

**Schiller Instituttets
internationale
videokonference den 5.-6.
september 2020:
Krigsmagernes dommedagskurs,
eller et nyt paradigme blandt
suveræne nationer
forenet gennem menneskehedens
fælles mål?
PANEL I video og engelsk
afskrift (d. 5. sept.):
At overvinde geopolitik:
Hvorfor et P-5-topmøde er
presserende nødvendigt nu.
Også paneler II-IV.**



Panel I: Se det engelske afskrift nedenunder. Her er talerlisten:

1. Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Tyskland), grundlægger og præsident, Schiller Instituttet
2. Andrey Kortunov (Rusland), generaldirektør for Det russiske

råd for internationale Anliggender

3. Dr. Edward Lozansky (US), American University i Moskva;
Moskow State University

4. Martin Sieff (USA), senior korrespondent for
udenrigsanliggender, UPI; Senior Fellow, American University i
Moskva

5. James Jatras (USA), tidligere rådgiver, det amerikanske
senats republikanske lederskab

6. Spørgsmål og svar, del 1

7. Marco Zanni (Italien), formand, Europa-Parlamentets gruppe
for identitet og demokrati

8. Oberst Richard H. Black (USA ret.), Tidligere leder af
hærens strafferetlige afdeling i Pentagon; tidligere
statssenator, Virginia

9. William Binney (USA), tidligere teknisk direktør, National
Security Agency og Kirk Wiebe, tidligere Senior Analyst,
National Security Agency

10. Spørgsmål og svar, del 2

Hele konferencen:

Dato: Lørdag og søndag den 5.-6. september 2020

Tid: kl. 16 – 24 dansk tid, eller fra arkivet bagefter.

Sted: [Hvis du tilmelde dig her, får du et link sendt direkte til din e-mail.](#)

Ellers vil vi lægge YouTube's live stream

på vores danske hjemmesides forside.

Paneler: Talerlisten findes nedenunder

PANEL II (Lørdag 21:00 – 24:00 dansk tid)

Videnskabens rolle i skabelsen af menneskehedens fremtid:

PANEL III (Søndag 16:00 – 20:00 dansk tid):

Bælte- og Vejinitiativet bliver til Verdenslandbroen & Franklin D. Roosevelts uafsluttede projekt:

PANEL IV (Søndag 21:00 – 24:00 dansk tid):

Opbygning af tillid i internationale relationer: Klassisk kulturs rolle og bekæmpelse af global hungersnød:

Tilmelding: [Klik her for at tilmelde dig og modtage talerlisten og opdateringer](#)

Ellers kan den ses her: www.schillerinstitut.dk eller www.schillerinstitute.com

Kontakt: for mere information: Michelle Rasmussen +45 53 57 00 51, si@schillerinstitut.dk

Foreløbigt konferenceprogram:

Arrangementet udsendes live på Zoom og YouTube. Der vil være simultantolkning på spansk, fransk og tysk på Zoom-plattformen.

(Det følgende er en delvis liste over talerne. Hvert panel indeholder rigelig tid til spørgsmål og svar.)

PANEL II (21:00 – 24:00): Videnskabens rolle i skabelsen af menneskehedens fremtid

1. Jason Ross (USA), videnskabsrådgiver ved Schiller Instituttet

2. Dr. Bernard Bigot (Frankrig), generaldirektør for den internationale termonukleare eksperimentelle reaktor (ITER), tidligere direktør for den franske kommission for alternativ energi og atomenergi (CEA)

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

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

5. Michael Paluszek (USA), Princeton Satellite Systems

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

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

6. Spørgsmål og svar

PANEL III (16:00 – 20:00): 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

PANEL IV 21:00 – 24:00): Opbygning af tillid i internationale relationer: Klassisk kulturs rolle og bekæmpelse af global hungersnød

1. Jacques Cheminade (Frankrig), leder af Solidarite & Progres, tidligere præsidentkandidat

2. Marcia Merry Baker (USA), EIR-redaktionen

3. Bob Baker og amerikanske landbrugsledere:

Ron Wieczorek, South Dakota cattle rancher, LaRouchePAC

Nicole Pfrang, Kansas Cattlemen's Association Secretary-Treasurer, cattle rancher

Mike Callicrate, Colorado, cattle rancher, Owner, Ranch Foods Direct:

4. Paul Gallagher (U.S.), EIR Editorial Board

5. Fred Haight (Canada), Schiller Instituttet

6. Michael Billington (US), chef for asiatiske anliggender, Executive Intelligence Review

7. Spørgsmål og svar

8. Beethoven-messe i C-dur, opførelse af Schiller Instituttets kor i New York City.

Mange mennesker rundt om i verden, som er uvidende om, at en løsning til de mangfoldige kriser i den nuværende verden potentielt eksisterer, reagerer med stadigt større fortvivlelse og radikalisering på den ene eller anden måde, eller trækker sig tilbage til deres privatsfære. Mistilliden til regeringer og førende institutioner i størstedelen af verden har aldrig før været så stor. På et og samme tidspunkt er vi konfronteret med en pandemi, der er ude af kontrol, et økonomisk sammenbrud udløst, men ikke forårsaget, af pandemien, et kommende kollaps af det transatlantiske finanssystem og den stigende fare, ikke blot for en ny kold krig, men for at det utænkelige rent faktisk kunne ske, og en tredje, denne gang atomar, verdenskrig kunne bryde ud. Vi er i sandhed konfronteret med et systemisk sammenbrud – enden på en epoke.

Det bliver nu stadigt tydeligere for mange kredse rundt om i verden, at Lyndon LaRouches advarsel i 1971 var absolut profetisk: at Richard Nixons ophævelse af Bretton Woods-systemet, ved at erstatte de faste valutakurser med et internationalt system for flydende valutakurser, og åbningen af vejen til monetarisme, ville føre til faren for en ny fascisme, depression, pandemier og krig. Det er også klart, at hvis vores verden skal undslippe disse meget reelle farer, så må vi implementere en presserende reorganisation af verdens finansielle og økonomiske system i den fysisk-økonomiske tradition fra Leibniz og Hamilton, som LaRouche har været fortalere for i årtier.

Lyndon LaRouche har i lang tid opfordret til en firemagts-

aftale mellem USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien, som det bedste udgangspunkt for at påbegynde et sådant nyt paradigme. I dag er den eneste synlige struktur, som, realistisk set, hurtigt kan føre i denne retning, en konference blandt de fem permanente medlemmer af FN's sikkerhedsråd, som foreslået af Præsident Putin i januar. De fem atommagter har et særligt ansvar for at blive enige om principper, som kan garantere menneskehedens overlevelse på lang sigt. Dette er særligt presserende i lyset af det faktum, at vores verden, med ophævelsen af så mange internationale traktater om våbenkontrol og andet, er faretruende tæt på at styrte ind i lovløshedens æra.

Men disse fem nationer må understøttes af et kor af andre nationer, individer og institutioner fra hele verden, som må kræve, at de trækker verden tilbage fra afgrundens rand. Dette topmøde må tilskyndes til at adoptere følgende:

- En mekanisme til at løse alle internationale problemer gennem dialog og diplomati.
- Et Nyt Bretton Woods-system – i overensstemmelse med Franklin D. Roosevelts intention og uddybet af Lyndon LaRouche – med det eksplicitte formål, at overvinde fattigdom og underudviklingen af de såkaldte udviklingslande, og som må begynde med skabelsen af et moderne sundhedssystem i alle lande.
- En aftale om at gøre programmet »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen« til grundlaget for sikringen af de mest moderne standarder i infrastruktur og industriel udvikling for alle lande på kloden.
- En ny sikkerhedsarkitektur baseret på verdenssamfundets fælles økonomiske interesser, hvilket indebærer sikkerhedsinteresserne for hver enkelt nation. De farvede revolutioner og destabiliseringer, som i øjeblikket orkestreres af det Britiske Imperium og dets bankerotte

finansinteresser, mod regeringer, som de ikke kan lide, må have en ende – dette inkluderer blandt andet destabiliseringen af Donald Trumps, Xi Jinpings og Vladimir Putins regeringer.

– Et internationalt samarbejde i et forceret program for at bemestre fusionsenergi, et internationalt samarbejde indenfor rumfart for at bygge en by på såvel Månen som Mars, og et videnskabeligt samarbejde om forståelsen af liv.

– En aftale for at påbegynde en sand kulturel dialog, hvor hver kultur og civilisation forpligter sig til at lære om de bedste traditioner og universelle bidrag af andre, som grundlaget for fred og forståelse, og en ny verdensomspændende renæssance.

Der er præcedens for sådan en tilgang. Efter 150 år af religiøs krigsførelse i Europa, hvilket kulminerede i Trediveårskrigen, blev alle grupper, der tidligere havde bekriget hinanden, enige om vedtagelsen af Den Westfalske Fred. De indså, at hvis kampene fortsatte, så ville der ingen være nogen tilbage, som kunne nyde sejren. Den aftale etablerede det moderne grundlag for alle internationale love blandt nationer. Det er nu på tide, at basere international lovgivning på den lovmæssighed der findes i det fysiske univers. Det er det eneste sprog, som har evnen til at eliminere enhver misforståelse og tilsyneladende interessekonflikter på et lavere niveau.

Schiller Instituttets kommende konference vil stræbe efter at bidrage med idéer hen imod dette mål.

Tilmelding: [Klik her for at tilmelde dig og modtage talerlisten og opdateringer](#)

Ellers kan den ses her: www.schillerinstitut.dk eller www.sc

Systemets korrupsion er det problem, som vi alle konfronteres med

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche d. 29 juli 2020

I sine afsluttende bemærkninger i dagens dialog fremhævede Helga Zepp-LaRouche korrupsionen i hele systemet, som ansvarlig for den civilisations krise vi står overfor. Hun henviste til sin bemærkning for flere år siden, på tidspunktet af Madoff boblen, om at hele systemet er et ponzi-spil med ingen interesse for det almene vel, men kun forøgelsen af den private profit.

Hvad enten man betragter den hurtige forringelse af amerikansk-kinesiske forhold, den forværende trussel fra Corona-pandemien, faren for massedød blandt børn pga. kollapset af fødevareproduktion og distribution eller stigningen i sociale kriser som stammer fra den voksende fattigdom, fører det alt sammen tilbage til oligarkiets Malthusianske hensigt.

Løsningen er den fulde implementering af LaRouche-Planen, som

ville genoplive det Amerikanske økonomiske system. Det er det, som må forme dagsordenen for det topmøde, som Præsident Putin organiserer. Hun opfordrede seerne til at blive en del af kampagnen, for at sikre at topmødet finder sted og at LaRouches politik er på dagsordenen ved topmødet.

Panel 3 “Ungdommens opgave” fra Schiller Institut konferencen “Vil menneskeheden blomstre eller gå til grunde?”

MEGAN BEETS: Good afternoon, or good evening as the case may be. I'd like to welcome everyone to the third and final panel of

the Schiller Institute conference, "Will Humanity Prosper, or Perish? The Future Demands a 'Four-Power' Summit Now." My name is

Megan Beets, I'm with the Schiller Institute in the United States, and I'll moderating the panel this evening.

Just a note by way of housekeeping, in the previous panel

this afternoon, we were unable to show a presentation by Mark Sweazy for time reasons, but we will be posting that video on the

conference page so that it can be included in the proceedings and

people can view that. [That that presentation is included in the

Panel 2 transcript, where it was originally scheduled -- ed.]

The title of this evening's panel is "The Job of

Youth," and

we are going to begin with a musical offering to set the tone for

our discussion. What you'll hear is My-Hoa Steger, who is a member and organizer with the Schiller Institute in San Francisco, California, performing Johann Sebastian Bach Prelude

and Fugue in C-minor, from the {Well-Tempered Clavier}....

If we look back through history at moments of great revolutionary change, we see that most of them have been brought

about either in part, or on the whole, by youth movements: The Italian Renaissance, the American Revolution, the Apollo Moon-landing. This is not by chance; there's a principle involved, a principle that Lyndon LaRouche recognized going back

to the very beginning of his own political activity in the 1960s

and in the decades since. Young people do not just represent the

future, they create it. They are not necessarily trapped by the

old, failed axioms of the previous generations. To quote Percy Bysshe Shelley, "young people resonate with the gigantic shadows

which futurity casts upon the present."

Today is no different, and today's huge crisis requires the

leadership of youth, But youth who are qualifying themselves to

lead this new paradigm of civilization. So, let me introduce our

speakers on the panel tonight, and give you a sense of how this

is going to work. We'll hear first from the leader of the leader

of the LaRouche Youth Movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, followed by

Daniel Burke, who's a leading organizer with the Schiller Institute, and is also currently a candidate for U.S. Senate in

the state of New Jersey. We'll then hear from a number of different people, including some of the people who are leading the effort to reach out to and educate young people in various parts of the world: Carolina Domínguez Cisneros in Mexico; Chérine Sultan in France, and you'll also hear from some of the young people who have been participating in an ongoing series of dialogues with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and in making organizing interventions in their own nations on behalf of the policies for a new paradigm. You'll hear from José Vega in the United States; Sebastián Debernardi in Peru; Andrés Carpintero in Colombia; Daniel Dufreine Aróvalo in Mexico. You'll hear from Franklin Mireri from YouLead, in Tanzania; Areej Atef in Yemen; Sarah Fahim from Morocco, studying in Paris; and Lissie Brobjerg in the United States.

We'll then go to a dialogue, where you'll hear more young voices who are part of this growing chorus.

So, before I turn it over to Helga, I'd like to go to a short clip from the founder of the LaRouche Youth Movement, Lyndon LaRouche. This is from an address that LaRouche made to a gathering of young people, the LaRouche Youth Movement, in February of 2003. What you'll hear him discuss is both the power, but also the responsibility, of youth.

https://larouchepub.com/lar/2003/3007cadre_sch.html

LYNDON LAROCHE: Because I saw the condition of society. And historically, only a certain kind of youth movement can change things.

Your generation, as well as those among your parents' generation, who are still alive and viable, are confronted by the fact that your parents' generation gave you a {no-future}

world.

There's no way you can make a deal with this culture, which prevails today. No way. Because you can't survive! This culture cannot deliver you the means to survive....

So, you know that. What are you going to do about it?

You

know that you don't have a future unless you can change society.

But you're a generation which is not in a controlling position in

policy-making of society. So what you do, is you go out like missionaries, and begin to organize the dead generation, your parents' generation, in society. And you see the impact you have

when you go into these various places, like the campuses--go into

places such as the state legislatures, or the Congress--you see

the effect you have. The presence of four, five, or six of you,

walking in, knowing what you're talking about, which is more than

most of these legislators can do, and others: You have an effect

on them.

What happens then, is not magical, it's principled.

Whether

people know it or not, the difference between man and a monkey,

is the fact that the human species can do what no monkey can do,

no ape can do, no Al Gore can do: Actually assimilate valid ideas

of principle, and transmit them to a next generation. That's the

difference between man and the ape. Man is capable of discovering

universal physical principles by a method of discovery which is

illustrated by Plato's dialogues. Or illustrated by the case

of

Kepler, or illustrated by the case of Gauss, or the case of Leibniz. Man can do that--and transmit these discoveries, about

what's out there in terms of principles in the universe, and transmit this to new generations.

These discoveries, and their transmission, increase man's

power in the universe, per capita and per square kilometer.

Therefore, the most important thing about man, is society. We all

die. Everyone is going to die. The mortal life of everyone will

come to an end. So, you've got a mortal life; what are you going

to do with it?

How long it is, is not the most important thing. It's what

you go out of this life, leaving behind.

And what do you leave behind? You leave behind younger people. You leave behind successive generations of younger people. You leave behind what you transmit to them, what you contribute to their development, to the circumstances of their work in life, to the conditions of society, to coming generations....

And when you're wise, and you're living in a generation, you

think about dying. Not in the sense of a morbid thing, but you say, "I'm going to die eventually. Now, while I'm still here, I'm

going to get a certain job done. And my job is, to guarantee, to

the degree I can contribute to this, that the next generation will have everything we have, in terms of knowledge, and the next

generation will have a better life than we had. And that future

generations will benefit from what we, in our generation, have done." [end audio]

BEETS: Now we're going to go to Helga Zepp-LaRouche

who is
joining us from Germany, who is the founder and chairwoman of
the
Schiller Institute. Helga, please go ahead.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I just want to bring to your
attention
a very important writing by Friedrich Schiller, after whom the
Schiller Institute is named, and that is "Why Do We Study
Universal History?" This was an address which Schiller gave to
students in Jena in 1789, where he talked to a room full of
students like you are now assembled here on this webinar, and
he
said that the fact that we have assembled here -- and you can
actually refer this to our situation as well -- you have to
take
all of universal history into account: All of you come with a
very specific history, family, background, cultural
experiences,
something which made you join this webinar. And he basically
then
says, it is that which brings people together which makes them
uniquely qualified to respond to the historical moment in
which
they are.

Now, we would not be here without the man you just
listened
to, namely, my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, who was really
the
most spectacular, knowledgeable -- he knew just about
everything.
He ran eight times for President, he was known throughout the
world. We had many leaders in India, in Mexico, in African
countries, who all expressed one thing, namely, that he was
about
the only American they could trust. And he had developed a
unique
method of scientific knowledge, of forecasting; he predicted
every single aspect of this situation in which we find
ourselves.
He talked about the pandemic; he talked about the systemic

collapse of the financial system, when it was absolutely not apparent, because everything supposedly went well. But if people would have listened to him, we would not be in the situation we are now.

He had an incredible vision where mankind should be, which is expressed in a beautiful movie he made, "The Woman on Mars";

[<https://larouchepac.com/20170321/woman-mars>] it's expressed in his writing {Earth's Next Fifty Years}; which were all extremely visionary ideas where mankind should be. But I want to emphasize one quality, which I think distinguishes him from all other people, because he had the most unbelievable passion for mankind.

And since it's now not so fashionable that young people should have passion for mankind, I would like to encourage you to take that specific aspect, the agape of Lyndon LaRouche, because if we are going to save civilization, and you are going to save civilization, because it's your future, I think you need exactly that incredible love for humanity, and then, there is no problem which is unsurmountable. That's really what I wanted to tell you.

BEETS: Thank you very much Helga. Next we're going to hear from Daniel Burke. Daniel is an organizer with the Schiller Institute in the United States, and he will speak to us on the topic of "If You Sat Where They Sit, What Would You Do?"

- If You Sat Where They Sit, What Would You Do? -

DANIEL BURKE: [as delivered] The Schiller Institute

has

convened this conference with the urgent goal of bringing about a

summit of the leaders of the so-called Four Powers: Russia, China, India, and the United States. I address my presentation to

the youth of the world, to encourage them to investigate for themselves, what should be the character of such a summit.

For,

without a personal notion of what should be accomplished, how can

you genuinely demand this meeting to occur?

So my question is, "If you sat where they sit, what would

you do?" You can also stand, sitting is not mandatory.

It may be useful to begin by asking, just who is it that we

are sitting in for? Not in the sense of, who are Trump, Putin, Xi, and Modi personally -- but, who is a national leader and what

are their obligations?

What authority is conferred upon you, when you take their place, and where does that authority spring from?

Some, like John Bolton, perhaps, would say that the authority of the U.S. Presidency lies in its vast power -- its military power. Its power to kill. These are the heirs of Thrasymachus, outright Satanists, who, in fact, obliterate the notion of "authority" by crowning "force" supreme -- force without regard for its author. This concept of authority is exactly the one {preventing} a summit from taking place.

It's like Mike Pompeo's doctrine of deterrence -- kill them first, that way they can't do anything wrong!

To many Americans, the source of a President's authority

lies in the notion of "democracy." Since we elected our President, he gets his authority from the people. He should represent their will. These are the people who put, "Not {my} President!" on their bumper stickers. But, it raises a question:

What if your citizens have become a bunch of raving degenerates, on account of the misleadership of the past, or their own moral failings? What if their will is to take drugs and play video games? That would make for a terrible summit!

If we change our approach, and say that this authority comes from the "consent of the governed" rather than "the will of the people," an obvious question follows: By what authority do individuals confer their consent?

In our nation's Declaration of Independence, we answered this question by appeal to the unalienable rights conferred on all human beings by their Creator -- to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Ultimately, therefore, the President's authority, and, indeed, the authority of the leader of any sovereign nation do not derive from the people, or even from the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence (no words jumped off the page to give him the keys to the White House), but rather from the natural rights of the human individual in the living image of God. Should life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness be promoted, the obligations of that authority are fulfilled. The same concept is known in China as the "mandate of heaven."

