstan og Indonesien i 2013, foreslog jeg, at vi i fællesskab byggede det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, hhv.

Shaanxi, min hjemprovins, er beliggende ved udgangspunktet for den Gamle Silkevej. Når jeg står her og ser tilbage på historien, føler jeg, at jeg kan høre lyden af kamelernes bjælder, der klinger gennem bjergene, og se røgskyer hen over ørkenen. Det føles alt sammen så bekendt. Fredelig udvikling har fra gammel tid været et fælles mål for menneskeheden.

[Caption]:

Krig

Sult

Rigdomssvælg

Økonomisk nedgang

Xi: Nutidens verden er fuld af usikre elementer. Folk har håb for fremtiden, men er samtidig forvirret.

[Caption:]

Nogle lande, der engang var fremgangsrige og fulde af travlhed, er nu synonyme med vanskeligheder, konflikt og krise.

Xi: Hvad er der sket med verden? Hvad skal vi gøre? Hele verden stiller disse spørgsmål, og jeg tænker hele tiden på dem.

[Captions:]

Politisk konnektivitet

Handelsmæssig konnektivitet

Infrastruktur-konnektivitet

Xi: Jeg foreslog Bælt & Vej-initiativet i håbet om, at, med fokus på konnektivitet – forbundethed – vil den frie og belejlige strøm af alle produktionselementer blive opmuntret, multi-dimensionalt samarbejde udviklet og gensidige fordele og fælles udvikling opnået.

Bælt & Vej-initiativet drager inspiration fra Oldtidens Silkevej og har til hensigt at være med til at virkeliggøre den fælles drøm hos mennesker over hele verden om fred og udvikling.

Lysende af Østens visdom er det en plan, som Kina tilbyder verden for at søge fælles fremgang og udvikling.

Bælt & Vej-initiativet bygger på principperne om udstrakt konsultation, fælles bidrag og fælles fordele.

[Caption:]

Usbekistan: Qamchiq-tunnelen, en del af Angren-Pap jernbanelinjen.

Xi: Initiativet er ikke ekskluderende, men må være åbent og inkluderende. Initiativet vil ikke blive en solopførelse fra Kinas side, men et kor bestående af alle lande langs ruterne.

[Captions:]

Belarus: Kina-Belarus Great Stone Industripark.

Kina-Rusland Samarbejdsprojekter

Maldiverne: Kina-Maldiverne Venskabsbro



Malaysia: Fragt over havet

Grækenland: Havnen i Piræus

Sri Lanka: Puttalam Kulkraftværk

Storbritannien: Kina-Europa Godstog

Etiopien-Djibouti: Addis Abeba-Djibouti jernbanen

Kasakhstan: Let Jernbanetransportsystem i Astana

Xi: I over tre år har flere end 100 lande og internationale organisationer responderet positivt og tilbud støtte til initiativet.

Initiativets »Venskabskreds« er blevet ved med at udvides.

[Captions:]

Fiji: Nabouwalu-Dreketi hovedvejen

Pakistan: Karakoram hovedvejen

Xi: En stor sag bør forfølges for det almene vel. Lad os tage hinanden fastere i hånden og smede nye partnerskaber, karakteriseret af win-win-samarbejde, og bygge et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid.

Det er de modige, der skaber historie. Lad os være tillidsfulde, gribe til handling og gå fremad, hånd i hånd.

[Caption:]

»Bælt & Vej«

---



---

# Video: En Ny Æra for USA: LaRouches Fire Love. Fuld dansk tekst

*Forestil jer, at vi lever i et samfund, der har forpligtet sig til at opnå fusion og implementere dens fordele.*

*Hvordan ville det, at være en del af et sådant samfund, forme dets borgeres selvopfattelse? Et menneskeliv har konsekvenser og betydning, der varer ud over den fysiske død – i det mindste potentielt. Ved at vedtage en mission for opnåelse af fusion, omsætter vi et af Hamiltons mål i praksis, hvor han skriver, at, »at værdsætte og stimulere det menneskelige intellekts aktivitet gennem at mangfoldiggøre objekterne for foretagsomheden, er ikke blandt de mindst betragtelige af de midler, ved hvilke en nations rigdom kan fremmes. Selv ting, der i sig selv ikke er fordelagtige, bliver det undertiden gennem deres tendens til at fremprovokere en anstrengelse. Enhver ny scene, der åbnes op for menneskets geskæftige natur for at vække det og hævde sig, udgør en tilgang af ny kraft til lageret af bestræbelse.« – Få det til at ske!*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, en guidet rundtur