This creates another problem -- you'd better figure out what this thing called happiness is! So, if you're depressed, you're going to have to give that up.

I submit to you -- that the greatest happiness is that corresponds most closely with our unique human characteristics.

{We are not animals!} We are {creative} creatures. We think, we discover, we devote ourselves to the future. {Not} to the

present

-- to the future!

Here, I can disabuse you of the idea that you are important

because you are youth! It's not so. It's because you are humans!

I will quote from Mr. LaRouche: "Natural Law is the hypothesis which corresponds to the necessary and sufficient reason for mankind's successfully continued existence." That is -- human progress in the universe towards a greater and greater mastery over its principles, is an essential function of that universe.

We're acting on behalf of the universe, when we do that.

As the German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke put it,

"By expanding through the Universe, man fulfills his destiny as

an element of life, endowed with the power of reason and the wisdom of the moral law within himself."

So, I think it is {not} at all an exaggeration, to say that

the authority of these Four Leaders, to create this New Paradigm,

depends upon the future colonization of the Solar System, and, implicitly, the Galaxy. In that that is the most human thing that

we can do.

Their actions today, these leaders, are necessary to the

task before us, which will have been vitally important to creating that future -- today, we have to overturn the unjust rule over world relations by Thrasymachus! He has palaces in the

City of London, in Lower Manhattan, and we should repossess them,

and his weapons of mass destruction -- financial derivatives -

- should be buried in a cave where they can't harm anyone.

And if we act in that way, we can unleash a Promethean age

-- we can create miracles such as as the founding of a freedom

from material want for every human child. A future where even the Moon and the Earth, who have been lovers forever, according to Percy Shelley, they will finally marry, the ceremony held at the founding of the first international Moon village. And in case you think I am too optimistic, consider the words of Lysander Spooner, from his 1860 treatise, "The Unconstitutionality of Slavery":

"Natural law may be overborne by arbitrary institutions; but she will never aid or perpetuate them. For her to do so, would be to resist, and even deny her own authority. It would present the case of a principle warring against and overcoming itself. Instead of this, she asserts her own authority on the first opportunity. The moment the arbitrary law expires by its own limitation, natural law resumes her reign."

Here I find, then, the job of the youth. Regarding yourself not as youth per se, but as practitioners of the natural rights of man -- discover for yourself the limitations of the arbitrary law of oligarchy, which has prevented humanity as a whole from acting in accord with natural law.

What are the limits to a tyrant's power? Where is the weak flank of the enemy?

I think it lies in the flimsiness of the postmodern paradigm, so-called. "The prevailing narrative" tells us that we want to be free from judgment, free from responsibility, free from rules or limits on our behavior. Free wifi. Or, increasingly popular, we're encouraged to run society the way that the Big Tech firms run social media. Block anyone whose views differ from you -- they are not human, you are justified in ruining their

lives by any means necessary.

And stacked on top of those narratives is a meta-narrative:

namely, that the universe as such is fundamentally unknowable, and that "narratives" are how we impose meaning on our lives -

- while we all acknowledge, with a knowing glance, that such a task

is, in fact, meaningless.

You can know whether you like death metal, or lo-fi hip hop, or K-pop, but you cannot know the meaning of your life in history

-- you can know if you identify as left-libertarian, or right-authoritarian, but you cannot know how to end poverty.

Poverty, human suffering, these are merely part of the pastiche

-- the millimeter-deep collage of experiences that comprise our lives.

That fraudulent and quite Satanic view of the universe {is}

a weak flank. Across the world, the real physical economic conditions have asserted themselves. The passions of the people

are erupting, and being manipulated to drive us further toward the mass killing of the impoverished populations of the world.

But, it's my faith that a small number of people committed to developing a higher, more beautiful concept of the nature of man,

can sound a certain note, and change the course of history.

And

it's my view that this is not a hopeful wish, but it is hope itself, upon which we have always depended.

So, ultimately, will you find within yourself the moral

leadership, to cause yourself and others, to discover the principles of natural law?

BEETS: Thank you very much, Daniel. Next, we're going to

hear from Carolina DomÁnguez Cisneros, who is leading the Youth Movement of the Schiller Institute, in Mexico. She'll be joined by three others, Sebastián Debernardi in Peru; Daniel Dufreine Arávalo in Mexico; Andrés Carpintero in Colombia. The title of their presentation is "Getting Back the Great Ideas That Were Stolen from Us."

- Getting Back the Great Ideas That Were Stolen from Us -

CAROLINA DOMÁNGUEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Carolina DomÁnguez from Mexico. I'd like to welcome you to this international conference, which is a result of the efforts of the Schiller Institute, which I've been a member of, for a number of years. I would like to share with you our enthusiasm and hope in creating an international youth movement.

Throughout his life, Lyndon LaRouche, and his movement which we are part of, defended the idea of creating a youth movement that studies the most profound ideas that humanity has produced.

These profound ideas represent the creation of new institutions.

LaRouche always said that, if you want to educate a president and transform a society, you should create a youth movement. And that is what we have done.

The youth movement which we are now creating is based on the idea of giving youth what has been stolen from them in their universities, their schools, and in general. They have stolen from them the idea that they can know the universe, they can understand the universe, and master the principles which run

the universe that man lives in. In addition to understanding those universal principles, they can take them, master them, and apply them for the welfare of all society.

As you have seen throughout this conference, it is essential that youth and the new generations master these concepts.

So our work in Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Venezuela and in general in Spanish-speaking countries, the task we have taken up is to gather together these youth who are interested in transforming history, in being participants in an international process with other youth who are not willing to be told by the media that yes, this is a sad situation, that lots of people are dying daily--but rather that they have to change it. They cannot just wait to some day be part of those statistics, but they have to act.

And that is what the LaRouche movement exists to do, to be that guide. We have weekly meetings studying Kepler, the astronomer LaRouche tasked us to understand. Kepler showed how human beings are able to understand those principles, and he left us documents that allow us to understand his method and his thinking. We also study Friedrich Schiller--right now we are reading the Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man, which has totally stunned the youth about how they have been denied all these ideas in the universities. The younger people in these meetings are the ones who are most struck, thinking that their education has only been to learn things, pass an exam, and then forget them. Now they recognize, by participating in our movement, that the knowledge and method they are learning is useful to transform society.

So the message I want to give you is to join and participate in this movement. I don't expect you to agree with all of the ideas that he have discussed on these panels, but I do believe that we have all felt at some point that things are not right, and that it is necessary to do something, to assume responsibility as young adults.

The following messages that we are going to hear are from youth whom we have asked to comment on what they think of the work we've done with them--youth from Peru, Colombia and Mexico, who have taken up the opportunity to know the ideas that were stolen from them in their formal education.

So I invite you to participate in this. We have meetings every week, and this movement is growing. All of the work which Lyndon LaRouche developed has allowed us to master ideas that will help us change history, and not be reconciled to a totally uncertain future. That is my message to you; we're here so that all youth can participate in this process. Thank you, very much.

SEBASTIÁN DEBERNARDI: Good afternoon. My name is Sebastián Debernardi of Lima, Peru. I want to tell you about a Dialogue Meeting that we held on June 17, with the participation of Schiller Institute youth from Latin America, on the subject of the proposal to create 1.5 billion new, productive jobs in the world. That program is in response to the economic and health crises globally, and to the urgent need of the population as a whole to have greater development for their lives, and those of their families.

Various great projects proposed for our countries by the Schiller Institute can have a major impact both on the creation

of jobs that improve the quality of life for people, such as access to a better education and culture to be able to carry them out, as well as benefits they would bring in the short term.

The Dialogue Meeting was characterized by a shared optimism, as a result of the joint search for answers to the problems of the age, which are overwhelming our countries. And so we met virtually this time, hoping to be able to actually meet soon as a result of the completed great projects.

ANDRÉS CARPINTERO: Hello, friends. My name is Andrés from Bogotá, Colombia. I'd like to invite you to get to know the proposals of the movement that Helga and Lyndon LaRouche have created, to reverse the economic and social entropy that has brought us the chaos we are in today. We need to learn and acquire the tools to create a clean and sustainable future, inspired by reason, morality and art. We youth will build the world of the next 50 years. Join and participate in this marvelous movement.

DANIEL DUFREINE ARVALO: Hi, how are you? I'm Daniel, and I'm very happy to greet you from Mexico. I have a very important message for you, especially the youth. We are living in a world that is changing ever more quickly, but the only thing that hasn't changed is oppression by the powerful, who are toying with the world's people. We are living in mankind's most important age, a mankind whose purpose is to grow and improve those aspects of life which make us human: love, passion, joy and methodology. The powerful have taken all of this from us, and they will continue to do so, unless we change this reality.

Fortunately, there is a plan, a plan inspired in the profound thinking of Lyndon LaRouche, which essentially is an

educational for fighting against the problems caused by the sick ambitions of the Wall Street and City of London circles. That plan requires the greatest possible number of youth, with their dreams and hopes, in order to make a better world in which to live, and not merely survive.

The Glass-Steagall Act will be implemented; the banks will be quarantined because they are bankrupt; and the toxic derivatives bubble will be frozen. We will demand that the leaders of Russia, China, the United States and India meet to decide on the next stage of industrial growth, which will allow us to grow more, while using less. Connecting the world with hundreds of thousands of kilometers of high-speed rail lines; creating more than 1.5 billion jobs in the whole world.

The time for changing the world has arrived, and we need you now. Let us fight now, to make this reality possible. Let us all fight to free the world, to bring down national barriers, to eliminate ambition and hate. Let us fight for the world of reason, for a world where science, where progress lead us all to happiness. Brothers, in the name of freedom, we must all unite.

BEETS: So, you've now heard from the United States and from Ibero-America. We're going to go across the Atlantic now, where it's much later at night, and we're going to hear next from Franklin Mireri, who is the partnership's coordinator for YouLead, which is an organization I think he'll tell you something about, which is based in Arusha, Tanzania.

Hi, Franklin. Nice to see you. Go ahead.

- The Greatest Want of the World Is for True Leaders -

FRANKLIN MIRERI: [as delivered] Hi Megan, nice to hear

from
you. Thank you, it's a pleasure.

Ladies and Gentlemen, fellow citizens of the world.
Allow me
to greet you in the famous Swahili greeting, "{Jambo}!" which
simply means "Hello."

My name is Franklin Mireri, from Kenya, representing
the
YouLead program. YouLead is East Africa's flagship Youth
Leadership and Development Program working to unlock youth
leadership potential for a prosperous region. YouLead is a
collective-action youth program hosted by MS Training Centre
for
Development Cooperation (MSTCDC) and the East African
Community
Headquarters in Arusha, Tanzania. It is co-owned and supported
by
the YouLead Consortium of over 25 State and Non-State Partners
across all the 6 East African Countries (EAC) and Member
States
of the EAC.

We are cognizant of the wonderful work that being done
by
the Schiller institute in advocating for and mobilizing
governments to respond definitively to the current crises,
especially through the efforts of impassioned youth across the
world, who are committed to taking responsibility of
persuading
their governments into action.

Last month, YouLead, a consortium organization in the
six
East Africa countries, launched a sovereign report on the
disruptions of the coronavirus in the youth life in East
Africa.
The study, which was conducted between March and April, laid
bare
the bare the startling socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 to
the
livelihoods here in East Africa: 59% of the respondents had
extremely severe negative impacts to their income and this was
just at the beginning of the crisis in March; 57% had

experienced

severe impact to their education, while 34% were not working from

home because of the nature of their work. We believe that the economic impact will be most severe in developing countries, since many countries do not have social security safety nets.

At YouLead we are developing an online jobs platform for

East African Youth, to mitigate the economics effects that have

been brought about by the coronavirus. The platform will bring together skilled youth and potential employers on the same platform, with an emphasis on verified skills and a scoring system from successfully completed tasks, which build trust. The

platform will provide three distinct features: a platform to reskill and retool youth; a one-stop shop for employers and employees; and a youth employer mobility passport, the year's passport. And finally, skilled and unskilled jobs without borders. This is to overcome the challenge of labor mobility in

East Africa.

The creation of 1.5 billion new jobs across the world and

dedicated financing for efficient health infrastructures in every

country will definitely require more than just talk. Sadly, many

of the noble ideas that have been advanced in the past, like the

Millennium Development Goals, then the Sustainable Development Goals, the Global Goals, and action towards curbing climate change, have been clawed back because of a lack of leadership.

The greatest want of the world right now is for True leaders. Leaders who will not be bought or sold, leaders who are

true and honest to the plight and needs of their citizens and humanity. Leaders who do not fear calling impunity and servitude

by its name, leaders who will stand for what is right, though the

heavens fall.

Allow me to end by quoting a famous Swahili phrase -- "{Hakuna Matata}," which means "All is well." I am sure most of

you have heard that saying in many cartoons or animation films.

The phrase appeals to the optimistic good-natured spirit of human

beings all over the world. The truth is that the world is presently faced with a uniquely challenging combination of threats on every side.

This is the time for decisive action by everyone: young and

old, rich and not-so-rich, from every religion, race and kindred.

If we do not move and act decisively, together -- the consequences will be dire.

Thank you

BEETS: Thank you very much, Franklin. Next we're going to

hear from Sarah Fahim, who is a student from Morocco who is studying in Paris, and she's been working alongside our Schiller

Institute friends in Paris, France. Hello, Sarah.

SARAH FAHIM: Hello, everyone's hearing me? OK.

I study in the Schiller Institute's press my thoughts on the

situation in young people's fate in my country and across Africa,

because many of the causes are still present there today. So real

phenomena are at the source of the failure of these young people

to enter the professional world.

Morocco is divided country. Politics have unfortunately made

of the national educational system something singularly reserved

for less privileged social classes. There are way too many

students and they're growing towards a school system that does not lead them out of poverty, and towards success. There are way

too few teachers and they're discouraged by mediocre conditions,

and educational structure. Then comes trouble with language:

In

public school classrooms French is not well taught, even when this language is, especially since the French protectorates that

ended 1956, essential in today's job market. This language, as well as the Arabic language, is spoken daily across the country.

These young people then find themselves less trained, pushed aside, and see their future constricted by these conditions.

At the same time, another part of the population is benefitting from quality teaching. The educational system itself

has never before been this developed. This minority has access to

an education that, while expensive, still guarantees admission into prestigious universities as well as very good jobs, the best

in the country. This evolution has led to a very real crisis, driven by the loss of confidence in one school, its role, efficacy, and equality. Public schooling, though supposed to bring children from various backgrounds together, as opposed to

separating them, has failed. This observation is a real threat to

African development. Governors do not ask for the required urgency to repair and invest in young people's educations, to offer them training that will ensure job acquisitions down the line.

This is how creating job opportunities as mentioned in the

LaRouche plan will be achieved. Indeed, we need to remember that

in the '60s, economists created a positive correlation between human investments and economic growth. The development process of

industrialized countries as well as developing countries has been structurally shown to accompany a general growth the skills and educational levels of their population. The essence of creation of job opportunities lies in education which is one of the strongest weapons against mass poverty.

While we stand to support the African development process, I always wondered if there was this conscious will to deprive Africa from developments and education for its youth? Can knowledge be dangerous? The answer to this question came to me when I paid closer attention to colonialism in this continent. It is important to understand that, in today's world, as claimed by LaRouche studies and conferences led by the Schiller Institute, every country's prosperity contributes to the well-being of the general population.

To me, at 19 years old, the only way to save the youth from this vicious cycle is to train them. Exposure to social media is stronger than ever nowadays. We must use all the digital resources we have access to and take advantage of this potential.

With around 364 million Africans ages 15-35, this continent has the youngest population on Earth. The United Nations predicted that Africa will be home to over 40% of the global youth population by 2030. The challenge of how to successfully integrate these new people into the formal economy needs to become a top priority for governments, policymakers, and development practitioners.

I was lucky enough to be born to a couple of hard-working parents, that had the privilege to offer me an education, that could help me succeed. I want this opportunity to become a

right.

The children of my country, of my continent, of the entire planet deserve these rights. But even the paradoxical reality between a youth that is sabotaged by our educational system and this enormous potential young people have, complete with the will to act and in an awareness of the battles to come, it is our duty to provide them with the necessary tools and the new job opportunities will naturally follow. Thank you.

BEETS: Thank you so much, Sarah. Next we're going to go to ChÃ©rine Sultan, in Paris, France. She will be speaking in French. I'd like to make sure the interpretation is working before we get underway. We have to fix an echo. Thanks to everyone for being patient.

OK, now we're working. Go ahead.

CHÃ©RINE SULTAN: [as translated] I would like to thank Sarah for developing this question of digital, as a chance to develop youth. But I would like to raise the negative point of the digital culture today and see what we can do. We could call that, "the youth and the digital and the future, how to employ digital?" Because often, you get children whose parents are telling them, you have to work in order to earn money, and you have to get good results in school. And when you have good results in school, the parents say, "well, I'm going to give him one hour of television, one hour of internet, because he's deserved it." So, it's a kind pathway to push children to education.

The problem is that the good results in school are not so

good, because the level of education has been going down. So international studies which are showing competencies of children in OECD, show that that the levels are lowering and equalities in measurement of the levels.

So this success is not at school. But we see the young people have a lot of success in the social networks, that is, that is the new way to have success. So you will see, on Instagram, on YouTube. And the objective of these media is to be seen to have a lot of viewers. So the young people want to be "influencers." It's become a competition, and the negative point in that is, some of them are becoming Manhattan sellers, even against their will, but they're just selling things, selling themselves, selling products: for instance, makeup, clothes, drinking. Imagine that, for the very famous influencers, we can have \$20,000 for some minutes of video, and some of them are less than 18 years old, so the parents are dealing with that; and some of them are very happy to have this money, because of the unemployment. So that is a big challenge.

Because I'm just asking the question, who is gaining, who is earning the money, really? Actually, it's not the people who are selling the product, it is the companies. Because the companies are just using those young people to selling things. So we can see that the videos are touching more and more people than advertising in the metro stations, because it's spreading very widely on the internet. And so, if you know Edward Bernays on propaganda, he developed the concept of advertising, this idea of making people commercialized, to sell people was already developed.

One of the favorite hobbies of youth is TikTok, today. TikTok is one of the main occupations of children. I don't

know

how many millions of young people have subscribed to this network. You have a lot of young people dancing, and you have to

manage to do a perfect dance movement on the video, to enter the

application and you can share the video -- and you can do it again and again, before you share it. And so you're repeating all

the movements. Now you have children in classrooms or at home, are doing the movements unconsciously, so it's kind of a robotization of the body's movement. So their behavior is modelled by this kind of dance. People are more and more sharing

their pictures without really going to other places; they're staying at home, sharing pictures, and not traveling or going anywhere to share.

Finally, people are becoming enslaved by social networks.

You could say that those young people who want to be influencers,

you could say that -- (I'm trying to get the idea); so you have

those young people who have access to a higher degree, and they

want to be not influencers as such in the social networks, but they want to build startups. And the problem is that even in this

world of the startup, the small companies growing up, there is a

trap, because you need a lot of finance at the beginning, and the

finances coming from the big companies, if you don't have money

to invest at the beginning, you have to submit to the big companies like Google, Microsoft, and you will have to work for

them. But because in France you have something, just call it, Station F, which is a startup incubator -- like you have a lot of

young people going things, and to go in that you have to pay

rent, you have to access to employment, often, you have to be dependent on a big company like the GAFAM, which is Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon and Microsoft. And if you are clever enough to develop something, the big company will help you but you will be under the circumstance of being employed by the company.

So your competence is used by those big companies. So maybe you are clever, you've done good studies, but we have to change the social environment and the economic environment, to ensure that the intelligence of people is used for the common good, not for those who have power. The question is, who will be instructed politicians, because now you have a lot of politicians who are discouraging, they are showing a lot of mediocrity.

So if you want to really be a startup to change the system you have to join our movement. If you want to start to develop as a young student, you have to join our movement, study how Kepler discovered the Solar System, that's what we're working on, that's what determines our capacity to understand the Four Laws that LaRouche has developed, for instance. So on that, I want to thank you.

BEETS: Thank you very much, ChÃ©rine, for that challenge.

Now, we're going to go back across the Atlantic, back to the United States, to Lissie Brobjerg, who is an organizer with the Schiller Institute, formerly in Denmark and now in United States.

Her speech is "Are You a Large-Scale Geological Force?"

LISSIE BROBJERG: [as delivered] Thank you, Megan.

I will begin with a quote from the great Russian-

Ukrainian

biogeochemist, Vladimir Vernadsky: "The noösphere is a new geological phenomenon on our planet. In it, for the first time,

man becomes a large-scale geological force. He can, and must, rebuild the province of his life by his work and thought, rebuild

it radically in comparison with the past. Wider and wider creative possibilities open before him."

Now, what will your role be in the shaping of future geological phenomena? How will future geologists see the irrefutable trace of your life in their geological studies? Will

the soil reveal but your biological remnants? Or a large-scale noetic geological force?

Vernadsky revolutionized the study of the nature of life.

Looking into the chemical composition of soil, he observed that

all organisms create a whirlpool of atoms passing through the body by way of respiration, metabolic activity and reproduction.

This process tends toward manifesting itself to the highest degree. Furthermore, the evolution of species has a directionality which is not random, but which increases this biogenic migration of atoms. Looking at the build-up of fossils

and life in the ocean, he recognized a steady increase over geological time of biomass, fleshiness, metabolic activity, energetic lifestyle (such as predation and swimming), and increase in food supply. Let's look at a few examples of this.

Four hundred million years ago the sponge class {Sclerospongiae} was dominating. Afterwards they declined and the

classes {Demospongiae} and {Hexactinellida} took over dominance.

The living tissue of the old class was confined to a thin veneer

outside a 2-dimensional skeleton; whereas the new classes had developed erect, interlocked 3-dimensional skeletal structures,

which enabled them to inhabit areas with strong currents, utilizing the waterflow for nutrition, thereby increasing their biogenic migration of atoms.

At the same time, the dominating corals were of the orders {Tabulata} and {Rugosa}. After they went extinct, {Scleractinia} took over. Whereas the old orders were barely able to attach themselves to the substrate, making them vulnerable to disruptions, {Scleractinia}, through its ability to cement itself to the substrate and build large colonies, could sustain communities that were able to survive even severe storms. Such communities underwent symbiosis with microorganisms which enabled them to inhabit low-nutrition environments.

Then, 240 million years ago, the only orders of {Articulata}, a class of brachiopods, that did not go extinct, were those that developed strong pedicles, enabling them to optimize their position in currents, and those that developed their feeding system to filter through more water for nutrition and prevent the influx of indigestible particles.

At the same time, the dramatic increase of the diversity of {Bivalvia}, a class of mollusks, was due to the development of full mantle fusion and siphons, which enabled it to burrow more efficiently and thereby invade new eco-spaces.

These are examples of the directionality of life toward maximum manifestation and evolution directed through the increase of the biogenic migration of atoms in the biosphere.

Now, the noosphere, the domain of the mind, is able to direct this increase through cognition rather than biology. In Vernadsky's words, since the appearance of civilized humanity tens of thousands of years ago, "the face of the Earth transforms itself and virgin nature disappears." Our thoughts are able to

change the chemical composition of the universe like no other species, and over short timespans, through exceptional individual contributions.

Shall your life, then, be reflected mainly through the biosphere or the noosphere? Do you choose to become a large-scale geological force?

What would Shakespeare say?

"Be not self-willed, for thou art much too fair

"To be death's conquest and make worms thine heir."

BEETS: Thank you, Lissie. Next, we have a short video message from Areej Atef. Areej is the Vice President of the Education Committee of the BRICS Youth Parliament, in Sana'a, Yemen.

- -Youth of the World Face Two World Systems: -
- The Old and the New -

AREEJ ATEF:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be able to talk with you about the youth at the present time and the future. I'm Areej Atef, the Vice President of the Education Committee in the BRICS Youth Parliament. The experience we got in the BRICS Youth Parliament has given us the ability to see two world systems: the old, and the new. All the things with available knowledge of the LaRouche "5 Keys" to advance the BRICS countries and its definition has reached Yemen, in English language and Arabic.

As I'm responsible for health education in the BRICS Youth Parliament, I trust that all youth of both genders have the will to face the war on policy-viruses, like they're able to face

deadly viruses. And this through the right health education, which is built on physical economy, which we have learned from the late Lyndon LaRouche.

As for the beauty of Yemen: The civilization of Yemen has a fragrant smell. This civilization is the identity that triggered the reports of the "Happy Economic Miracle" because of the pairing of the old frankincense trade and the New Silk Road. It is a model report and all countries should pursue its rules.

Finally, I would like to share with you that on the coming Tuesday [June 30] we will be celebrating World Parliament Day. The world has been celebrating this day since 2018, so there they can encourage the development in the parliamentary work. So, if the world is going to celebrate this day, let the Alliance college in Yemen be lifted, so we can achieve the Sustainable Development Goals nationally and internationally.

Thank you. [end video]

BEETS: Thank you to Areej, who is doing some very important work in Yemen.

Our final speaker for the presentation portion of the panel will be JosÃ© Vega, who will speak to use from the Bronx, in New York City in the United States, and his presentation is "A New Space CCC."

JOSÃ© VEGA: [as delivered] Hello everybody, I'd like to start by reading a quote by Schiller, later put into song by Beethoven:

Be embraced, O ye millions!
Here's a kiss for all the World.
Brothers, above the canopy of stars,

A loving Father must surely dwell.
Do you feel Him near, O ye Millions?
Do you sense your Creator, World?
Seek Him above the canopy of stars!
Above the stars must he reside.

I don't think even Beethoven realized it, but he was actually calling for a space program long before Kennedy.

Through classical composition, Beethoven's entire symphony serves to develop the ideas and essence of Schiller's poem, which is that of Mankind's beauty under the image of the Creator. Beethoven was incredibly challenged to set music to the poem, saying that it may not have been possible to create a symphony as beautiful as the poem. Beethoven's composition of the {Ninth Symphony} is similar to the Apollo space program, in that it required the composer to make new creative discoveries that would allow for such a composition to even exist.

In our pursuit to seek a loving father above the canopy of stars, we must make new discoveries that'll enable us to go farther and faster than ever before. But what does it take to actually accomplish this? Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in his letter from a Birmingham jail "Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co-workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation." What does that mean to be God's co-worker? It demands that you use everything you have, no matter how big or small it is. That requires big thinking, not small-mindedness.

Take the poorest district in the United States, which has the highest COVID transmission and infection rates, the highest levels of poverty and drug use, and also the highest amount of "essential workers." How can anyone who lives in these

conditions

be expected to believe me, when I tell them that humanity is greater than this, and that within them is the potential for greatness? Well, truthfully they no longer have a choice. They have to believe me because if they don't the country, and the world around them will implode. The fight for an honest future begins with those who need it the most. Because it is within them that the real future begins.

We must demand a New Deal-era policy, where a new kind of Conservation Corps is brought about, and it will be called a Space Civilian Construction Corps. Where anyone between the ages of 18-26 is allowed to use their God-given right to develop their creative capacities to bring forth a real future.

Suppose the people who go through the program are now running around building hospitals in their communities where millions will be born long after their deaths, and building schools where those millions will receive an education similar to theirs. These same people start developing higher forms of energy flux density where it'd be more expensive to send you a bill every month than to actually power your home. But then they go beyond their communities and even their own countries. As they get older and other programs start popping up all over the world they become teachers, passing down what they've learned, so that those they teach can then do for the world, what the original group did for their country. I would like to think that Martin Luther King, Jr. would agree with me when I say that this is one of the highest forms of non-violence.

I'd like to finish off with a quote from Beethoven's {Choral Fantasy}. "Only when Love and power are wed/ Mankind has God's blessing." So with that being said, are you ready to be co-workers with God?

- Question and Answer Session -

MEGAN BEETS: All right! Thank you very much, JosÃ©. So, we're going to move into our question and answer session now. What we're going to do is, we have a number of young people who I mentioned earlier are part of the chorus of voices who are organizing, educating themselves on, and demanding a New Paradigm. So, we're going to bring some of them in to ask questions of the panel. What we really want to build here is not just some kind of formal Q&A, but a real discussion with the panelists.

We are going to start with a question -- or maybe it's a comment, he'll have to tell us -- from an honorary member of the youth movement, State Senator Theo Mitchell. Senator Mitchell is, as I said, a former state senator from the state of South Carolina in the United States. He is a Board Member of the international Schiller Institute, and a long-time friend of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. He's also a long-time fighter, courageous fighter for justice. So, Senator Mitchell, welcome. Can you hear us? We can't hear you. We're going to come back to Senator Mitchell after trying to solve those audio problems.

In the meantime, I would like to go to a question from our panel of questioners assembled in a Zoom meeting. We're going to go first to Maddie Hirst. Maddie, are you there?

MADDIE HIRST: I wanted to thank JosÃ© first off for that impassioned speech, because that's what we need. We need somebody who's going to connect with people. I also wanted to note on a kind of theme that's been throughout the entire program, and that is that history is made by individuals. Every single one of us

has the potential to change the world. Unless we act on that, the future we all dream of is not going to come into being. That's mainly what I wanted to say.

BEETS: OK. JosÃ©, do you want to start us off?

JOSÃ© VEGA: Sure. To your response, yes, it is true. History is changed by individuals. But what good is writing the greatest symphony, or a great treaty, or the greatest essay if nobody is going to read it or listen to it? You really have to organize people around your ideas. Martin Luther King, Jr. was an amazing reverend, preacher, organizer, non-violent promoter. But it was the people around him, the people who organized with him who really made that possible. So, I don't think you can forget about the unsung heroes, as we put it. They're just as important, if not more important. I'll just say one thing. I know that there is a great philosopher from the 13th century whose name is escaping me at the moment who writes about civilizations that were so great, that were lost to war and famine. And no one has ever heard of them since. So, how do we stop that from happening to us? That requires everybody to come together to prevent from getting lost and destroyed.

BEETS: Right, well I think that raises to a certain degree what ChÃ©rine was bringing up about the culture. And I wonder if ChÃ©rine would like to come in on this, and say something.

CHÃ©RINE SULTAN: I don't know exactly what I can add. Creativity is a big word that attracts people. And often we don't

know exactly what we are talking about. When you are really creative, maybe you don't recognize it in the time, but if you are confident in the long time, finally you will see the difference between a false creativity and the true one. So, I would like to encourage people to make this tough work, to work on science, to work with others, because to do it by yourself is quite difficult.

BEETS: Thank you. For any young people who are watching this, we do have classes of the exact kind of group educational sessions that ChÃ©rine was referencing. So, I would invite you to get involved in that. Would anybody else on the panel like to respond to Maddie before we move on? OK.

It looks like we have Senator Mitchell back. Senator Mitchell, can you say something? Let's see if we can hear you now. Still can't hear you.

Let's take another question from our Zoom meeting here, while we fix Senator Mitchell. I'm going to go to

, and then after Senator Mitchell, I would like to go to Vicente or Mauricio. Is that Senator Mitchell? Welcome!

THEO MITCHELL: Thank you. Thank you very much. I certainly want to pay my respects and regard to my good friend Helga, for having this the temerity to put on this panel, this conference; and certainly to Lyn, my long-time friend too in giving recognition to his contribution and his foresight and his perspective as far as even today is concerned. It's really perplexing to see that we are living in a time and an administration that has little interest at all in doing the

right

thing, especially on exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche.

I have been active for quite a while with the Schiller Institute. We dealt with the Operation Freuhmenschen and the human rights abuse concerning Lyndon. The Operation Freuhmenschen, of course, was targetted at the African-American

elected officials. We managed to bring that to a standstill or halt. and consequently we don't know what if anything Lyn paid the price for, for he served time for nothing: it was abuse. Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark said that it was the chronic

case of abuse of the so-called system of justice that he had ever

seen. And this man was in the Attorney General's office, one of

the Cabinet offices. Consequently, he came out in support of Lyn.

We all did.

We are all happy to know that there are so many young people

who are now participating in this saga. There's a lot of work to

do, but we always have to remember this: To be able to get the justice that Lyn deserves and the exoneration, we're going to have to press people into the service, as far as this world is concerned. How can we act, when there's still abuse? No matter what you talk about as far as the Four-Power conferences are concerned, they're not going to spend one nickel or time on Lyndon LaRouche; especially this administration. This is a program that we certainly can't forget. It is something that we

must continue working on. Of course, at this time, the abuse of

the police departments, George Floyd, and the one in Atlanta, Mr.

Ahmaud Arbery: it's an abuse. It's open season. Still, open season on the black male. Consequently, I'll ask this distinguished panel, what suggestions if any to you have to be able to help save us? Thank you. Exonerate our good friend Lyndon

H. LaRouche, Jr.

BEETS: Thank you so much, Senator Mitchell. Before I turn that question over to the panel, let me just say that we will put a link in the video description to the petition to exonerate Lyndon LaRouche, so people can go there. There's also a really wonderful video on Lyndon LaRouche's exoneration which people should watch and help us disseminate.
https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/petition_exonerate_larouche

Let me turn that over to the panel. Let me start with Daniel, and see if you have a response to Senator Mitchell's question.

DANIEL BURKE: Thank you, Senator Mitchell; thank you, Megan. I'd like to respond by saying that the most important thing that we can do in my view is to create 50 million new productive jobs in the United States, and 1.5 billion jobs in the whole world. This is not a jobs program; this is a fulfillment of what Mr. LaRouche was fighting for in his life. It is a policy of transforming the human species to a new and more noble level of activity. It means that we're going to be invigorating all Americans with a mission for the future. Because it is only means of the future that we have any ability to unify Americans. It's always been that way; we're always for a "more perfect union" to fulfill the promissory note known as the Declaration of Independence. It's in that effort, as people commit themselves to creating such a future, I believe, that we'll be able to solve the abuses of people that exist. Intolerable crimes that are committed against people in the name of -- for all types of

justifications. We're going to have to take a look at a universal standard of man that demands of us that we fight with such a passion to overcome the brutality of this system in all of its representations by establishing a scientific optimism about the future.

To put it very directly, I am perhaps more optimistic than you are, that we could get this administration to exonerate Mr. LaRouche. I think that this is a time for miracles, and whatever circumstances stand in our way that appear to be objective, the fact of the matter is that their system is in a total breakdown crisis. So, the rules that have been set up to keep this system going are crumbling, because the system is crumbling. Therefore, I'm committed to the idea that it is possible in a short amount of time to create a breakthrough on the recognition of Mr. LaRouche in the United States. And that perhaps the most important thing we can do, in addition to fighting for his exoneration itself, is to recruit people to this vision that he developed. Which includes taking the people of the post-industrial cities of the United States, taking the people of the poor areas of our nation, and giving them a means to contribute to the future. This is how we're going to give people a deeper identity and get them out of a feeling of nihilism and despair, which is clearly inundating the country.

BEETS: Would anyone else on the panel like to say something

in response to Senator Mitchell on the issue of justice?
JosÃ©,
yeah, go ahead.

JOSE VEGA: If Black Lives Matter, why isn't there a space program in the Bronx, or in Oakland, California? That's my response.

I live just a few blocks away from Gouverneur Morris' grave, and Gouverneur Morris was the person who penned the Constitution.

He also wrote the words to the Preamble of the Constitution.

In it, there is a section on promoting the General Welfare. So, if

we're promoting the General Welfare, doesn't that include developing the minds of all Americans, and giving them the opportunity to educate our youth?

I'd like to reference the story of Caliph Browder. He was

wrongfully put in Riker's Island prison, over a dispute of stealing a backpack. He was there for three years; his mother could not afford bail. Eventually, he was found innocent. He refused to plead guilty to a crime he did not commit, and three

years after leaving Riker's Island, he committed suicide. There

was no more hope; there was no future for him, in his mind. That

is a tragedy. That is what's happening to many young Americans

today who feel as if there is no future and no hope. We will give them one.

I'd like to also reference Plato's {Meno} dialogue. Because

in the {Meno}, Socrates and Meno, a slave master, are having a discussion about virtue and where does knowledge come from.

Socrates says, I'd like to see one of your slave boys. So, Meno

brings out a slave boy, and Socrates asks about the slave, was

he
born here, and can he speak the language? These two things
imply
that this is not a native Grecian. This is somebody who does
not
look like them, or may not even sound like them. What he does
is, he brings him to the beach, and he tells the boy to double
the area of the square. What does that mean, exactly, to the
slave boy? The slave boy does it, and the slave boy is not
learned. He has not studied at all, nobody's ever taught him
anything. And yet, he was able to find the solution to a
complex
geometrical problem, which is not so complex. The point is,
he
could easily be the slave master, as Meno could be a slave.

The way we're going to solve this, is just develop the
minds
of people, so that 50 million years from now, when everybody
owns
their own galaxy, what will the questions be? Will the
question
be, do black lives still matter? Or what do they become? How
do
you transform the future in that way? I'll leave it there.

BEETS: Franklin, go ahead.

FRANKLIN MIRERI: Thank you. It's been wonderful
hearing
from the fellow panelists and even from Senator Mitchell, and
how
passionate he is about the issue of exonerating Lyndon
LaRouche.
I think while many people outside of the United States may not
have heard of Lyndon LaRouche, personally I first heard about
him
this year, when I started taking the economics classes being
offered by the Schiller Institute. When I many people may not
have heard about him, what I know resonates across the world
is
what he stood for. For example, the way the financial systems

are currently skewed against developing countries. So, that's just one aspect. As we then seek, as we then sign the petition, let us not forget the importance of global solidarity towards that cause. You never know; the more people who get to hear the wonderful works he did, the more gradual pressure might be put on any administration. It might be this administration, or the coming one; but ultimately what he stood for was greater than just in the United States. That's my submission, thank you.

BEETS: Thank you, Franklin. Thank you so much for joining us, Senator Mitchell.

I'd like to go back to our Zoom call, our collection of young panelists there. Actually, Calvin I said you could go next, but first I want to check and see

VICENTE: I would like to ask the panelists if they can clear me a doubt that I've been thinking about. Today, as we can see, it is inevitable and it is impossible; we cannot implement all these projects of the LaRouche movement and the Schiller Institute without the concepts for embracing globalization and various alternatives like the multipolar world, and this is talked about in the BRICS and the New Silk Road. So, I wanted to say these are all new alternatives for globalization, but as we can see in nature, so as in the spirit of the human, there doesn't exist multipolarities, so I wanted to ask if the new embracement of multipolar world for globalization, if it coexists with the physical laws of the universe? Because in nature, there is no multipolarity and neither in the human spirit. There is only the Earth is a polar world and as the Chinese law of

change

-- they call it the sooyi or iching -- they say that you can bypass the polar concept, but you have to go beyond the polar concept. It's not anymore polar; it's passive. It's not any more active, it's beyond. So, these are not active spaces on Earth; these are passive spaces on Earth.

So, I wanted to ask if the multipolar world of the alternative of globalization being embraced in BRICS and the New Silk World, if it coexists with the universal laws of physics and the human spirit?

BEETS: OK. I believe we also have Carolina on our Zoom call. So, if she's on, we should test the translation first. I'd like to see if she would like to respond first, and then open it up to the other panelists. So, Carolina, are you on? It doesn't sound like it. I'm going to open up Vicente's question, which is really wonderful, to the other panelists, and if Carolina is on and we can get the translation going, then we'll do that. Actually, Lissie, would you like to answer that one to start us off?

LISSIE BROBJERG: I think we have to start from the standpoint of trying to understand what the nature of the universe is. So, I don't think that we just look, when we look at how life has been developing biologically, we see that new solutions are found all the time in order for life to manifest itself more effectively all the time. It's interesting how animal life and plants develop new biological technologies in order to do that. But the mind is superior to that, and Vernadsky discusses how suddenly you have an explosion in the world because of human cognition. We make all these discoveries.

So, I don't think that the nature of our universe

comes down
to a question of multipolar or not. I think what's
interesting
is our creative ability to find solutions and to manifest
ourselves in our thoughts and our ideas more effectively in
this
universe. What do you think about that? Was it Vicente?

VICENTE: Yes, well, I think that the universe is as
Lyndon
LaRouche said, is negentropic, and as we can see the
mathematics
and its closed system can't understand it because it's an
entropic model. I was asking because if in politics and in
the
economy, we create on Earth and embrace a new concept of the
alternative of globalization based on the multipolar world
idea,
it is as we can see if we just study old civilizations. They
say
it is proven scientifically that Earth is based on two poles -
-
the North Pole and the South Pole. This is gravitational and
electromagnetic, so I don't understand the concept of a
multipolar world when you want to embrace it on Earth. I
wanted
to understand if this is an entropic system or a negentropic
system that can coexist with the universal laws of physics?
This
is in the aspects of politics, economy, and globalization, so
is
this negentropic or entropic?

BEETS: Carolina, can you hear us?