Video; introduktion v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

*Der er stadig mange mennesker, der siger, at denne vision blot er en drøm – at det er umuligt. De nationer, hvor nutidens stormagter kæmper mod hinanden i geopolitiske stedfortræderkrige, såsom Yemen og Syrien, vil imidlertid fortælle dig, at det er det nuværende paradigme, der er umuligt og ikke kan fortsætte.*

*Opførelsen af Verdenslandbroen ville betyde en økonomisk og kulturel renæssance for planeten, et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden. Projekterne og de økonomiske hovedkoncepter, der præsenteres i denne rapport, er i sandhed det udkast, ud fra hvilket førende regeringer i hele verden arbejder; udfordringen består nu i at bringe USA tilbage til sine rødder og transformere det til en magtfuld allieret for denne nye, økonomiske orden.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**Schiller  
interviewer**

**Instituttet**

# dansk Ruslandsekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen på treårsdagen for kuppet i Ukraine

*København, 22. februar, 2017* – Som det danske bidrag til den internationale aktionsdag på treårsdagen for kuppet i Ukraine havde Schiller Institutet et timelangt interview (engelsk) med den danske Ruslandsekspert, Jens Jørgen Nielsen, om Ukraine, Krim, Rusland og Vestens fejltagelser.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen er historiker og filosof, med et dybtgående kendskab til Rusland og Østeuropa. Han har været Moskvakorrespondent for dagbladet Politiken, har forfattet mange bøger om Rusland og Østeuropa, inklusive »Ukraine i spændingsfeltet« (udgivet februar 2016) og en bog om Putin («På egne præmisser – Putin og det nye Rusland«, udgivet 2013), og han optræder jævnligt i medierne som Ruslandsekspert og er leder af organisationen Russisk-Dansk Dialog, og desuden lektor ved Niels Brock.

Her følger nogle af de områder, der blev dækket af det meget polemiske interview, og som fordømmer Vestens fejltagelser og geopolitiske intentioner: Interviewet indledtes med en beskrivelse af begivenhederne i Ukraine, ikke som et demokratisk skifte, men som et ulovligt kup, anført af pro-nazistiske elementer, og som en del af det geopolitiske forsøg på at holde Rusland og de asiatiske nationer nede; den historiske baggrund for spørgsmålet om Krim; at Vesten, med sin sanktionspolitik, skyder sig selv i foden – Rusland er ikke isoleret, men arbejder sammen med Kina, BRIKS, osv. Han udtalte, at der ville have været fare for atomkrig, hvis Hillary Clinton var blevet valgt til præsident, og at mange russere nu frygter, at der kunne komme et kup/mordforsøg mod Donald Trump pga. dennes beredvillighed til at normalisere relationerne med Rusland. Han beskrev perioden mellem

Sovjetunionens kollaps og kuppet i Ukraine som en tabt mulighed for at skabe en sikkerhedsorden, der burde have inkluderet Rusland.

Interviewet blev gennemført af formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg.

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nFtvjZ9tDmo&feature=youtu.be>

Audio:

[https://soundcloud.com/si\\_dk/jens-jorgen-nielsen-russia-expert-on-the-3rd-anniversary-of-the-coup-in-ukraine](https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/jens-jorgen-nielsen-russia-expert-on-the-3rd-anniversary-of-the-coup-in-ukraine)

---

## **‘Ingen overlevende’ Video fra LaRouchePAC Danske undertekster**

En mørk, grusom, men helt igennem sandfærdig afbildning af truslen om en termonuklear krig og konsekvenserne, og Obamas deployering af hovedparten af USA's termonukleare kapacitet i flere områder, som truer både Rusland og Kina.