CAROLINA DOMÍNGUEZ CISNEROS: Thank you. What I can
say to
you about this question is that you're going to have to
discover
this for yourself. You could discover this. We're working on
Kepler, and that's the best method. There's a document that

LaRouche wrote for all youth, people who are younger than me, people young like you and even younger people. It's called "My Encounter with Leibniz and with Kepler," which is a document for young adults. So, I'm not going to save you the hard work that's required, but let's keep studying Kepler every Monday in the evening, and that's my answer to you. Thank you.

BEETS: OK, great. Daniel, you want to say something?

DANIEL BURKE: Yeah, if I can, briefly. I just want to respond because this question of a multipolar world and the idea of globalization. What do we mean when we say "globalization"?

This is something that Helga LaRouche has referenced more than once. It is not her view, and I concur, that there is such a possibility of a multipolar world. In other words, one in which

you have multiple poles of influence, who are collaborating; it's

meant to be in opposition to what's called the unipolar world, which is where you have a collection of power in one center.

Neither of these theories of the world really cohere with what is

happening, which is that we live in an era of oligarchy. One of

the tools of oligarchy which is, in my view, centered in these

... groupings across the world, these institutions that Mrs. LaRouche in the first panel referred to as the British

Empire. That this operation to suppress humanity is the key enemy that we have. It's not a matter of one nation holding power over others, although the United States has often played the role of the brawn for the British brains, but rather, it's a

matter of creating a community of nation-states. Or, as the

President of China refers to it, a community of shared destiny.

A community of principle is what John Quincy Adams called it.

The point is, and this is what I was trying to get across in

my comments: if the whole purpose of a nation and the whole purpose of our republic here in the United States is to advance

the pursuit of happiness for our population. But it's based on

the idea of universal rights of the individual that extend naturally beyond Americans per se, as Franklin emphasized, then,

we have the prospect of national governments working together for

the common aims of humanity. If we want to demonstrate that the

world is not a closed system, not an entropic system, as you're

raising, Vicente, then it's my view that the strongest way to do

that is to have collaboration between Russia, China, and the United States, and other countries. All other countries that we

possibly can bring into this, on the exploration of the Solar System and the galaxy. Because as JosÃ© said, it's some future in

which we're all going to have our own galaxy. There are 2 trillion galaxies out there, and there's more than enough room for the human population to extend out there. It's a demonstration that there's not such a thing as fixed resources,

or a closed system, or that we have to manage through a unipolar

or multipolar system. What we need is a level of recognition of

sovereignty, respect for the sovereign governments of many nations, that they can form agreements in which they can work together for the benefit of all. This realm of space science would be a great frontier by which we could change everything.

BEETS: OK, great. Now, we're going to go to Calvin. Calvin, are you there?

CALVIN: Mine is more of a question. I think it was Dennis, I'm not sure who said this, but there was a comment one of the guys made about people who are becoming slaves of white social networks and social platforms, and he further went on to criticize young people for making a huge amount of money by doing things such as selling make-up and making a lot of videos. That criticism about the way people choose to make money kind of reminded me of a conversation I had with someone last week about how when people do Uber and Lyft, those aren't real jobs. They aren't really productive, and they don't provide a sense of security for people. We talk about a lot of advances, but me personally, I see a lot of advances in this society technologically and non-technologically in both ways. I do think the result of some of these advances let's some of the white people choose to make money. But my question is, what's wrong with people making money off of selling videos and doing Uber and Lyft and things like that? I'm all for the 1.5 billion industrial jobs and things like that, but I think some people have to be realistic. Not everyone wants an industrial job; some people are satisfied with selling make-up for the rest of their lives. I'm just trying to understand what's wrong with making money off of making videos and stuff like that. I hope the question made sense, I know I was all over the place.

BEETS: It made sense to me. ChÃ©rine, I think maybe we start with you; that's your territory there.

CHÃ©RINE SULTAN: Yes. I think that there is a common

point

between this and in the past when people had still productive jobs, the less-educated were workers, and the more educated ones

were the bosses. It's to simplify, but that was the question. Because you asked yourself, do I need to find a job on my own and

the society won't help me? So, I have to fight for my future on

my own. The question today is quite the same. If I will use all

my means on my own, if I can make videos in my bedroom, in my bathroom, I will make it. I will own my life, and if I have more

skills, I can produce some software, some applications, I can invent something. At the same direction, there is no collective

work. We have to work on this issue.

BEETS: Yeah, Sarah? We can't hear you. Why don't we work

on your audio, and we'll go to somebody else and come back to you. JosÃ©, why don't you go ahead?

JOSÃ‰ VEGA: Sure. First of all, Calvin, always a pleasure

talking to you, pal. I actually had this conversation with a few

friends the other day. Is it immoral to want to make a living for yourself, and want the best conditions for yourself, if that

involves you working a menial job or selling content -- whether

that be stupid videos on the internet or whether that be dirty pictures and videos on the internet? My point is simple: I think you're worth more than that. I think you're worth more

than a 9-5, and I think you're worth more than any salary or any

amount of money that you could ever make in the world. I think

everybody is worth

dollar amount. But where is that worth? That worth is in the soul and in the mind; that's what makes you beautiful. I'm simply saying the country needs the means to develop that beauty that lies within everybody. That's where your real worth is. You could die with \$50 million in your bank account, 5 homes in Beverly Hills, 20 luxury cars. I think Jay Leno has a robot that he can use. None of that will mean anything. You die, and you've contributed nothing. Is that what you want your life to mean? Because life is not defined by the present, but the future. If you live in the present, you will die when you die. But if you live in the future, you become immortal. And that's really where true beauty and meaning in your life exists; in the future. That's my response to you, Calvin.

CALVIN: JosÃ©, I truly and honestly agree with everything you say, 100%. But maybe it's just me -- I don't know if there's bias on my end, but I think those jobs have value. It's good to live for the future, but I think we also have to live for now. I'm going to use a few examples: Uber and Lyft drivers, for example. Not everyone is in the position to afford a car. Some people have to get a job. It's more affordable than catching a cab. Selling make-up; that's a huge industry. The make-up industry is a huge one in America right now. We have beauty standards in America, unfortunately, you have to look a certain kind of way to get a job; have a certain kind of hairstyle to get a job. These are jobs that help satisfy those requirements to get those jobs or get to work and things like this. Don't you think it's a bit odd to say that those jobs have no value when

they in a way satisfy certain things that are needed today? I don't know; I hope that makes sense. I think those jobs that people consider unworthy are worthy.

BEETS: Franklin, did you want to say something in response to Calvin?

FRANKLIN MIRERI: I just wanted to say I totally understand where Calvin is coming from. I am a content producer, by the way. I produce gospel music when I'm not doing youth engagement work. What I can say is that I think I heard the contributor saying is it isn't bad to be making content and to be spending your time using your talent -- whatever it is -- to get a living, and as JosÃ© was saying, explore your creative aspect. But what I see most young people doing is that they see it as a means to an end. It stops there. The intellect is not growing. Because yes, you can be making music, but also develop your mind. When you look at how even structures are, I think one of the contributors was saying in the medieval times, and while the economy was developing, the ones whose intellect was more developed were the bosses, and the rest of them were the peasants. Sadly, that's how the world is. When your intellect and your ingenuity is not explored to the fullest, you are, so to speak, confined to now trying to just the menial crumbs of the economy. Yet, we could do much better. In Africa, for example, let me give our context for example. A lot of youth are spending more time trying to be YouTubers, trying to be on TikTok. It's not bad, but we could be doing so much more, like exploring funding opportunities, exploring opportunities to be computer scientists. So, that is the whole aspect. We are not saying

that yes, content production is not bad, but let us do more.
And
with that, we will open up a whole new basket of opportunities
for the economy. That is my input.

BEETS: Thank you. Lissie, go ahead.

LISSIE BROBJERG: I just have a question for Calvin.
What
kind of culture, what kind of thinking is needed among people
today and in the future for us to face a situation in 2
billion
years where the Sun will burn out? How will we solve that?
Yes,
we have creative abilities, we have the ability to solve
problems. But what kind of culture do we need in order to do
that? Many animal species went extinct, and if we are not
acting
on a higher level, if we're just acting on some kind of basis
where we're not developing and making new discoveries, and
developing in a way that will make us able to solve that
crisis
in 2 billion years, then we could go extinct. What's special
about man is our minds; that's the most precious thing we
have.
Therefore, I think in terms of necessity, necessity changes.
Once the person can make a new discovery that makes a lot of
what
you can call practical jobs or anything obsolete. What do you
think? What kind of thinking do you think is needed for
facing
that in 2 billion years?

CALVIN: Critical thinking, logical thinking most
definitely
some form of intellectual thinking would be needed to at least
that kind of future, or contribute to that kind of future.
So,
it would most definitely be a culture of critical thinking.
That's my answer.

LISSIE BROBJERG: Yeah, well we have to look. It's not an easy question, so we really have to look into how do we answer that question. Lyn had a huge attack on the educational system, because you have this drill and grill method where people have to learn as if they are like a box. You fill the thing and you basically just have to learn like a dog that learns tricks. But he actually was challenging people, especially young people, to go through the discoveries. Who made the biggest changes for mankind? Who had these huge, large-scale geological influences on behalf of mankind? Carolina was talking about Kepler, who discovered how the Solar System works. So, we should look at those people who actually did change physically and through the noosphere, and redefined mankind and the role of mankind, and the future of mankind. And look at how did they think; we should rediscover their discoveries, so that we actually become also qualified to answer that question. What do you think?

BEETS: Can we see if Sarah's audio is working now?

SARAH FAHIM: To answer that question, I think the problem is deeper than just selling products. I think that the problem is the fact of what kind of society are we thinking if we just reduce all our visions to social media? We are encouraging a lack of ambition, we are encouraging this idea of easy money, of not developing our minds because we can have a normal life by just selling products on Instagram or something. I think the problem is that we are not educating people if they think that there is a future in that type of work. It can be a first step; you can sell products to win money to create another project.

But it can't be a vision. This is not the way we should imagine a society; this is so small. Social media is part of our lives now, we can learn to live with it. But we can't make it the major part of our vision. I do not agree with that, because I don't want my society to not be educated and to dream about selling products and nothing more. This is what I have to say.

BEETS: Thanks, Sarah. So, we have a question from Joshua Kisubika, if he's still in the Zoom.

JOSHUA KISUBIKA: I just wanted to pose a question to Daniel, maybe, just to get to know the position of the LaRouche group to support the youth in Uganda. So, I was saying that over 700,000 people reach working age every day in Uganda. This is expected to rise to an average of 1 million in the decade from 2030 to 2040. It's already creating a mismatch between labor demand and supply. While Uganda's youth are known for being highly enterprising, fewer than 4% of Ugandans are employers, 32% [?] are working for themselves only. 43% are unpaid family workers.

So, you can see that even this, it all goes back to maybe leadership. I was trying to look at which strategies can we decide and fight together with you to help the youth in Uganda to start living life to the full.

DANIEL BURKE: Thank you very much, Joshua. I think that what you're raising is the prospect of dialogue and discussion about, most importantly as we are discussing here -- the epistemology of economics. Because what you're describing -- it depends upon your point of view. The point of view expressed

by
this British imperial, oligarchical financial system is the
point
of view that if you have many mouths to feed and you don't
have
enough food, or if you have many youth to employ, but you
don't
have enough jobs; then that means that you're poor. But from
the
standpoint of the American System -- which is to say, I'm not
referring to what the United States has been doing recently or
even over most of its history, but rather the so-called
American
System of economics from Alexander Hamilton -- which has been
developed by Lincoln's economist, developed under Franklin
Roosevelt, developed under John Kennedy, and in particular, by
Lyndon LaRouche as an economist and an individual. Under that
system, you look at a large number of youth and you say, "My
goodness! What incredible wealth we have," because of the
creative powers of their minds. And because we understand, as
Hamilton did, that it's through the function of the human mind
making discoveries that we actually are able to increase our
wealth, our ability to provide for the population and for the
future population. If we approach the circumstance from that
respect, then we will immediately begin to look at what are
the
great projects that need to be built that would establish a
new
platform of infrastructure, a new platform of capability for
the
nation and for the region and for the continent, and
therefore,
for the world, which provide a basis for new qualities of
economic activity that otherwise were not possible? That you
create a future with a future. You create some kind of next
step
to the whole system.

But it's most important that this be under the idea of
a
leapfrog. We say leapfrog to signify go beyond any of the
so-called intermediate steps that the IMF demands that people

take, which is total nonsense. You may have seen on panel 1, that Daisuke Kotegawa, former Japanese representative to the IMF, dealt with this idea: that it's ridiculous that we should be expecting nations to go step by step by step up the ladder of industrialization and so forth. That's nonsense! We should go to the highest technology that's available, and overmaster all of the problems that have come before, and go for the most rapid possible advance of productive capability. So, what we would like to discuss with you would be, what are the principles by which this can be achieved in Uganda, in the region, in the continent, and in the world. And what are we demanding from governments?

That's why presently, given the conditions of total breakdown of the system, which is what we're faced with right now, we're seeing that we really have got to bring forward youth leadership to demand this summit. A summit of the nations that are capable of initiating a New Paradigm. Because if we want to get that kind of project rolling, that kind of new platform, then we're going to have to change the whole financial system. We cannot allow the continued suffocation of the so-called developing countries. What the Schiller Institute is proposing is 1.5 billion new jobs. The discussion is that this could mean \$125 trillion of international credit, provided by international credit institutions to nations.

So, we'd like to discuss this with you and the youth that you work with, and provide a basis for dialogue in which we can have shared understanding of what is necessary. Then, have a basis by which to demand that of the government there, and of the

people of the world, and the governments of the world. Thank you very much for participating.

BEETS: Thank you very much, both of you. We have unfortunately come up on time. That's very unfortunate, because we have many more people who I know have questions, both live and we also got a number of email questions which we don't have time to take on this panel right now. I would encourage everyone who did not get an opportunity to ask a question, to send your question in. We will direct it to the panelists, so that we can continue this fun, fruitful, and important dialogue.

What I'm going to do is ask each of the panelists who remain with us if they'd like to say anything in closing before we end our panel.

CHERINE SULTAN: I would like to emphasize on the question of leadership and so on, saying once you have discovered a kind of truth, a kind of direction society is, maybe you didn't aim to take leadership, but this fate coming on you owes you to take leadership.

LISSIE BROGJERG: To all of you, I would just like to say that we will all become very old and wrinkled and ugly and all that, in old age. So the question is, when you are there can you think about your life and say that "Certainly, my life was important, and I am not just going to worm food." That's all.

CAROLINA DOMINGUEZ CISNEROS: I appreciate and thank

everyone for having participated in this. I'm very happy. This is the first time we've had a forum of this sort for youth. I think that what helps me to understand and organize youth is to not be judgmental, but to actually try to inspire them. To view them from the standpoint of agape, of love. If we see the pain of seeing youth who are on drugs or doing those kinds of things, if this causes pain, we have to realize that perhaps there is something better that's an option. So, I think that we should take the occasion to try to communicate the idea that we can change all of this. We have tremendous potential. The more people die from drugs in the streets, the worse it is; rather, they can have lives based on creativity and agape towards others.

Thank you very much for this seminar.

SARAH FAHIM: I think this is extremely amazing to be all gathered today to fight for our ideas and for a better world. This is so powerful and inspiring at the same time. I'm really happy that we're slowly changing our world, and I'm glad to be a part of that change.

DANIEL BURKE: I want to echo what Sarah said; I totally agree. It's inspiring; it sets a standard that encourages us to go higher. So, I just want to quote the immortal words of Lyndon LaRouche: "Have fun!"

JOSE VEGA: Think like Beethoven!

MEGAN BEETS: So, I'd like to thank all the panelists, everyone who got on to ask questions, and I'd like to thank

our
audience for watching today.

Let me put out a call: Get active! If you're young,
if
you're old, get active with the Schiller Institute. We need
you
to become a member of the Schiller Institute. We need to sign
and circulate our petition for a global health system. We
need
you to circulate our program for 1.5 billion productive jobs.
And we need you to organize.

Thank you very much. Thank you to everyone who
watched the
conference today, and we'll see you again soon.

"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 sanktioneerne 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 Fødevarerprogram, 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/](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 regimeskifteketup, 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!

**International ungdomsopkald
med Helga Zepp-LaRouches
tirsdag 31. marts kl. 16-18**

dansk tid via Zoom

Verden er i en alvorlig krise, som er uhørt, uden sidestykke. De gode nyheder er, at eftersom situationen er resultatet af de sidste årtiers forfærdelige politik, vil det være umuligt at "vende tilbage til normal praksis". Helga Zepp-LaRouche har opfordret unge mennesker til at tage lederskab på dette tidspunkt med store forandringer, for at bekæmpe de to dødelige virusser som nu truer menneskeheden – coronavirus-pandemien og nedsmeltningen af det globale finanssystem.

Vi må komme ud af denne krise med et helt nyt paradigme for fredelig sameksistens mellem nationer og et nyt økonomisk system baseret på samarbejde om fremskridt for hele menneskeheden. Som det bliver mere og mere graverende med coronavirus-pandemien, vil det blive en hasteprioritet at bygge et moderne globalt sundhedssystem for at sikre retten til liv for alle mennesker på jorden.

Videokonferencen er en mulighed for unge mennesker at tale med Helga Zepp-LaRouche og tilslutte sig kampen for dette nye paradigme.

Efter indledende bemærkninger af Helga, vil repræsentanter fra hver nation give en 2 til 4 minutter lang rapport om deres organisering, og en spørgerunde vil herefter følge.

HVORNÅR

31. marts kl. 16-18, dansk tid

HVOR

Voom video konference

[Klik her for at tilmelde dig: http://LPAC.co/hz-youth](http://LPAC.co/hz-youth)

Del venligst med dine unge kontakter!

**Luk den neoliberale kasino-
økonomi ned nu, den er
håbløst bankerot.**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche, d. 19. marts,
2020**

Schiller Instituttets formand Helga Zepp-LaRouche offentliggjorde, d. 18. marts, en presserende appel, som hun understregede i sit webcast, d. 19. marts, for at lukke finanssystemet ned i flere dage, således at der vil være tid til at indføre nødvendige reformer, begyndende med en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, for, gennem en konkursbehandling, at reorganisere det nuværende finanssystem. Det neoliberale system er bankerot, sagde hun, pga. det skifte der begyndte for 50 år siden, væk fra efterkrigstidens Bretton Woods-systems faste vekselkurser, over til en dereguleret, spekulativ kasinoøkonomi.

Det finansielle sammenbrud, som finder sted samtidig med coronapandemiens udbredelse, kan ikke løses gennem flere redningspakker, hvilket blot forlænger ødelæggelsen af den virkelige økonomi. Yderligere vil dette underminere indsatsen undervejs for at rette op på kollapset af sundhedssystemets verden over, der blev saboteret med "sundhed for profit" for øje (i profitmaksimeringens navn). Hvad der nu er brug for, er et fuldt samarbejde mellem de førende nationer – en global

solidaritet – som må erstatte det geopolitiske syn. Selvom at der er taget nogle positive skridt i denne retning, forbliver de økonomiske tiltag indenfor neoliberalismens pålagte rammer, i mens nogle embedsmænd, såsom USA's udenrigsminister Pompeo, fortsætter med at søge den geopolitiske konfrontation, som ses i hans angreb på Kina.

For at lykkes i kampen mod den globale pandemi, sagde hun, bør vi lytte til lægestaben fra Wuhan, som førte en heroisk kamp mod sygdommen. Hvad der er brug for er kærlighed, ikke ubegrundede anklager. Krisen har givet os muligheden for at kassere alle geopolitiske og neoliberale aksiomer, og i stedet handle i solidaritet med vore medmennesker.

Afskrift på engelsk:

SHUT DOWN THE NEOLIBERAL CASINO ECONOMY NOW, IT IS HOPELESSLY BANKRUPT!

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, March 19, 2020

With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute, with our weekly webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, our founder and president. It's March 19, 2020.

Let me begin by simply saying that we had intended to do this webcast yesterday, but the sheer volume of activity on the internet has made it questionable. Hopefully, we will be able to get through the briefing and discussion today, but please bear with us if there's some shakiness or jumpiness in the picture. These are extraordinary times, and it does require a certain amount of patience and concentration.

We're facing a situation which is a worldwide emergency, and Helga, we'll start with your call yesterday. You issued an emergency call for a bank holiday, which I think addresses the problem of the corona virus and the financial crash

simultaneously. So, why don't we start with what you said yesterday?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I think the need to address the fact that we don't only have the coronavirus crisis, which is a pandemic, but we also have clear signs that the financial system is collapsing. So, that is why I issued a call to close the markets for a few days, which I will specify, in order to take the absolutely necessary reforms of the financial system, which has to start with the immediate implementation of a Glass-Steagall banking separation. Followed then by the other measures which we have been asking and demanding for, namely; a national bank in every country; a New Bretton Woods credit system in order to restart the economy and concentrate on the physical economy. This is absolutely necessary because, while it is clear that now, finally, after a quite significant delay, all the governments of the trans-Atlantic sector are clearly taking measures. For example, the European Union has suspended the rules of the stability pact, Trump has invoked the National Defense Act, there are obviously many measures being taken. For example, the various bazookas which have been taken out, giving credit to firms to delay tax payments, to even talk about helicopter money – in other words, directly handing out money to everybody who needs it. All of these things are necessary steps to just keep the economy going, and also calm down the population, which is really in a difficult state of mind. And physically, many people have existential worries about their livelihoods.

But this is all missing one essential point. That is, the reason why we are in this crisis has to be addressed. That is something which absolutely only we can bring on the agenda. So, the very first step would be to close the financial markets in order to implement Glass-Steagall. Now that is obviously something which requires a different kind of approach. It requires the intervention of the most powerful governments in the world working together. And that is the

need to have the summit of the United States, Russia, China, and India; then other countries can support that. But you need a decision on the level of the heads of government to end the casino economy, to go in the direction of a world credit system which enables a world health system. Because it should be very clear that this pandemic will not be fought in one country, but you need a health system in every single country of the world, and that is absolutely not possible under the present circumstances. So therefore, the shutting down of the financial markets is the absolute necessary first step, but it must be followed by the whole package.

SCHLANGER: In saying that, and looking at the importance of taking emergency measures, I think it's really important that people step back and recognize what you just said. This is something that's been in the making for many years, and your expertise in this comes from your long working relationship with your husband, who forecast this back in 1971. It was clear to him back then that this is what we were facing; and yet, governments missed these warnings. Why don't you just review for a moment his forecasting on this, and how we missed the boat?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: My late husband, in 1971, was probably the only economist who with absolute clarity recognized the significance of Nixon abandoning the fixed exchange rate system and abandoning the coupling of the dollar to the gold standard, and going in the direction of unregulated monetarism. He said in August 1971 that if the world would stay on this course, it would absolutely necessarily lead to a new depression and the danger of a new fascism, or you would replace the system with a completely different one; namely, a just, new world economic order. Then, at every step of the way, whenever the financial oligarchy moved in the direction of further deregulation, he absolutely pointed to the consequences of that. He predicted the crash of 1987, he absolutely recognized the significance of the 1997 so-called

Asia crisis as being really the eruption of a global crisis. And he made this famous video on the 25th of July in 2007, saying this is the end of the system, and all which we see right now will be coming to the surface of the total bankruptcy of the system.

Obviously, the measures which were taken by the central banks and the G-20 after the 2008 collapse, just amplified the problem by pumping more liquidity into the system. Now we are at the absolute end phase of that process. He also was very much on the record saying the consequences in the physical economy of this monetarism would lead to the eruption of pandemics. It would lead to the re-emergence of old diseases, and the emergence of new epidemics, pandemics; because you cannot lower the living standard of entire continents over a long period of time without causing such breakdowns of the health system, the immune system. That is exactly the point we are at right now, and that is why we are saying that you cannot remedy it by just controlling this pandemic. Because if you don't remove the causes, the danger is that new viruses, new diseases will emerge. So, we are at an absolute fundamental point that we have to change the whole system.

SCHLANGER: I think we're seeing some governments beginning to recognize that this is more than just a simple crisis. Macron, for example, announced the suspension of the so-called reforms he was pushing. Macron and others are saying we need to look into what caused the failures of the system. But up to this point, Helga, have you seen anyone addressing the need to reject the whole casino economy and go back to the measures that would feed the physical economy?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No. I think that the measures that have been taken by, for example, Germany – Merkel was yesterday in a TV speech where she really didn't say anything significant. All she said is, "It's up to you to flatten the curve of the spread of the pandemic." Now, I don't think that is the way to go about it at all. Naturally what is behind that is how all

the Western governments are now confronted with the fact that the takedown of the health system over the last decades, the privatization, the shutting down hospitals, shutting down other facilities for the sake of profit, is now haunting everybody, because we have a severe shortage of such facilities. But, I think the approach which was taken by China has been a completely different one. They did not talk about flattening the curve; they took in Wuhan and Hubei province very decisive measures. They closed down the entire area of 60 million people and acted in solidarity in the whole country; all of China was supporting that. They were successful in reducing the number of new cases erupting. So, they basically have it under control for the situation in China. That is a successful model. Also, Singapore and South Korea took a similar approach. There is no reason one cannot replicate what China did, if there is solidarity.

Obviously, in the EU, that has been lacking so far. There was no solidarity. This just shows you the deficiency in the neo-liberal and liberal model of everything – the markets, the health system, the cooperation among countries. I think that the situation now is very severe. You can see it in Italy, which was the country which, because of its positive relations with China, did apply the Chinese model to a very large degree. But in northern Italy, in Bergamo, in Lombardy, they are now faced with the situation that the capacity simply is not sufficient. So there is de facto triage, not because they intend it, because the doctors and the nurses around the clock and they are near the point of breakdown; but they simply don't have enough facilities, so they cannot treat every patient. This is a total catastrophe.

But China, which not only totally successfully contained the virus, is now worried that it may come back from abroad, because other governments did not apply the same rigorous methods. But the Chinese are providing help. They have sent medical experts to Iran, to Iraq, to Spain, to Italy. They

have offered help to any country which wants to take it. They are sending massive supplies to Italy, Spain, and France, who they regard as having shown to have been friends with China. I think the only thing to draw as a conclusion is to stop this anti-China bashing. First of all, it's completely insane; it is not justified. Cooperate. I think this is the moment where you have to work together as a human species. China has provided the way to go.

You need to learn the Chinese lesson from Wuhan, and that is the best thing the Europeans and others like the United States can do right now.

SCHLANGER: On the question of the takedown of the public health system and replacing it with a totally for-profit health care, which has obviously failed, even the New York Times admitted this today. I just want to read a couple of quotes from an article there where they said that it's now the EU austerity which has left the health care systems unprepared. We're talking about Europe, but the same thing can be said about the United States. They said, in the southern European countries, they're ill-prepared for a pandemic. They describe this as "tragically vulnerable", that the countries are tragically vulnerable.

Now, we had in the United States, a standard set with the Hill-Burton system, of 4.5 hospital beds per 1000 people. This was taken down starting in 1974. Helga, you were talking about a world health standard. What would that take to get a Hill-Burton standard for the whole world now?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, you would need a crash program approach, where obviously those countries which have the capability would have to help those who don't. But all together, it would mean to build 35 million new hospital beds worldwide. It would require having the necessary electricity, which would mean the creation of 358 gigawatts of new electricity; most of which would also have to be built in a

crash program. You would need the increase of clean water supplies by 40% of the existing capabilities. So that obviously is a completely different approach, and would require a completely different approach in terms of real industrialization of the Southern Hemisphere. That brings you to the absolute point where this went wrong. We are now at the point where we have to make a fundamental decision: Do we want to in the direction of a Malthusian world order, which indeed would mean what the British system has been pushing? Like Jeremy Warner in the Daily Telegraph, wrote a couple of weeks ago, that the coronavirus has a benefit; namely that it is culling older people. That notion of culling, that you treat the human species as a herd of animals which must be culled, this has been our attack against the British Malthusian genocide approach for a very long time. This is now what obviously is coming to the fore. We have to make a fundamental decision, that we absolutely reject this idea that there are useless people, which obviously is behind some of the thinking, because the danger is that we come out of this with a Green approach, with a Malthusian approach. We have to absolutely go in the opposite direction, and go for the full industrialization of the world economy. We have to have the industrialization of Africa, of Southwest Asia. That is the key moral decision which the whole human race has to make at this point.

SCHLANGER: As you said, this would require international solidarity. I think there is still the proposal that you made, and was somewhat adopted by others, that there be an emergency summit of the great powers. How could they act to bring about not just this new world health standard, but a new financial system?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I made this proposal for an emergency summit of the United States, Russia, and China following the assassination of Iranian General Soleimani on the third of January this year, because there was the immediate danger of

an escalation which could have gone into a superpower conflict. Subsequently, President Putin called for a summit of the Permanent Five of the UN Security Council to establish the principles for the continued collaboration and survival of the human species. Now in the meantime, all the governments of the Permanent Five have agreed – the US, China, Russia, France, and Great Britain – that they would agree to this. I still think that the absolutely necessary combination is the United States, Russia, China, and India, being representative for the whole world, and then other countries should cooperate. I think we have reached the point where we have to different principles in the international cooperation. Geopolitics must be absolutely put aside forever. We have to define the common aims of mankind; we have to agree on those principles which constitute the one humanity. That would first of all mean to establish a system of new international relations of countries respecting the sovereignty of everyone, of non-interference, of accepting the different social system of the other one. And then agree on joint economic development programs to overcome poverty, to overcome underdevelopment.

I think the only realistic proposal on the table is what China proposed with the New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative, which already 157 countries are participating in. The Schiller Institute, already several years ago, started to publish reports – “The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge” – which is a comprehensive economic study of how to bring industrial development to every continent on this planet. Some of these projects are in different degrees of realization, but that would be the kind of platform which has to be agreed upon by the top governments in the world. That way you could start a real economic development plan following such a summit right away. It would mean you completely change the orientation. In a certain sense it's like the end of the Thirty Years' War, where people recognized that if they continued, there would be nobody left to enjoy the victory, so-called. That is the point humanity has reached right now.

We have reached a point where we either become rational and cooperate, or we may not only face a Dark Age, but we may actually face a real holocaust of the whole human race.

SCHLANGER: I think a lot of people would like to get your assessment of the so-called financial measures that are being taken, beyond those that are emergency funds to provide care or funds for people who are losing jobs, a moratorium on foreclosures – at least for a month or two. But what we see from the Federal Reserve in the United States, as an example, is a bail-out of the speculators of extraordinary level of so-called credit; basically, funny money. What's your assessment of that? Obviously, this goes against what you're talking about in terms of the financial bankruptcy reorganization.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: That just reflects the intention of Wall Street to keep the casino economy going. They bring out what they call the big bazooka, I think the Federal Reserve put in \$1.2 trillion in various support actions, buying up bonds, buying up all kinds of debt to keep the derivative bubble going. The European Central Bank has announced 750 billion, and that is not the end of it. If they keep doing that, and there is right now the clear intention to do so, it will lead to a hyperinflationary blow-out of the whole system.

I'm not saying that these temporary measures to keep individual families and firms going by giving all kinds of support measures, that may be useful in the short-term. But you need to end the casino economy. You absolutely have to have Glass-Steagall, because this would shut down the casino economy for good. You put the commercial banks under state protection, you put a firewall between the commercial banks and the investment banks and all the other operators and players. If they have no more access to the savings of the commercial banks, or do not get bail-outs from the taxpayers any more, they will have to bring the books in order on their own and if they can't do it, they have to be closed down. That is the kind of intervention which now absolutely needs to

exist. If this thing is continuing, you will end up in a hyperinflationary blow-out like what happened in Germany in 1923. That is the complete expropriation of the life savings of the population, and that would lead to a social explosion such as I don't even want to imagine.

So, I call upon all rational people to support our action that this approach – that you need a summit of the most important governments of the world, and they have to end the casino economy, and they have to adopt a system of integrated cooperation for world development. If there is sufficient support for that, it can be done, because there is already motion in this direction. So, I'm calling upon you, that you sign this appeal which will be below this webcast [https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/four_laws_new], and that you help us to circulate this idea. Because there is a lot of confusion right now, a lot of panic, a lot of chaos. But you have to elevate the whole discussion on a much higher level, and that has to be one of unity of the entire world. Then we can solve it.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned ending the casino economy, I found it somewhat interesting that yesterday the state of Nevada shut down the casinos in Las Vegas. That's a good step in the right direction.

Helga, come back to this question of international solidarity, and why that's necessary. Unfortunately, we have someone who hasn't gotten that message; namely, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, who continues to rant against China, talking about escalating sanctions against Iran, which is one of the countries that has been badly affected by the coronavirus. What can you say about that? Obviously, this is the opposite of solidarity.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think President Trump has been capable of getting rid of some of his bad advisors in the past, like Bolton. And I think he would be very well advised to get rid

of Pompeo. What Pompeo is doing right now in his anti-China campaign is really dangerous. The relationship between the United States and China has been deteriorating. It's very difficult to assess all of this, because there is a lot of fake news being circulated right now, and one has to be very careful in assessing this.

Let me bring in another element of this. There is a geopolitical dimension in a lot of things that are happening right now. There was, for example, a scenario played out in October 2019, where the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the World Economic Forum, the CIA, and the UN, and a couple of other institutions had a scenario acting out a new pandemic hitting the world with the coronavirus, and they basically came to the conclusion that this would cause 65 million deaths. Now that was the very same day the military games were conducted in New York on the very same day in Wuhan the military games started, and subsequently the Chinese Foreign Ministry raised the question, if the virus had not originated in Wuhan, but possibly coming from US soldiers participating in these war games. There is a big story as to what was the role of Fort Detrick, which was closed down last July. In any case, I'm not in a position now to assess the validity of all of this. And as I said, there is a lot of psywar fake news, disinformation. But this whole question has now led to a brawl whereby Pompeo is continuously talking about the China virus. The Chinese government correctly refuted that as a racist policy. This is going back and forth, and unfortunately, President Trump has repeatedly also used that language of the China virus.

This is very dangerous, and naturally, there is also this question of Iran. The oil price right now is at \$20/barrel for Brent crude [North Sea], and that means the entire shale-gas industry at this point is completely bankrupt. So, there is absolutely the danger that on top of this present crisis, you could have a war in the Middle East, with the intention to

drive up the price of oil. I'm just saying that we are in a situation where if this present situation is not brought under control in the way I said before, that we could really end up in a complete strategic disaster. This is why I think President Trump is doing a lot of positive things. He has started a very useful cooperation, for example, with Governor Andrew Cuomo from New York. There are lots of things where people overcome bipartisanship. But there is also this other tendency. So, I think the absolute necessity right now is to go for an international cooperation and address the common aims of mankind as an absolute necessity of surviving for all of us.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned earlier the period of the Thirty Years' War and the end of the Thirty Years' War, which led to the Peace of Westphalia. This actually does give us an opportunity to reflect on the actual nature of man, as opposed to being totally focussed on material wealth, greed, making money. You actually have an opportunity to sit back and reflect on why we're here. And I think it would be very useful, Helga, at this moment of great anxiety and stress, for you to reiterate points to what is that nature of man? And how do we regain this concept of the cooperation among beautiful souls?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think that the medical team of doctors who worked in Wuhan, they just issued a very beautiful video and message, where they told what incredible strain one goes through in this period. But then they say they came out of it with the idea that what was really needed was love. That each individual human being is mortal, but what is immortal is love. Love for your loved ones, your family, your nation; love for mankind. And that that is the kind of spirit which needs to be evoked. I think this is really the true tendency you can clearly see. You have those people who are for humanity, like for example, the unbelievable work being done by the many doctors and nurses around the world, and other people who help

to make this situation function. And people who grow, who show a humanity which goes beyond anything which was there before. But then you also have the people who are displaying their evil nature. I think in a certain sense, we are now at the point where we have to shed all the axioms which led to this situation; which is geopolitics, monetarism, Darwinism, the liberal system that everything is allowed. And we have to replace it with the idea that the human species is the only creative species known in the universe so far. That we have to employ these creative capacities to relate to each other from that standpoint to respect the creative mind of the other; to show the kind of solidarity which has been demonstrated, especially by such doctors in China in Wuhan. That should be an inspiration of how we get out of this crisis.

SCHLANGER: I would encourage all of our viewers to take the time now, especially if you are off work or you have limited hours, instead of sitting there worrying, or wasting your time watching CNN or MSNBC, go to the Schiller Institute website; go to the LaRouche PAC website; and familiarize yourself with the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly related to the Four Laws of Economics, and also the Four Power Agreement.

So, Helga, do you have anything else to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I can only add that a lot of people in Italy are now going to their balconies and singing. You have opera houses playing for free to be transmitted on the internet. Since we are in the year of Beethoven, I can only say that the best thing to get the inspiration is to listen to a lot of Beethoven. Otherwise, I really think that if you go into the archives of our website and study the works of Lyndon LaRouche, that is actually a very good advice. Because we have to come out of this present crisis with a completely different approach. I think between Beethoven and LaRouche, you will find a lot of the inspiration needed. So, we will come back with other programs as the situation unfolds. So, stay tuned, and help us to change this paradigm.

SCHLANGER: OK, Helga. Thank you very much.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: 'Til soon.

SCHLANGER: 'Til soon.

<https://www.larouchepac.com/20200319/shut-down-neo-liberal-casino-economy-it-hopelessly-bankrupt>

Vil de igangværende chok fremprovokere en ny slags tænkning, der er nødvendig for at overvinde en ny mørk tidsalder? Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche d. 11. marts 2020

Helga gentager de seriøse advarsler fra ledende tyske eksperter indenfor smitsomme sygdomme og ser på Wuhan-modellen for at bryde smittevejene i begyndelsen. Helga beder lande om at koordinere deres indsats for at besejre denne pandemi, inklusiv at dæmme op for de økonomiske indvirkninger på den globale økonomi, men det betyder ikke at redde Wall Street!

(Se hendes opdaterede underskriftsbegæring)

Helga og Harley diskuterer svindelens her-og-nu-økonomi, og påmindelse om Lyndon LaRouches advarsel, at hvis vi fortsatte ned ad vejen mod nulvækst, ville Vesten ikke længere være i stand til at opretholde sig selv og ville sprænges indad. Hun kræver en ende på geopolitik, og at alle kræfter må være fokuserede på at løse den fælles virus- og finanskrisis. Pas på dig selv, og tak for at du følger vores arbejde.

Afskrift på engelsk:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute, welcome to our webcast with our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's March 11, 2020. And now we're very deep into a process which has been unfolding rapidly with the coronavirus, the emergence of a pandemic worldwide. And Helga, this is something that people in the West have been trying to wish away, but it's something that's going to be wished away: It requires a total change in thinking. Why don't you start with your thoughts on that, because you have been very out front in the need for an emergency call to reject this old paradigm, and move to the new.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I think the situation is very serious. It probably will not be possible without a lot of casualties, but nevertheless, if there are decisive measures now, and a complete change in the attitude, the damage can be minimized. Otherwise, it will be catastrophic.

Now, I think it is useful to listen to the experts from Germany who are making regular podcasts, Christian Drosten, the virologist from Berlin Charité hospital, and Professor Lothar Wieler from the Robert Koch Institute, and they put out very drastic warnings. What Drosten said is that there will be no lessening of the increasing in the spring and summer period, which some people temporarily assumed, because we will

face a virus wave, and naturally, in the summer period, the virus will continue to spread to the summer hemisphere, where it will be winter, and then in all likelihood return even more, and with possible mutations in the fall, and a vaccine, as of now, cannot be expected before a year or so.

So, Merkel announced what is now commonplace among many leaders of countries, that the infection rate probably will infect 70% of the population, and unfortunately, it is absolutely not true what our Health Minister Jens Spahn still thought in January, which is really incredible, where he said that the coronavirus does not represent a danger for Germany, and that the mortality rate of the coronavirus would be lower than of the common flu – that's what he said in January.

Now, obviously, that that was not the case was clear, already if people looked to China, which in the month of January was waging an incredible battle, and by closing down the entire city of Wuhan and Hubei province, effecting a lockdown for 60 million people, implementing it and also enforcing it and having a population which was very cooperative in doing so, according to the World Health Organization, China has set a new standard in dealing with such pandemics. And the West could have taken that as an example, but people in the West are just too arrogant, too Euro-centric, or too Western-centric, so they thought they could ignore, or even think "this is affecting China and not coming to Europe or the United States"; so they lost three valuable months, maybe not entirely, but obviously, a completely different attitude would have been necessary.

And now, it is spreading and changing by the hour, so people are completely aware of the fact that this is out of control. And I do not want to add to any panic, but it is very clear that the numbers which are announced right now are not accurate. I talked to my colleagues in France, today, and there are only a little bit more than 1,000 tests which have been made in France so far! That is not a representative

figure which comes out, then. And we have some cases where people clearly have symptoms, and they try to get tests, and they were told, there are no tests in France right now, France doesn't have the production capability and all the tests have been bought up and there simply are no tests. So, obviously, the fact that in Germany, there are only two deaths so far, as of this webcast [midday in Germany March 11 – ed], they attribute that to the very well testing – now, we have to see.