---

# En orientering mod Stillehavsområdet: Det Eurasiske System. Video

Alt imens de asiatiske Stillehavsnationer har brug for den videnskabelige viden, teknologi og fordele ved vores form for regering, såsom et statsligt kreditsystem efter Alexander Hamiltons principper, så står det klart, at, med hensyn til inspiration, så må vi nu se hen til Stillehavsområdet.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

*Titelfoto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche på Kinas kyst, »Den Eurasiske Landbros Terminal Øst«, 1996.*

---

## Video, 5 minutter: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

Den 28. juli 2016, v/næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

»Jeg inviterer dig til at lære Schiller Instituttet at kende og til at kontakte os.

Verden er i en dyb krise, en civilisationskrise. Det er en brydningstid. Det kan blive meget værre, med et fuldt finanssammenbrud, måske sat i gang af de italienske banker,

som er i krise, eller sågar af Deutsche Bank, som står øverst på listen over de store, systemiske krisebanker, og som teknisk set faktisk er bankerot.

Det kan også være krig med Rusland og Kina, ført af dem, som gerne vil forhindre, at disse nationer fører an i skabelsen af en alternativ økonomisk politik.

Vi oplever efterdønningerne efter Brexit-afstemningen i Storbritannien, og det har rystet hele EU. Men det giver os nogle muligheder. En ting, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, er en redningsplan for Deutsche Bank, men på betingelse af, at Deutsche Bank vender tilbage til den ånd, der var, da Alfred Herrhausen var chef i 1989, hvor han havde en produktionsbaseret politik for banken, og hvor han kom ud med et krav for gældssanering for de fattigste lande og for udvikling af Østeuropa. Dengang var Berlinmuren endnu ikke faldet.

Vi kan takke ja til samarbejde i stedet for krig med Rusland og Kina, om at bygge en Ny Silkevej hele vejen fra Asien til Europa. Vi kan udvide det til at blive en Verdenslandbro, en bro over land, gennem Sydvestasien og hele vejen ned til Afrika. Vi kan følge den tråd, der for nylig er kommet frem, med Saudi-Arabiens rolle bag angrebene den 11. september 2001, og følge denne tråd helt til det nuværende Britiske Imperiums fraktions rolle bag terrorisme; og så kan vi takke ja til samarbejde med Rusland om at bekæmpe terrorisme.«

Præcisering: Chefen for Deutsch Bank, Alfred Herhausen, blev dræbt af terrorister den 30. november 1989. Berlinmuren faldt den 9. november 1989. Hvis han, som var en ledende rådgiver til den tyske kansler Helmut Kohl, havde levet, ville verden have set anderledes ud.

Denne video blev lavet i forbindelse med omdeling af Schiller Instituttets materiale i jyske og fynske byer.

Kontakter i Jylland:



Kolding: Preben Samsøe, 4146 4714

Aarhus: Hans Schultz, 4841 4096; 6016 4096

Randers: Poul Gundersen, 2082 0350

Her er nogle vigtige links:

NYHEDSORIENTERING JULI 2016: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Menneskehedens skønne fremtid – hvis vi undgår dinosaurernes skæbne.

Hovedtale på Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Berlin, 25. – 26. juni, 2016

Baggrundsmateriale:

Lyndon LaRouches 3-punktsprogram for genopbygning af realøkonomien:

1. Hvorfor en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling ville løse finanskrisen og ødelægge Wall Street
  2. Hvordan man skaber ikke-inflationære kreditter gennem et nationalt kreditsystem
  3. Infrastrukturprojekter og fusionsøkonomi
-

# »Med Verdenslandbroen vil alle have et job.«

## Lyndon LaRouche

Det følgende videoklip er et meget kort uddrag af en tale, som hr. LaRouche holdt ved et forum i Washington i 1997 i sammenhæng med *EIR's førsteudgave* af specialrapporten om den Eurasiske Landbro. Denne præsentation var en del af en række af såkaldte »udviklingskonferencer«, der blev afholdt i Washington i løbet af disse år – 1996, 1997 og 1998 – og jeg vil mene, at det, I får at se i denne video, er Lyndon LaRouches »marchordre«. Det var på en måde hans kreative vision om, hvilken rolle, som Kina, med den Nye Silkevej, og ligeledes hvilken rolle Rusland ville komme til at spille i den totale omformning af den strategiske geometri i verden.