I think the lesson from Wuhan, and now that all of Italy is basically a red zone, after some very irrational behavior on the side of some citizens, after the north was locked down, you have quite an advanced situation; but I think the lesson to be learned from all of that is that is that we have to learn from China. We have to get rid of our Western arrogance, and simply look at the way how China effectively dealt with it, and then the only conclusion is, that you have to enforce these measures before you have a mass of cases. That means that if you have anywhere, a region, like some cities or areas in North Rhine-Westphalia, one should apply the Wuhan model immediately. It should be closed down, there should be a quarantine for a certain number of weeks, and these measures must be taken early on, because everything which counts in this is the speed, to take preemptive measures before the virus spreads completely out of control.

So I think we are in a very serious situation, but it's not some moment where you can completely panic, but there are clear ways, and I think the Chinese efficiency with which they dealt with this, should be a lesson for everybody.

SCHLANGER: When you speak of the arrogance, I think you're referring, in particular, to the continued adherence to geopolitics, to the neo-liberal model, the whole idea that the West is superior, the West has solved all the problems. Isn't this what hampers the thinking of people at the European Union and many of the people in the U.S. Congress, and think tanks in the United States?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the reaction so far by the leading politicians, for example, the European finance ministers – the so-called Eurogroup – they have a meeting on March 16, and on their agenda is first, the European Stability Mechanism, and then something else, and then only third, the coronavirus attack, and it is very clear that the reason why the reaction was so late, and why they didn't use the word "pandemic," because they were more concerned about the stock market, the efficiency and the profits coming from the so-called "pandemic bond" – which is an absurdity all by itself, that you would try to finance the cost of pandemics with bonds from which people can make a profit, but only if you have the maturity of the bond. So, I think the thinking is still very much dominated by the geopolitical idea: For example, yesterday, I was listening – and one should actually stop doing that! – I was listening to the ZDF news and this moderator reported about the coronavirus crisis, but then, instead of praising what the Chinese accomplished in Wuhan, he took the occasion to blast China and attack it, or to continue to attack Russia, China, that has to stop! Because if you look at it, the only way how humanity will get out of the crisis, is international cooperation. Wang Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, has just telephoned the Italian Foreign Minister Luigi Di Maio, and the Chinese offered share their experience, to send their experts; they're donating masks, protective suits, and tests to Italy. This is a completely different approach. And I think the West has much to learn how to respond to challenges which all of humanity is facing. And this whole geopolitical thinking is really one of troglodytes and should be eliminated completely.

SCHLANGER: We see people like U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo continuing to attack China; he calls coronavirus the "Wuhan virus" – you have this kind of attitude, when in fact, what we're seeing is a significant drop of cases in China. And you mentioned earlier the importance of President Xi Jinping going to Wuhan to talk to the people who are on the front lines. I think it's important to report this, Helga, because

it's not going out in the Western press.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I have proposed something, which may look impossible to some people, but I dare the prediction that the situation will – because of this ineffectiveness of Western response – that the situation will soon come to the point where more and more people are recognizing that what I'm saying is the only way to address this problem. What I have reiterated is my call to have an emergency summit by Xi Jinping, Putin, Trump, Modi, as a minimum combination, to address all these problems. Because it's very clear that we need an international cooperation concerning the coronavirus pandemic. This is already threatening the international financial system: We saw, in the last several weeks, several plunges, absolutely of the same dimension as after the 2008 systemic collapse, or after the September 11, 2001 attack; and only because the central banks have now decided to flood the markets, to lower the interest rates – like the Bank of England lowered the interest rate by a half-percent, 50 basis points, today – as if the simple pushing of liquidity would remedy any of the real, physical causes for why the system is collapsing. So, I want to have a mobilization of the population to demand that the leaders of the most important governments – of the United States, Russia, China, and India – need to discuss the Four Points which were proposed by my late husband Lyndon LaRouche, in June 2014, because you need to have an immediate end of the global casino economy, by implementing a Glass-Steagall system; we have discussed this many times on this program, but it is the only combination of measures which would address the problem. Then, you need a national bank in every country; in Germany, we could extend the functions of the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau; have a national bank in every other country; have an international cooperation among these national banks, reinstate fixed exchange rates, and then have agreements about industrial development projects, like the industrial development of Southwest Asia, of Africa, and this will become then, a New

Bretton Woods system. There must be cooperation with the Chinese New Silk Road to have these kinds of development plans. And we need a crash program to go into a new platform of higher productivity of the economy, joint cooperation in advanced technologies, like fusion, like biophysics, like space research cooperation. And then, such a summit could implement these measures, and then could have a series of such summits, and that way change the geopolitics, and move towards an international cooperation, a shared future of humanity.

And that shift has to occur. And I'm predicting, and I think I'm on the safe side in doing so, that the crisis will accelerate, there will be many more unfortunate consequences, and people will recognize that to establish a completely different level of thinking will be the only way out for all of mankind.

If you agree with that, you should help this mobilization. There is a resolution, which is attached to this webcast [https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/four_laws_new], please sign it, please spread it among your friends and colleagues, get more people to sign it: Because we need a public discussion about this, and public demand that the whole world should move into a completely new way of cooperating and solving these kinds of problems.

SCHLANGER: I've received a few emails from people who have asked, why do we focus on "neo-liberalism" as the problem? What does that have to do with the virus? And I think it's important to look at what Dr. Redfield of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) had to say about the need to rebuild the system: That the so-called "just-in-time" system, which has been accepted as an economic model doesn't work. We need redundancy. And Helga, I think it would be very useful for you to just review again, why this neo-liberal system is the cause, or sets humanity up for these kinds of crises. Because this is what your husband was warning, going back to 1971, with the Biological Holocaust Task Force he set

up, and so on.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The prognosis of Lyndon LaRouche, which he made on Aug. 15, 1971, when Nixon dissolved the Bretton Woods system by going to floating exchange rates, by decoupling the dollar from the gold-reserve standard and that way, opening the deregulation of the markets which has escalated ever since. My husband at that point had made the prognosis that if the West would continue on this road, of liberalizing the markets, of going with neo-liberal, monetarist policies, that it would end up in a new depression and the danger of a new fascism; or, one would go to a completely new economic system.

Now, that prognosis has proven to be absolutely on the mark. And the Biological-Ecological Holocaust Task Force which you just mentioned, he set up in 1974, and it was to study the effects of the policies of the IMF and World Bank on the economic system, especially in the developing sector. And in meantime, we have produced *many* studies, which you can all see in our archives, that if you impose such austerity or zero growth policies, especially on the developing countries, that you would inevitably cause the emergence of old diseases and new diseases, because you cannot consistently lower the living standard of entire continents, as the IMF and World Bank have done in the last 50 years, without creating conditions of breakdown. And that is exactly what you see right now: Because you don't have only the coronavirus crisis, you have the locust situation getting completely out of control in many African states, in the Horn of Africa, and in the Arabian Peninsula and Pakistan-India, even threatening to go into China.

Then, as part of this geopolitical, liberal scheme of the West, the refugee crisis: It's not a natural phenomenon, it is the result of the interventionist wars conducted by the Bush Administrations and Obama, with the idea that you have to spread "democracy" and "human rights" and that it's legitimate to made interventionist wars against Iraq – doesn't matter if

it's based on lies that there are so-called weapons of mass destruction which Nancy Pelosi, in the meantime has admitted that they all knew it was lie and they did it anyway; Iraq, Afghanistan – these are all the reasons why you have a refugee crisis. The underdevelopment of Africa is a result of these policies.

So that is why I am saying, if we don't get rid of this paradigm, which has many elements – it has geopolitics, it has neo-liberal economic policies; but it also a Malthusian dimension to it. The Green axiom which says that nature, or some spiders or some ants somewhere are more important than human beings; and I even go so far as to say that I think the reason why there is such an absolutely bestial attitude – I mean, on the coronavirus, do you think that most African countries or Asian and Latin American countries that do not have the health systems we have, do you think they are testing their people? I don't think so. So the figures are in all likelihood completely off, and the ability of these countries to remedy it is much, much less. And I'm absolutely convinced that there are some people who say, "Oh, there are too many people anyway," like Bertrand Russell, who said, you need a pandemic every generation – these are quotes we have published many times! And the absolutely disgusting way how the EU is dealing with the refugee crisis, now again erupting at the Turkish-Greek border, that is a mindset which is disgusting! And it is the reflection of geopolitics, of the Malthusian idea that there are too many people anyway.

Now, Erdoğan, obviously, is playing his own, terrible games. But I think in this moment, where innocent people who have nothing, – the whole thing is that these refugees, even if they're sitting in camps for years on end, and have begun speaking Turkish, and now Erdoğan is instrumentalizing them, that may all be true – that's what the Greeks are saying – but what is the solution to that? You have to stop insisting that you have regime change in Syria, that has to stop. There has

to be recognition that the only legitimate government in Syria is the one which the Syrian people themselves elect. There was a constitutional process under way, which is now stopped again; that has to be resumed. There has to be an end to the war. Turkey should not be backed by NATO – this is an insane idea. The U.S. special envoy for Syria James Jeffrey just demanded that NATO should fully back up Turkey against Syria, that is complete insanity: What needs to be done is you have to have peace with Syria, and then you have to have an orderly negotiation between the Assad government and the opposition, to arrange for the return of the Syrians to their own country, which is what most people want to do, anyway.

So I think all of these assumptions, that you just keep going with the policies which have proven to be a failure, that that has to absolutely stop. I don't see a sign that the European establishment is capable of doing it. That just means we need a mobilization of the population, because this is becoming a serious existential crisis for all of us, and we have to take responsibility to put in a new paradigm – a paradigm of cooperation, and then we can solve most problems; at least over time, we can find solutions to such problems as coronavirus. But we need to change the view of the West towards China and Russia, and this whole idea that regime change is allowed under the pretext of spreading democracy and human rights, is one of these imperial, colonialist ideas which have to go.

SCHLANGER: Another perfect example of that is the expansion of sanctions against Iran and Venezuela for regime change, in the face of this growing pandemic.

I'd like to come back to one other point, which I think you alluded to earlier, which is the financial crisis: We now see, if something is going to be quarantined, we ought to quarantine Wall Street and the Bank of England. The idea that lower interest rates will solve something, but what's going on with the repo lending, the incredible demand for liquidity

without any concern for solvency, this is the other aspect of Mr. LaRouche's warnings over many years.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I don't know how long this will continue. And I think what the central banks are proposing is completely irresponsible, because the continuous flooding of the markets with money, and the idea to go even to negative interests rates, all of this is already eating up the savings and life's earnings of the population, and is threatening at some point to go into a hyperinflation. So these derivatives must be absolutely written off – this is why Glass-Steagall is so crucial – and I think the whole EU program as it was announced by EU Commission President Ursula von der Leyen, in this presence of this deplorable Greta Thunberg, that has to go, too! Because you cannot have an industrial state and implement these policies. I think if you want to have hospitals, if you want to have enough intensive care units to deal with such a situation, you have to have a productive society. And that Green policy of von der Leyen it has to go. We need the full package that I talked about before: Glass-Steagall, and the return to Hamiltonian banking, which every time there was a successful economic system in history, whether it was the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt, whether it was the reconstruction of Germany in the postwar period, these were the principles which were applied, and that is what is urgently required.

SCHLANGER: And while this is all going on, we have this incredible soap opera in U.S. politics around the Democratic nomination. I think it would be very useful, as we come toward the end of this webcast, for you to emphasize again, what do you think people should do, to make sure we can change the paradigm? There's a hunger for change, people are still extremely unhappy, and now, very nervous, both because of the financial crisis and the coronavirus, what should people do? How should they respond?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Since you mentioned the U.S. situation, I think it's a big problem, because, unfortunately Trump said he had a

hunch that the mortality rates of the coronavirus is much less than what the World Health Organization was saying. Now, I think that he's probably saying that because of the election campaign and he thinks that this will intervene. But I think the reality will assert itself very quickly: This will come as fast as it came in Europe, maybe faster even, and the U.S. right now is really unprepared! The health delivery system was taking even more than in Europe. The Democrats have this Biden now as a major candidate – I can only advise people, there is a very interesting collection of videos which was published by *Consortium News*, the author is Caitlin Johnstone [<https://consortiumnews.com/2020/03/06/stop-calling-it-a-stutter-dozens-of-examples-show-bidens-dementia-symptoms/>], and she collected about 20 or so videos of speeches of Biden where you clearly can see that he doesn't have it any more – he's lost it. So the idea to somebody who has clear signs of aging (to put it mildly), to think that you can run him through the Democratic Convention, the election campaign, and then win the election in November against Trump, is also a sign of extreme mental deterioration of the people who think they can do that and get away with it.

So if you look at all of these things, we need a completely new thinking: We are in a Dark Age, the Dark Age is absolutely comparable to the 14th century when the Black Death killed one-third of the European population, and people just went crazy! You see signs of this insanity, already now, and we need therefore, a completely different approach, like it came with the 15th century and the Golden Renaissance in Italy. We can talk about that some other time, but, I think people have to really recognize, we are in a Dark Age, and we have to reject all the assumptions which have led to this present situation.

And I actually would like to make one other point: I think the coronavirus will force lockdowns, it will force measures, schools and universities are already closed for several weeks

in several countries; you don't know yet what will be the effect of all of this on the financial system, on the real economy, and I think on these circumstances, where Merkel is talking about 70% of the population will become infected, and if you assume worldwide it may be 100 million people, and then, if you take present mortality rates, it will be 2-4 million people – under these circumstances, we should not have war games. And therefore, I think we need to stop the present NATO maneuver in Eastern Europe, the Defender-Europe 2020: Because obviously, the virus does not stop in front of the military. And to have these kinds of things going on, when you have an immediate health threat to the population, is really something which doesn't make any sense. So this NATO maneuver should stop. Presently I think the highest commander of the U.S. forces in Germany is a victim of the coronavirus and is in quarantine in Wiesbaden: So, that should just give people to think that the virus does not stop in the face of the military.

And I think we should go in the direction of mobilizing for the summit: I know people think that this is too big, but sometimes, when you are in a real crisis, only if you reach a completely new level of thinking, namely the idea that all the major countries of the world – the United States, Russia, China, and India, as a minimum; and then other countries can come together with these countries – only if you change the level of thinking, and the level of approach, can you find a solution. So if you agree with that, then help us in this mobilization, because, you know, we will do other things: We will call for the rebuilding of the health delivery system, there are other things we can do. But I think because of the complexity of the world situation, the interaction of all of the elements of the breakdown, that we will not solve the problem unless we go to a completely new paradigm, a new system of international relations, and you should help us in this mobilization, and that's the very best thing you can do for your own life and your own future.

SCHLANGER: And I would recommend, toward that end, that people circulate this webcast, get this webcast around, so people can hear the extent of the crisis and the solutions; and secondly, go to our website, and download the call for emergency summit from Helga Zepp-LaRouche, take that to your city council, to your trade union group – well, maybe you shouldn't go too far, but you can certainly use the internet to get it around and get people signing it and support it.

So, Helga, anything else you want to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No. I think this is a moment where people will be freaked out and it's understandable: But sometimes a shock is also healthy if it helps you to get out of a wrong idea, and to think things through and then move ahead and find a solution. So, I would urge people to overcome your present fears and be confident that if we work together as one humanity, we can solve this.

SCHLANGER: OK, well, with that, we'll see you again, next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

Formand Tom Gillesbergs tale til Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris

Jacques Cheminade, LaRouche-bevægelsens leder i Frankrig og fhv. præsidentkandidat, og Tom Gillesberg på en tidligere konference.

Den 4. februar 2020 organiserede det franske Schiller Institut et meget vellykket seminar i Paris med titlen: "Dialog mellem Kulturerne eller Handelskrig: Frankrig ved en skillevej." Tæt ved hundrede personer – kontakter, diplomater, foreninger, iværksættere og Kinaeksperter – fyldte lokalet på rådhuset i Paris' 5. arrondissement. Såvel Schiller Instituttets internationale grundlægger og præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche som formand for det danske Schiller Institut, Tom Gillesberg, sendte varme hilsner samt meddelelser til begivenheden.

Meddelelse fra Tom Gillesberg, formand for det Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:

Jeg er ked af, at jeg på grund af sygdom ikke kan være med jer i dag, men her er nogle tanker jeg gerne vil dele med jer.

I Danmark, og i resten af Skandinavien, har vi gennem de sidste par år set en voksende kampagne i medierne – og med støtte fra efterretningstjenester og regeringsinstitutioner – for at dæmonisere Kina, i lighed med, hvad der igennem nogen tid har været tilfældet for Rusland. Presset kommer fra USA og deres kontrollanter i Storbritannien, og udøves ofte gennem "soft power" ved at sprede historier om Kina såvel som Rusland der skal vise, at de er diktaturer, som man virkelig ikke kan stole på. På det seneste er dette set i den massive kampagne imod at lade det kinesiske firma Huawei, verdens førende leverandør af G5-teknologi, levere udstyret til det nye G5-netværk i Danmark og på Færøerne. Nogle prøver endda at bruge udbruddet af en ny form for koronavirus i Wuhan som et eksempel på, hvordan Kina og dets indflydelse verden over bringer os alle i fare.

Derfor besluttede Schiller Instituttet i Danmark i 2017 at imødegå denne voksende fjendtliggørelse med et projekt for en "Dialog mellem Kulturerne". Sammen med venner, der var aktive i det dansk-russiske samfund, arrangerede vi en koncert, hvor vi havde klassisk musik og dans fra Rusland, Kina, Afrika, Indonesien og mange europæiske lande, for at vise, hvor

berigede vi alle bliver ved at få adgang til alle disse andre nationers kultur. Kinas Kulturinstitut i København var også medsponsor, og arrangementet blev afholdt i det russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur.

Koncerten var en stor succes. Vi havde en fuldt pakket sal, og på trods af at vi fik ekstra stole bragt ind, var vi nødt til at afvise mange der kom. Publikum blev imponeret og bevæget af mangfoldigheden og skønheden af bidragene ved koncerten. Især afsyngningen af en kinesisk folkesang af en kinesisk studerende sammen med Feride Istogu Gillesberg, vicepræsident for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og hovedorganisator af begivenheden, betog publikum. Hvordan er det muligt, at en europæer kan synge på kinesisk og skabe så bevægende og smuk musik?

Siden dengang har vi haft yderligere to meget succesfulde koncerter, med fremtrædende og smuk deltagelse fra både russiske og kinesiske musikere, og musikere af høj kvalitet fra mange andre lande. Vi er blevet lovet, at den årlige koncert i 2020 kan finde sted i Kinas kulturcenters nyistandsatte faciliteter i København, som snart åbner.

Samtidigt har vi forsøgt at få information om Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet ud til offentligheden på enhver måde, vi kan. I København afholdt Schiller Instituttet et seminar sammen med 'Confucian Business Institute' ved CBS, og i Sverige har Schiller Instituttet samarbejdet om stiftelsen af BRIX, Bælte- og Vej-Instituttet i Sverige. BRIX har afholdt en række seminarer med pæn deltagelse fra akademikere og industrifolk, der er blevet adresseret i fællesskab af den kinesiske ambassadør og ledende medlemmer af BRIX og Schiller Instituttet. På samme tid har vi intervenseret i mange møder og diskussioner om Kina, der finder sted i Danmark og Sverige, for at sikre, at den rigtige historie om Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet – og nødvendigheden af at de vestlige landes aktivt deltager i dette store foretagende for menneskeheden – kommer ud, så de løgne og falske bagtalelser om det i

'mainstream' medierne bliver modsagt.

Som det ses med udbruddet af det nye koronavirus i Wuhan er der mange udfordringer, når man søger at løfte 1,4 milliarder mennesker ud af dyb fattigdom og at blive en moderne nation. På trods af fremragende nationalt lederskab, kan lokal inkompetence skabe store problemer. Men jeg er sikker på, at Kina vokser med udfordringen, og vi ser nu, at den kinesiske regering intet sparer for at besejre denne trussel imod menneskeheden bestående af sygdom og død.

Da den nationale regering først blev opmærksom på epidemien, handlede den hurtigt for at besejre den. Oplysninger om koronavirus blev hurtigt sendt ud over hele verden, og resten af verden kunne forsvare sig mod sygdommen på en måde, som den lokale regering i Wuhan undlod at gøre. Og forhåbentligt vil samarbejdet mellem Kina og medicinske forskningscentre i resten af verden snart føre til behandling og en vaccine. I mellemtiden yder Kina enorme menneskelige og økonomiske ofre for at få epidemien under kontrol, og udgør menneskehedens bolværk imod en verdensomspændende pandemi.

Forhåbentligt vil de enorme ressourcer, som nu indsættes i Kina, og med hjælp fra verdenssamfundet, bære frugt, og besejre den nye koronavirus. Og forhåbentlig bliver det et eksempel på, hvordan Kina og verden kan arbejde sammen om en endnu farligere dræber: fattigdom. Kina har vist, hvordan det har været muligt at løfte 850 millioner kinesere ud af dyb fattigdom. Og med Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet har de igangsat det største udviklingsprojekt, som menneskeheden nogensinde har set. Vi behøver fuldt internationalt samarbejde for at sikre sejr over fattigdom overalt i verden, ved at anvende videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt til først at etablere den nødvendige infrastruktur, og derefter den nødvendige industrielle udvikling, til at løfte hele menneskeheden ud af fattigdom.

Men hvis Danmark og andre vestlige lande skal deltage i disse,

for menneskeheden nødvendige tiltag, må vi først besejre det mentale angreb, der finder sted imod befolkningens sindelag. Kina og Rusland er ikke vores fjender, men er vores vigtige samarbejdspartnere i sikringen af den bedst mulige fremtid for hele menneskeheden. Lad os derfor erstatte den kunstigt skabte frygt og splittelse med en dialog mellem kulturerne, og lad os alle deltage i Bælte- og Ve-Initiativet. Så vil vi se en verdensomspændende renæssance af de bedste bidrag fra alle de forskellige kulturer, og vi vil se en eksplosion af menneskelig kreativitet og udvikling, der ikke alene forvandler livet på Jorden, men også vores solsystem, og det der ligger derudover, når vi får ubegrænset billig energi på Jorden ved at høste helium-3 på Månen og bruge det til fusionsenergi, som kineserne har tænkt sig at gøre.

Se på 'Verdens-Landbroen'. Dette er det levende billede af de smukke ord, som vi hører i Beethovens 9. symfoni:

Seid umschlungen, Millionen!
Diesen Kuss der ganzen Welt!
Brüder! über'm Sternenzelt
muss ein lieber Vater wohnen.

Vær omfavnede, millioner!
Dette kys til hele verden!
Brødre, over stjerneteltet
må der bo en kærlig far.

Og den kærlige far bliver realiseret gennem vores handlinger; mænds og kvinders handlinger for at forandre verden til det bedre.

Tom Gillesberg på Radio 4 om magnettog over Kattegat den 20. januar 2020. 18 min.

Lydfil:

Magnettog over Kattegat: Tom Gillesberg på Radio 4

Den 20. januar 2020 kontaktede programmet 4- toget på den nye nationale radiostation Radio4 Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark og tidligere kandidat til Folketinget, og interviewede ham i 18 minutter om at opføre en magnettoglinje på tværs af Kattegat (en del af Toms slogan til Folketinget i 2007 var »Efter finanskrisen – magnettog over Kattegat«). Dette skete dagen efter, at regeringen besluttede at videreføre en forundersøgelse af bygningen af en kommende Kattegatbro, men i modsætning til den forrige regering, inkludere en togforbindelse.

Tom Gillesberg havde mulighed for at diskutere mange ting, deriblandt: Kina og Japan udvikler nye magnettog; Den Nye Silkevej; fordelene ved at gå til et højere teknologisk niveau; at tænke ud fra fremtidens teknologier og ikke reparere tidligere teknologier; at broen kunne betale sig selv ved at øge produktiviteten i den samlede økonomi; at han kunne forudsige den økonomiske nedsmeltning i 2008, fordi han lyttede til Lyndon LaRouche; behovet for videnskabelig og teknologisk fremskridt, inklusive fusionsenergi, i stedet for at blive et friluftsmuseum med forældede teknologier som træflis og vindmøller. Efterfølgende sagde en af værterne, »Jeg håber, at DSB lyttede med. Det var oplysning, om noget.«

Her er interviewet på 4-Togets podcast. Interviewet er fra tidspunktet 6:21 til 25:11:

http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Tom-Magnettog-real-one_4_toget.mp3

Her er vores optagelse mens vi lyttede til interviewet:

Interviewet med Tom Gillesberg er også tilgængeligt på www.radio4.dk/programmer/ . Kik efter program *4-togets* podcast side den 20. januar 2020 time 2, tidspunktet 6:21 til 25:11.



Fra Transport og Boligministeriet pressemeddelelse den 19. januar 2020:



Billedet fra Transportministeriet.

Regeringen vil fortsat undersøge en fast forbindelse over Kattegat

Regeringen har besluttet at videreføre den igangværende forundersøgelse af en fast forbindelse over Kattegat, som blandt andet ser på mulighederne for en kombineret vej- og jernbaneforbindelse. Transportministeren offentliggør i dag delkommissorierne for de videre undersøgelser.

19. januar 2020

Regeringen ser store perspektiver i en fast Kattegatforbindelse, som vil kunne binde Øst- og Vestdanmark tættere sammen og forkorte rejsetiden mellem landets to største byer med op til halvanden time for både bilister og togrejsende. Regeringen har derfor videreført forundersøgelsen af projektet på finansloven, ligesom regeringen i dag offentliggør delkommissorierne for undersøgelserne.

Regeringen er optaget af, at vi med forundersøgelsen får belyst de klima- og miljømæssige aspekter ved at anlægge en fast Kattegatforbindelse.

– Det er afgørende, at vi undersøger en kombineret vej- og jernbaneforbindelse og ikke bare en ren vejforbindelse, som

den forhenværende minister oprindeligt ønskede, siger transportminister Benny Engelbrecht ...

[Resten af pressemeddelelsen kan læses her.](#)

Lang video: EN MUSIKALSK DIALOG MELLEM KULTURER den 29. november

Se også en video trailer 6 min.:

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Arrangører: Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog,
Det Russiske Hus og Det Kinesiske Kulturcenter

EN MUSIKALSK DIALOG
MELLEM KULTURER

Gratis adgang
29. november 2019 kl. 19

Russisk Center for Videnskab og Kultur
Vester Voldgade 11, København, ved Rådhuspladsen

Medvirkende: Musikere fra Kina, Rusland, Albanien, Poland,
Sverige og Danmark (se billedet)

Også: DANMARK: SCHILLER INSTITUTTETS KOR

I en tid, hvor der er alt for meget politisk splid i verden, og verdens lande i stedet burde arbejde sammen om

menneskehedens fælles mål, er det ekstra vigtigt, at vi på alle måder bygger bro mellem verdens nationer og de mange forskelligartede kulturer. Når vi oplever det skønne i andre kulturer, skaber det gensidig forståelse og et grundlag for samarbejde og fred. Klassisk kunst er derfor en vigtig nøgle til en sådan dialog mellem kulturer, og det er grunden til, at vi afholder denne koncert!

Info: 25 12 50 33, 53 57 00 51
si@schillerinstitut.dk

Video og afskrift: Fejring af Berlin murens fald og Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag.

Konference i NYC med Helga Zepp-LaRouche som hovedtaler den 11. november 2019 (på engelsk)

A Three-Fold Anniversary

Address by Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Se afskriftet nedenunder)

Excerpt from video: "The Lost Chance of 1989"

Schubert/Schiller: Die Hoffnung

Michelle Erin, soprano – Margaret Greenspan, piano – Elliot

Greenspan, speaker

Schubert/Schiller: An Emma

John Sigerson, tenor – Margaret Greenspan, piano

Shakespeare: Luciana's Monologue from Comedy of Errors, Act 3,
Scene 2

Leah DeGruchy

Max Caspar on Kepler as a Philosophical Mind

John Sigerson

Schiller: "Die Teilung der Erde"

Frank Mathis

Schubert/Schober: "An die Musik"

Lisa Bryce, soprano – Richard Cordova, piano

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

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

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

[her.](#)

Læs også afskriftet (på engelsk) nedenunder.

Trailer:

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

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

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

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

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

Afskrift på engelsk:

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

The Case for the Exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche

June 21, 2019

[music]

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

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

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

Now, I'm saying this because to put a man of great ideas into jail is a crime all by itself, because of the ideas. The reason why we were able to mobilize hundreds of parliamentarians and thousands of VIPs from around the globe – why would people from Africa sign the parole request for Lyndon LaRouche? Why would people from Latin America do this? Why would people from around the world, from Russia; why would people come out of completely different cultural

worlds to fight for this man? Well, because we not only said this man must be free and his innocence must be proven, but they, many of them told me and others that they understand that the kind of change in global policy my husband is standing for, the kind of just new world economic order which allows the economic development of Africa; which allows the economic development of the developing countries, of Eastern Europe, they say is the only hope for them, for their nation, as far away as it may be.

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

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

NARRATOR: On August 31st and September 1st, 1995, a series of extraordinary hearings were convened in Tysons Corner, Virginia, to investigate gross misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice. The hearings were chaired by former U.S. Congressman James Mann of South Carolina and J.L. Chestnut of Alabama – the great lawyer and icon of the Civil Rights movement. The hearings focussed on abuses by the U.S. Department of Justice, highlighting the onslaughts of targetted criminal cases against black elected officials in the United States – dubbed “Operation Fruehmenschen” according to FBI whistleblowers and Congressman Merv Dymally of

California; as well as the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

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

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

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

[from Oct. 6, 1986]

NEWS REPORTER 1: The raid command post, about three miles

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

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

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

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

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

In addition the materials specified in the Federal search warrant, according to later court testimony, the FBI case agent in charge was searching for evidence by which to obtain an arrest warrant for Lyndon LaRouche himself and a search warrant to allow armed entry to the farm. A plan was in place to provoke a firefight with LaRouche's security guards, to

take out LaRouche, which was admitted years later.

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

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

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

The first one is that both cases with a British call for prosecution and criminal investigation. In LaRouche's case, British intelligence sent a letter to the FBI in 1982, demanding investigation because LaRouche, the British claimed, was an agent of Soviet disinformation. At the same time, Henry Kissinger and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board triggered a counterintelligence investigation

of LaRouche under Executive Order 12333. In the Trump case, the British government began demanding Trump's head as early as 2015; and have bragged to the {Guardian} and other British newspapers that their spying was the origin of Russiagate.

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

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

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

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

MANN: As we attempt to study the broad subject of misconduct by the Department of Justice ... we cannot overlook the case that is perhaps the most pervasive (and I'm stealing the words from Ramsey Clark, I think), most pervasive course of misconduct by the Department of Justice, in the history of this country: broader-based, longstanding, abuse of power beyond expression, abuse of power through the use of Federal

agencies, including, even, a Bankruptcy Court.

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Well, if you put up No. 2, you'll see that they got that authority from the Director of the FBI, and his blessing: "Authority is granted to anonymously mail copies of the leaflet submitted." Now, I'm not going to bother to show you the leaflet, because it's a piece of scurrilous garbage. It's available for anyone who would like to see it. It was called "The Mouse Crap Revolution," but its intent and purpose was exactly as defined in the letters. {This} is the Department of Justice, {this} is the FBI at work in the 1960s, under – if you look at the bottom – what was called "Cointelpro," or

“Counterintelligence Program.”...

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

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

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

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

Years went by, and the members of the National Caucus of Labor Committees continued their political efforts. Now, they are considered, Mr. LaRouche is considered, extremely controversial by many. Those he's considered controversial by, tend to be those whose policies are inconsistent with his, or those that he has named as operating against the best interests of the society and peoples of the United States. And we all know, that those people tend to be very powerful

people....

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

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

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

Now, what that does, and the words are bad enough, but the reality is terrifying. This triggers the Executive Order I referred to earlier, Executive Order 12333, which allows virtually *{any form of conduct, any activity}*, to be undertaken, as long as it's under this national security cover. So, this was the beginning of a national security-covered operation against Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues....

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

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

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

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

Among those who attended this meeting – and there were several of them, that we have evidence of, collected over a period of years, and admissions by people under oath – were members of

and persons associated with the intelligence community, as well as people with political axes to grind against Mr. LaRouche, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, who has, historically, done everything it could, financially and editorially, to label Mr. LaRouche as an anti-Semite, as a fascist, as a racist, as a "Hitler," a "little Hitler," and some of the most scurrilous names we can imagine hurling in another person's face without basis.

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

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

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

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

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

We sued NBC in Alexandria, Va. As soon as that case was over, NBC in Boston, on the very day – I had finished our presentation and was packing up to go back to Boston,

published a so-called "investigative series" of theirs, alleging that certain persons associated with the LaRouche political campaign, had made false credit charges against certain contributors. And they [NBC] had a couple of contributors who got up and said, "you know, I met these people, and I gave them 35 bucks, and the next thing I knew, there was 100 bucks charged to my credit card."

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

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

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

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

Of course, another thing you'll all recognize from your personal experiences, is that when they want to charge you and they don't have anything, they charge you with conspiracy; because then, they don't have to prove anything! They just go around, tell a bunch of stories, and hope that the jury is

poisoned against you, is going to link it all up somehow, and convict you. So "conspiracy" is the vehicle, and that's precisely what happened in Boston: LaRouche and his colleagues were charged with conspiracy, with a few other specific charges linked on as an afterthought.

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

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

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

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

"Government misconduct." Very seldom do you get a jury to see it, because the government fights you {*nail and tooth*}. They lie, they cover up evidence, they, in fact, deny information to their own agents, so that the agent won't be in a position to have to intentionally not disclose it. These are common tactics, and that's what happened here. Fortunately, in our case, we were able to show enough of it to the jury, so that

the jury got the smell.

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

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

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

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

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

Back in Boston, the grand jury that was investigating the case, held certain businesses associated with Mr. LaRouche in contempt of court, for not producing documents which were

under subpoena, which were being fought during a period of time based on various privacy grounds.

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

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

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

In any event, I want to say that we have fought as vigorously as anyone can through the appeals process, without success and through the {*mandamus*} process, 2255s in federal court. And are now at a stage, where, Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States, who has been with me on all of the appeals, – he joined the effort just after the sentencing of Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues in 1990. Recently, he

wrote a letter to the Attorney General, asking for a departmental review of the LaRouche case. I'd like to read you some portions of his letter. He'll be here tomorrow to speak to you personally. I'd like to leave you with the following words of Ramsey Clark:

"Dear Attorney General Reno,

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

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

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

RAMSEY CLARK: Thank you very much. It's a good feeling to be here with you again this year. I wish I could say it's been a good year for freedom and justice under law, but I can't say that. But at least, in this company, you know that the struggle goes on, and that we shall overcome.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I guess I'm really still caught with the idea, the old idea of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, that is ingrained in a lot of Americans, in particular, young lawyers, who are kind of idealistic and believe in the idea of freedom and the power of the word and the truth. I believe the truth can set us free. I think that's the struggle. The real

struggle, is whether we can see the truth in time... The truth can set us free.

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

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

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

And not only that: then they take people who were contributing and supposed to be paid back their loans to the publisher, and try to prosecute, falsely, on it. They put on witnesses, to give false testimony. From the tens and tens of thousands of contributors, and thousands of people who gave loans, they came up with a baker's dozen, roughly – 13, 14, 15 people – who got their feelings hurt, perhaps. And some who were mean-

spirited enough to lie about it, and who didn't get their money back, although they were being paid back. Because anybody can have financial crunch, where you can't pay back.

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

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

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

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

They were put to trial, without any chance to prepare their case, and they made a valiant effort. And got consecutive sentences – unbelievable...

We've been trying in every way we can, others much more than I, to make the LaRouche case known. I personally have appeared

at meetings in Europe and North America. There have been books and pamphlets and there's a constant flow of literature and verbal communication.

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

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

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

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

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

The **[inaudible 54:09]** rocket docket.

So, we have to find solid means. The media's a great problem. The media's controlled by wealth and power that prefers the

{status quo}, and it's very sophisticated in how it manages these matters. I can take a cause that they're interested in, that's virtually meaningless, and be on prime time evening news. And I can take on a cause of what I consider to be international importance of the highest magnitude, that they oppose, and shout from the rooftops, and you'd never know I existed. That's the way it works.

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

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

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

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

MANN: The session will come to order.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the course of this, a number of these students who participated in these classes, became associated with me, and,

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

And that was essentially our commitment as an association.

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

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

From that point on, during the 1970s, until the end of COINTELPRO, we were constantly beset by the FBI. Our main weapon against the FBI was jokes. We used to make some jokes about the FBI, which we would pass around, to try to persuade

them to keep off our tail, but they kept coming, and all kinds of harassment.

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

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

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

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

In January of 1984, this attack came into the open, launched by NBC-TV, which had been a participant in this salon of

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

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

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

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

In 1982-83, there were two things which greatly excited my enemies. Number one, I had been involved, in 1982, in presenting a proposal which was based on my forecast in the spring of 1982, that a major debt crisis would break out in South America, Central America, and the expectation that

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

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

This report was published in August of 1982, ironically a few weeks before the eruption of the great Mexico debt crisis of '82, and was presented also to the U.S. government and the National Security Council, for the President's information at that time. There was some effort, on the part of the President of Mexico, to implement my proposal in the initial period of the debt crisis. He had, at that time, some support from the President of Brazil and the government of Argentina. But under pressure from the United States, the government of Brazil and Argentina capitulated, and President José López Portillo, the President of Mexico, was left, shall we say, "hanging out to

dry.”

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

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

And so, from February of 1982, through February of 1983, I did conduct such back-channel discussions with representatives of the Soviet government in Washington, D.C. Those were somewhat fruitful, but ultimately abortive. Kissinger and others became aware of this discussion, during the summer of 1982, and their circles were very much opposed to that. The general view was expressed, that I was getting “too big for my britches,” and I had to be dealt with: on the question of debt, which some of these people were concerned about, and on this question of strategic missile defense, where I had this proposal, which the President adopted, at least initially, in the form of what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. And when the Strategic Defense Initiative was announced by the President on March 23, 1983, there were a lot of people out for my scalp.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MANN: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

They run to this way and that way.

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

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

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

Now, we don't know who among us is going to be the great leader of this period. But we know, as the civil rights people of the 1960s, who had been at the civil rights business for many centuries, in point of fact, many of them with a conscious family tradition. They assembled together. They picked people from their midst as leaders; and among these leaders, was a Martin Luther King.

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

[closing music]

Foredrag #4 (18. maj): Italiensk Videnskab og Kultur

Talere: Liliana Gorini, John Sigerson

Lyndon 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.

Grundlæggende er der imidlertid ikke noget specifikt italiensk knyttet til disse fremskridt; Italien er den gode muldjord, som bærer de nuværende frugter af de platoniske ideer, der opstod i det gamle Grækenland, videreført af Nicolaus Cusanus, Johannes Kepler, den tyske matematiker og fysiker Bernhard Riemann, og det musikalske geni Wilhelm Furtwängler. Furtwängler var omtrent ene om at redde den

europæiske musikkultur fra at blive destrueret af den britiske *golem* Adolf Hitler. Senere blev han den ledende inspiration for LaRouches insisteren på at musik ikke udfoldes i lyd, men i det riemannske komplekse domæne.

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.

Schiller Instituttes foretræde for Erhvervsudvalget den 22. november 2018

Kun Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og et Nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem kan forhindre finanssammenbrud

Jeg er Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark. Tak fordi vi måtte komme.

Den danske offentlighed har haft en brat opvågning til den sande tilstand i den danske finansverden. Danske Bank har i årevis været dybt involveret i hvidvask af enorme pengebeløb og både bankens ledelse og Finanstilsynet svigtede totalt, når de gennem mange år blev gjort opmærksom på problemet. Andre af de store SIFI-banker i Danmark er samtidigt blevet afsløret i medhjælp til skatteunddragelse og svigt i deres bekæmpelse af svindel og hvidvask. Endelig har mange af de danske banker, i lighed med deres internationale kolleger, været medvirkende til at den danske og udenlandske statskasser er blevet plyndret gennem svigagtige udbytteskatrefusioner. Alt dette viser, at det ikke drejer sig om enkelte problemer eller enkelte brodne kar, men er et systemisk problem, hvor hele bank- og finansverdenen er gennemsyret af ukontrolleret grådighed, hvor man sætter sin egen finansielle vinding over

loven og det almene vel. Politikken med afregulering, og med at lade finansverdenen styre sig selv, har spillet fallit.