Her følger det korte uddrag:

Lyndon Larouche: Der er kun to respektable nationer tilbage på planeten, dvs. nationer med en respekabel magt: det er USA, nærmere bestemt ikke det USA, der repræsenteres af Kongressen, men af præsidenten. Det er USA's identitet, der udgør en politisk magt, ikke en eller anden sammenkædning af dens bestanddele. USA repræsenteres i dag udelukkende af dets præsident, som en politisk institution. Kongressen repræsenterer ikke USA; de er ikke helt sikre på, hvem, de repræsenterer nu om stunder, eftersom de ikke har besøgt deres vælgere for nylig.

Præsidenten som institution er legemliggørelsen af USA i internationale relationer. Det kan Udenrigsministeriet ikke gøre; Justitsministeriet kan ikke gøre det; intet andet ministerium kan gøre det; kun USA's præsident kan, under vores forfatning, repræsentere USA som en enhed – hele dets personlighed, dets sande interesse, dets hele folk.

Der findes kun én anden magt på denne planet, der kan være ligeså respektløs (arrogant) over for andre magter, og det er Den kinesiske Folkerepublik. Kina er i øjeblikket engageret i et stort projekt for konstruktion af infrastruktur, i hvilket min hustru og andre i en årrække har haft et uophørligt engagement. Der finder en stor reform sted i Kina, som er en »reform af vanskeligheder«. De forsøger at løse et problem. Det betyder ikke, at der ikke er et problem. Men de forsøger at løse det.

Hvis derfor USA, eller USA's præsident(skab), og Kina, deltager i at begunstige *dette* projekt, der undertiden kaldes Silkevejsprojektet, undertiden Landbro-projektet, som, hvis dette projekt med udviklingskorridorer over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika, ind i Nordamerika, udvides, så er dette projekt tilstrækkeligt til at sætte hele denne planet på en kurs for økonomisk genrejsning. Jeg vil gå lidt i detaljer med dette for at gøre det mere konkret.

Kina har i nogen tid haft et samarbejde med Irans regering. Iran har faktisk været i gang med at fuldføre en række jernbaneforbindelser, der er en forlængelse af Kinas Landbro-program (eller Silkevejsprojekt). For nylig har vi fra Indien set, at det indiske lederskab er mødtes med repræsentanter for Kina for at påbegynde en indledningsvis rute, blandt landruterne, under Landbro-programmet. Én rute går ind i Kunming i Kina. Under Anden Verdenskrig, i dette område, Myitkyina (Burma/Myanmar), havde vi fly, der fløj ind i Kunming, »over Knolden«, som de plejede at sige dengang. Jeg er ganske godt bekendt med dette område.

Men, hvis man har vandvejsforbindelser, kanalforbindelser, og jernbaneforbindelser fra Kunming gennem Myitkyina – dette område – tværs over Bangladesh og ind i Indien, igennem Pakistan og ind i Iran, op til området lige over Teheran, syd for det Kaspiske Hav – så har man en forbindelse til Mellemøsten; man har forbindelse til Centralasien; man har forbindelse til Tyrkiet; man har forbindelse igennem til

Europa.

Dernæst er der den nordlige rute, der stort set er den samme rute som den transsibiriske Jernbane, der blev bygget under amerikansk indflydelse og amerikansk rådgivning, af Rusland. Så har man en mellemliggende rute, der er i færd med at blive udviklet, i Centralasien, med Kina og Iran.

Indien arbejder på en plan, der blot involverer at tilføje nogle få hundrede kilometer jernbanelinje – der var mange andre forbedringer langs med den lige linje – og som ville forbinde området nord for Teheran, gennem Pakistan, gennem Indien, gennem Bangladesh, gennem Myanmar og ind i Kunming, ind i Thailand, ind i Vietnam, ned gennem Malaysia og Singapore, over stræderne via en stor bro og ind i Indonesien.

Der er ligeledes en plan for udviklingen af jernbanelinjen gennem det, der var det nordlige Sibirien, over Beringstrædet og ind i Alaska, og herfra ned og ind i USA. Der er en forbindelse til Mellemøsten – flere forbindelser – fra Europa, og også fra Kina; men fra Kina en forbindelse til Mellemøsten og ind i Egypten, ind i hele Afrika.

Så hvad vi har her er en række projekter, som ikke blot er transportprojekter, ligesom den transkontinentale jernbane i USA, der var forløberer for denne idé tilbage i slutningen af 1860'erne og 1870'erne. Man har »udviklingskorridorer«, hvor man i et område, der strækker sig 50-70 kilometer på hver side af jernbaneforbindelsen, har olie- og gasledninger, og så fremdeles. Man udvikler dette område med industri, minedrift, alle sådanne ting. Og det er sådan, man *betaler* for transportforbindelsen, pga. al den rige, økonomiske aktivitet, der skabes. Med en indbyrdes afstand på nogle kilometer langs hele denne forbindelse foregår der noget, en eller anden økonomisk aktivitet. Folk, der arbejder, folk, der bygger ting, folk, der gør ting. For at transformere denne planet ved hjælp af store projekter for byggeri af infrastruktur, som vil skabe store industrier, nye industrier, nyt landbrug og de

andre ting, vi har så desperat brug for. *Der er ingen som helst grund til, at noget menneske på denne planet, der kan arbejde, skulle være arbejdsløs.* Så enkelt er det. Og dette projekt er midlet til dette mål.

Hvis nationerne – som nu omfatter Rusland, Iran, Indien og andre nationer – kommer overens med Kina, og engagerer sig i en forpligtelse til dette projekt, som de bygger hver dag; hvis USA – dvs. USA's præsident, Clinton – forsætter med at støtte denne indsats, som han har gjort, i det mindste rent politik, hvad får man så? Man får USA og Kina og nogle andre lande, der går i samlet flok op imod den største magt på denne planet, som er Det britiske Imperium, kaldet det Britiske Commonwealth (statssamfund). Det er fjenden!

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Resultatet vil så være, at en sådan meddelelse en skønne søndag morgen med sikkerhed vil få »snakkehovederne« på Washington Tv til at 'spinne'. Men bortset fra det, så betyder det, at hele systemet, fra dette øjeblik, har været en tur i guillotinen, og at hovedet ruller hen ad gaden. Alan Greenspans hoved, måske.

Det betyder, at vi nu har tilskyndelsen til omgående at opbygge et nyt finansielt og monetært system. Når man skal genrejse et selskab, der er bankerot, til en levedygtig form, hvad gør man så? Man må finde de erhvervsaktiviteter, som selskabet skal gøre, hvilket danner grundlaget for at skabe

den nye kredit, der skal få firmaet til at køre igen.

Programmet for Landbroen, med sine globale implikationer, er det store projekt, der direkte og indirekte vil afkaste tilstrækkelig med aktivitet, så at sige, i alle dele af verden til, at vi atter kan få denne verden tilbage på et sundt fundament.

Matthew Ogden: Som man kan høre, så afslører denne tale stor forudviden; og det er i realiteten Lyndon LaRouches aktive indgriben, med rejser til Rusland, med hans hustrus rejser til Kina i denne periode, og med udgivelsen af *EIR's* specialrapport om den Eurasiske Landbro, der har formet den nuværende situation, vi befinder os i. En ting, der er interessant at fremhæve, er de kort, I så. Dengang var mange af disse jernbanelinjer og andre olie/gasledninger blot forslag; men nu er flere af dem faktisk under opførelse.

Jeg mener, at det, 20 år senere, står klart, at dette er det dominerende system, der er ved at vokse frem på denne planet. Samtidig står det transatlantiske system foran en umiddelbar nedsmeltning. En umiddelbart forestående implosion af gæld og eksponering til derivater i betalingsstandsning til milliarder af dollars projiceres nu ind i alle storbanker i hele det transatlantiske system.

*For et engelsk udskrift af hele fredags-webcastet, se <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14279>*

---

**Koncert med Schiller  
Instituttets kor o.a.,  
Berlin-konference juni 2016**

**Se/hør alle musikvideoer fra  
Schiller Instituttets  
Internationale Konference, 25. –  
26. juni, 2016: [Klik her](#)**