Dette var egentlig allerede tydeligt i forbindelse med nedsmeltningen af det internationale finansielle system i 2007-2008. Jeg, og andre aktivister fra Schiller Institutet, advarede om dette allerede i 2007, da jeg stillede op til Folketinget med sloganet: Efter finanskrakket – Magnettog over Kattegat. Men man sad vore advarsler overhørigt. Da vi så efter krakket i 2008 – hvor kun en dansk statsgaranti, der dækkede alle finansielle institutioner, forhindrede en nedsmeltning i den danske bankverden – kom med forslag til, hvordan vi kunne rense op i finansverdenen gennem en gennemførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, hvor man i processen vil skille skidt fra kanel – udskille samfundsvigtig normal bankaktivitet fra kasinoøkonomi – så nægtede man på institutionelt hold i Danmark og resten af den vestlige verden atter at lytte. Man ville ikke gøre op med den usunde adfærd i finansverdenen, der havde skabt sammenbruddet i 2008. Havde man nemlig ikke afreguleret hele den finansielle sektor, og i 1999 afskaffet Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingen i USA, så havde vi nemlig undgået finanskrisen.

Men nu blev fokuset at redde bankerne – og alle andre aktører i finansverdenen – med bankpakker og kvantitative lempelser; på bekostning af realøkonomien og almindelige menneskers levestandard. Derfor står vi i dag over for en kommende finanskrise, der er potentielt langt værre end den, som vi oplevede i 2008. De danske tiltag med at lade banker og realkreditselskaber polstre sig (med kundernes penge) vil ikke forhindre en ny krise. Uden en opdeling af aktiviteterne i de finansielle supermarkeder har vi stadig, som i 2007-2008, ingen branddøre, der kan forhindre, at ildebrand i en del af finansverdenen spreder sig til hele det finansielle hus.

Det forestående finanssammenbrud

Der er mange tikkende bomber under det internationale finanssystem. I kølvandet på den amerikanske føderalbanks rentestigninger er der stadig flere advarsler om en kommende nedsmeltning af det 3.500 mia. dollars store marked for amerikansk virksomhedsgæld, hvor stadig mere usikre lån bliver pakket om og gensolgt i mange forskellige forklædninger – i lighed med dårlige amerikanske boliglån i 2007-2008. Dette har fået følgeskab af nedgang på børserne og et kraftigt fald i den økonomiske vækst i USA og Europa. Bank for International Settlements advarede om denne farlige udvikling i sin årlige rapport i juli og noget lignende gjorde Bank of England i oktober. Så kom IMF's udtrykkelige advarsel om faldende virksomhedsobligationsmarkeder i IMF-bloggen den 12. november.

Et kollaps af markedet for virksomhedsgæld vil have større konsekvenser end kollapset af den amerikanske subprimelånboble i 2008. Når først krisen er udløst, vil det ramme bankerne verden rundt, og bag den blankpolerede overflade er de blevet endnu større og endnu mere bankerotte, end de var i 2008. I lighed med optakten til krisen i 2007-2008 har der også været et kollaps og en kapitalflugt fra de såkaldte "emerging markets" og det gigantiske uregulerede marked for finansielle derivater kan implodere når som helst.

Løsningen

Der er ingen lille lappeløsning, der kan rette op på dette, men Schiller Instituttet og den internationale LaRouche-bevægelse har fremlagt en sammenhængende løsning for, hvordan vi kan bortoperere den spekulative kræftsvulst og skabe kreditter til produktive investeringer – både på internationalt plan og her i Danmark.

1. Vi skal med i Den Nye Silkevej

Mens størstedelen af økonomien i den vestlige verden har ligget underdrejet i de seneste 10 år – hvor de fleste har oplevet en faldende levestandard – så har man i Kina oplevet fortsat kraftig økonomisk vækst og været i stand til at løfte stadig flere mennesker ud af fattigdom. Man brugte krisen i 2008 til at påbegynde massive infrastrukturprojekter, så Kina har nu flere kilometer højhastighedstog end resten af verden tilsammen. Man har bygget nye byer, vandprojekter, kraftværker og anden infrastruktur, der gør det muligt at tage sig af en voksende befolkning med en stigende levestandard.

I 2013 lancerede Kinas præsident Xi Jinping så denne udviklingspolitik på internationalt plan med Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, også kaldet Den Nye Silkevej, der i dag er 12 gange større end USA's Marshallplan efter 2. verdenskrig og som over 60 lande nu deltager i. Danmark burde være en fremtrædende del af denne udviklingsdagsorden, specielt i Afrika og Sydvestasien.

2. Et Nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem

Den 30. november er der G20-topmøde i Argentina, og Schiller instituttet har foreslået, at topmøderne mellem præsident Trump, Xi Jinping og Putin bruges til at etablere et nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem, i samarbejde med Indiens premierminister Modi. En ny version af det gamle fastkurssystem, der blev etableret efter 2. verdenskrig, men nu for at skabe langfristede kreditter til udvikling af alle nationer. Dette er det eneste, som kan forhindre, at den igangværende disintegration af det nuværende City of London- og Wall Street-baserede finanssystem fører til kaos og mulig krig.

3. LaRouches fire love

I Danmark kan vi i mellemtiden forberede tiltag, der kan beskytte vores økonomi imod den kommende finansielle tsunami. Schiller Instituttet har fremlagt Lyndon LaRouches fire love, der er en konceptuel drejebog for at få vores økonomi drejet væk fra finansiel spekulation og tilbage til fysisk økonomi og videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt:

- Gennemførelsen af en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling af den danske finanssektor, hvor vi sanerer banksystemet og adskiller normal bankaktivitet fra finansiel spekulation. De finansielle supermarkeder skal opdeles i normale banker, investeringsbanker, realkreditaktivitet og forsikringsvirksomhed. Bankerne og andre finansielle institutioner skal opdeles og reduceres i størrelse, så de ikke længere udgør en systemisk risiko, og den statslige indskudsgaranti vil kun gælde for normale banker.
- Vi må skabe statskreditter til produktive investeringer i økonomien;
- Vi må kanalisere en del af disse kreditter ind i store infrastrukturprojekter og andet, der kan øge produktiviteten og energigennemstrømningstætheden i økonomien og skabe den næste højere økonomiske platform for Danmark, som f.eks. en Kattegatbro og et nationalt magnettoget, og faste forbindelser mellem Helsingør og Helsingborg og under Femern Bælt.
- Vi må investere massivt i forskning og udvikling af de områder, som skaber fremtidens teknologier som f.eks. kernekraft, fusionsenergi, rumforskning etc.

Den største fejl, som vi kan begå, er at tro, at vi kan overlade disse spørgsmål til den finansielle verden. Den har bevist, at den hverken har det moralske kompas eller de nødvendige løsninger, til at sikre vores fremtid. Derfor må staten nu påtage sig sit ansvar, og etablere de nødvendige love og regler, der kan sikre det almene vel og Danmarks og

danskernes fremtid. Det er der, i lyset af de seneste bankskandaler, en bred offentlig opbakning til.

Tak for ordet.

Slides fra mødet:



Opdel Danske Bank: Hvad er Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling? Fra arkivet.

Schiller Instituttet har kørt en kampagne i mange år for at indføre Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i alle nationer. F. eks. stillede aktivister fra Schiller Instituttets Venner op til folketingsvalg i 2013 udenfor partierne med det berømte slogan: "Glass-Steagall – eller kaos".

“En Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling vil fritage staten og skatteyderne for at skulle dække insolvente bankers spillegæld. Vi vil opdele bankerne i banker, der kun laver normal ind- og udlånsaktiviteter, og som vil have et statsligt sikkerhedsnet, og investeringsbanker a la Saxo-bank, der må leve på egen risiko. Realkreditlån skal igen adskilles fra bankerne og yde billige realkreditlån til kunderne i stedet for være en malkemaskine for bankerne. Der skal ikke længere være »banker, der er for store til at gå ned«, som får bail-out, i form af statslige bankhjælpepakker, eller bliver hjulpet af bail-in-aktioner, som den på Cypern, hvor bankerne får lov til at stjæle bankkundernes penge...”

[Klik her for at læse mere om Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling fra Schiller Instituttets kampagneavis 16 fra 2013 \(html-versionen\), eller læs pdf-versionen nedenfor.](#)

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Bemærkninger af Dennis Speed til Schiller Instituttets mindekoncert med instituttets kor den 11. september i St. Antonius af Padua Kirke i New York

Vi er samlet her, ikke for at mindes en tragedie, men for at afværge den. Selv når vi samles her i aften, som det var tilfældet for 17 år siden, slås der på krigstrommerne af en

gruppe af mennesker i verden, som spænder over forskellige nationer og agenturer, der søger at presse USA til et angreb på Syrien. Et Syrien, som sammen med Rusland og også med bistand fra USA, har reduceret og inddæmnet de kræfter betydeligt, som nogle gange kaldes Al-Nusra, andre gange kaldes al-Qaeda, men altid passende kaldes onde, der var en del af udførelsen af angrebene her for 17 år siden. Angreb, hvor denne kirke og flere andre områder i dette kvarter fungerede som fristed, som nødhjælps-hospitaler, og i nogle tilfælde som stedet, hvor den sidste olie blev givet.

Og det er vores situation i aften. Det er vigtigt at {sige} det, fordi vi er forledt til at tro, i vores verden, at tragedien er en nødvendighed. Det er den ikke. En amerikansk statsmand, en

senator ved navn Richard Black, er for nylig i sidste uge vendt tilbage fra Syrien. Han talte direkte med præsident Assad, og han forsøger, ikke egenhændigt, men meget modigt, at afværge krig. Han er ansat på livstids ved militæret, tidligere kampsoldat og veteran fra Vietnam-krigen, fløj over 200 luftmissioner der, og han har været involveret i den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste i mange årtier. Og som han sagde i et interview, som han gav for nylig, kunne han som kampsoldat ikke vende ryggen til sit flag, marineinfanteriets flag, for at tillade at USA endnu en gang forsøger at udføre en blind, forkert intervention. Og i dette tilfælde, ville skæbnens ironi være, at i en sådan intervention ville det være USA som yder luftstøtten til samme al-Nusra og Al-Qaeda-styrker, der deltog i 9/11 angrebet.

Hvornår vil krigen ophøre? Krigen vil ophøre, når menneskeheden vokser op. Beethoven, som vi nogle gange har nævnt, sagde: Hvis folk tog min musik seriøst, ville der ikke være krig. Og i det program, vi har sammensat for denne aften, forsøger vi at trække på, egentlig ikke forskellige genrer af musik, men på det Klassiske princip i musik. Det klassiske princip accepterer ikke, at tragedien er uundgåelig. Ja, der

er græske tragedier, og de er klassiske stykker; men så er der værkerne af digteren Friedrich Schiller. For eksempel i den græske tragedie, som citeret af Robert Kennedy, der, i anledning af mordet på Martin Luther King, sagde: "Selv i vores søvn, vil smerter, som ikke glemmes, falde dråbe efter dråbe på hjertet, indtil til sidst, i vores fortvivlelse, mod vores vilje, visdom kommer, gennem den forfærdende nåde af Gud," og ja, det var synspunktet hos Aeschylus. Men der er en anden indsigt, og det er anskuelsen hos digteren Friedrich Schillers, der sagde:

+++”Et formål, som højere Fornuft, har undfanget, at mænds trængsler trang, ti tusind gange besejret, kan aldrig være forladt.”+++

Formålet med oprettelsen af USA var at skabe frihed, og frihed til tænkning, som forudsætning for statsborgerskab. Og krig, specielt krig der anvendes af finansielle og andre kræfter mod menneskeheden, er en gift for denne frihed. Formålet med USA, og formålet som denne idé blev udbredt og vedtaget over hele verden, betyder, at Amerika ikke er et sted, det er en idé. Denne idé er hvad vi ønsker at styrke i aften, fordi når vi bringer mennesker sammen, og vi bruger musik for at komme ud over det hverdagsagtige, det banale, det bogstavelige, det didaktiske, ideologiske, - kan de bedste sider af vores sind blive parate og væbnet til at vælte vore egne ønsker om uvidenhed, og blindhed.

Som en mand sagde engang, der er ingen rigtige mysterier, der er kun blindhed. Og blindhed kan altid overvindes af sandheden. Men for at befæste velmenende mennesker, der måske har mistet deres retning, skal sandheden nogle gange ikke tales – men synges. Og vi håber, at vi i aften, når vi står her for at ære dem der døde ved bunden af World Trade Center, og dem der er døde efterfølgende på grund af sygdomme og på grund af deres tapre indsats den dag, vi håber, at det vi gør her i aften for at forny vores engagement, og engagement i

selve USA, via idealet om frihed, kan fortsætte gennem skønhed, i stedet for krig.

Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen Webcast, 16. feb., 2018

Gæst Paul Gallagher.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen«. Jeg har inviteret Paul Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for Executive Intelligence Review, på showet i dag, og vi er glade for at du tager dig tid til at komme, Paul. Vi har nu mulighed for at få en meget seriøs og nøgtern diskussion om LaRouches økonomiske program: De »Fire Love«, og lige nu er dørene vidt åbne.

Med udgivelsen af den såkaldte »Udkast til Lovgivning for Genopbygning af Amerikas Infrastruktur« – Dette er programmet fra Trumps Hvide Hus, som blev sendt over til Kongressen. Det blev udgivet mandag. Alt imens indholdet af denne rapport er, for at sige det mildt, uheldigt – det har Wall Streets fingeraftryk over det hele, alene det, at dette forslag er kommet frem; men det er rent ud sagt en total taber, der har galvaniseret diskussionen nationalt, og det er virkelig begyndt at katalysere kongresmedlemmer på begge sider

midtergangen til at begynde at tænke over spørgsmålet på en meget mere seriøs måde: Hvordan finansierer man infrastruktur? Hvis vi taler om \$1,5 billion, hvor skal de komme fra?

(Her følger engelsk udskrift):

And this includes, frankly, Trump himself. As President Trump said in the Letter of Transmission, that was sent over as

the opening to this legislative proposal, he said: "Our nation's

infrastructure is in an unacceptable state of disrepair, which damages our country's competitiveness and our citizens' quality

of life. For too long, lawmakers have invested in infrastructure

inefficiently, ignored critical needs, and allowed it to deteriorate. As a result, the United States has fallen further

and further behind other countries. It is time to give Americans

the working, modern infrastructure they deserve.... My administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact

a law that will enable America's builders to construct the new,

modern, and efficient infrastructure throughout our beautiful land."

Now, on Tuesday, President Trump held an open, televised roundtable with different Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, and this was ostensibly to discuss the

aluminum, steel industries and trade policy around that, but during that roundtable, which was televised, the discussion of the infrastructure program came up. And I'd like to just play a

short clip from that roundtable; this is an exchange between President Trump and Sen. Sherrod Brown [D] from Ohio, and then Senator Blumenthal [D-CT] also gets in on this. And what you hear is that President Trump says, look, I want to have a bipartisan plan. Come back to me with a counterproposal. What

we put out was an opening bid, but I really want a bipartisan plan. I'm ready, willing and able.

So, here's a clip from that roundtable:

[start video]

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I actually think that we can go bipartisan on infrastructure, maybe even more so, than we can on DACA. ... On infrastructure which is the purpose of what we're doing tonight, come back with a proposal. We put in our bid – come back with a proposal. We have a lot of people that are great Republicans that want something to happen. We have to rebuild our country. I said yesterday, we've spent {\$7 trillion} – when

I say "spent," and I mean wasted – not to mention all of the lives, most importantly and everything else – but we've spent \$7

trillion as of about two months ago, in the Middle East – \$7 trillion. And if you want to borrow two dollars to build a road

someplace, including your state, the great state of Ohio, if you

want to build a road, if you want to build a tunnel, or a bridge,

or fix a bridge because so many of them are in bad shape, you can't do it. And yet, we spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East.

Explain that one. [crosstalk]

SEN. SHERROD BROWN: I've love a bipartisan – we have a bipartisan proposal. We can [crosstalk] dollars on it in infrastructure. We're glad to work together on a real

infrastructure bill with real dollars, plus what you can leverage in the communities and private sector.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Do a combination.

SENATOR BROWN: It needs real dollars.

President Trump: I would love to have you get back to us quickly, 'cause we can do this quickly and we have to rebuild our country. We have to rebuild our roads and our bridges and our tunnels, so the faster you get back, the faster we can move. Focus on document this week, if you don't mind, right? But the faster you get back, the faster we move.

SEN. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: I come back to Senator Brown's point, I think there's a opportunity for real bipartisanship here, in these two areas.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I agree, and I'd like you to come back with a suggestion on infrastructure in the plan, and I think that's a bipartisan plan. I really would like to see you come back with a counterproposal on the infrastructure. I think we're going to get that done. I really believe that's – we're going to get a lot of Democrats, we're going to get a lot of Republicans. We're going to get it done. It's something we should do. We have to fix our country: We have to fix our roads and our tunnels and bridges and everything, so, if you can work together on that, and I am ready, willing and able, on infrastructure – that is such a natural for us to get done. And I think we could probably do it.

Thank you all very much. [End video]

OGDEN: So as you can see, asking them to come back with a counterproposal, he said, this is our opening bid, but the point

is clear: Now is the time for us to mobilize like never before,

to put the LaRouche plan on the table. {This} is the counterproposal.

Let me put on the screen here: first we've got our Campaign To Win the Future. This is obviously the national statement of

intent for the elections in 2018. LaRouche PAC is mobilizing a

national movement and galvanizing discussion around this program.

And then the content of that campaign can be seen on the next slide, this is "The Four Laws To Save the United States: The Economics Principles Necessary for a Recovery – Why the United States Must Join the New Silk Road" and this contains full elaboration of Lyndon LaRouche's four economic laws.

So, I know that Paul is very short on time, and I would just like to ask you: Please address what the situation is now in Washington. What's coming out of this release of this so-called

legislative proposal? And what actually has to be done?

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thanks, Matt. My first reaction, when the White House plan was released – I call it the "White House plan," not the Trump plan, but the White House plan – when it was released, was that closed a certain door of people in

elected offices around the country and in Washington, constantly saying

"what is the White House going to come up with? what is the White House going to come up with? what are they going to give

us in the way of what they can get started towards infrastructure investments? because we desperately need it?" And when it finally came out, and it was very, very, very lacking – as you said, a Wall Street plan – that closed a certain door, and immediately, thus, opened another one.

OK, now they have come out with that. Now, we have to come out with something. It's up to the rest of us, particularly those in elected office, but all of us who are active in fighting for this: It's up to us now to shape the alternative, because this one just isn't going to work. And it's good to see that that definitely includes the President – that view. He, on another occasion, immediately after the plan was rolled out on Monday, he said that compared to the tax legislation and the military spending increases and so forth, that this infrastructure plan that the White House has put out, was really quite unimportant. A rather surprising thing for him to say. But it indicated, when it was followed the very next day by the comment you just saw, "give me an alternative," and then the very day after that, in another meeting with members of Congress, when, as soon as he was prompted in any way by any of them, he came out very strongly for increasing the Federal gasoline tax by 25 cents a gallon, and applying that through the Highway Trust Fund, to infrastructure investment – not at all something which is part of the White House plan, so-called; and not part of the Republican leadership's plan at all.

But when he was asked, he went with that. He hasn't said this publicly, but a number of senators and representatives who were at that second meeting, have reported it publicly in the

same way. It's clear that he did say that he was for that increase in the gas tax, and as he said, he would take the political heat for backing it as President, if they would go forward with it.

So you've had, in rapid succession, a number of indications that this plan, as poor as it was that came out from the White House, is not in fact the President's plan, and it simply closes

the door on all this waiting, and now says, where are the alternatives?

And that is very definitely what is in the LaRouche Four Laws, is the one alternative to this that will work.

Let me get into this in another way, unless you want to break it up, Matt. And if you have questions, please, interrupt.

But I wanted to read a piece that was written just two days ago by a Chinese scholar John Gong; he's a very prominent professor University of International Business and Economics in

Beijing; and he's a former executive editor of the {Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies}.

OGDEN: We actually have a slide with the title of that article which was written for China Global Television Network (CGTN), "Make America Great Again – With Chinese Money." And I

can read some of the quotes that people can see on the screen, and then maybe you can address what the content is.

This is what he had to say: "Trump is absolutely right that Americas crippled bridges, potholed highways, and crooked railways cannot wait any longer. America needs to be great again.

The only question is, where is the money coming from?" And then

later in the article he said, "I have a great idea. Bank of China

and other major banks from China are now flush with dollar

cash

and other dollar-denominated liquid assets, totaling over \$3 trillion, mostly in the form of holdings in U.S. Treasury bills

and bonds. This money can be readily used for Chinese investors

to participate in America's infrastructure boom. By that I mean

Chinese investors can participate in those infrastructure projects as active equity investors, and maybe contractors or suppliers at the same time.

"Call it the Belt and Road. Call it

America-belt-America-road. I don't care, as long as China's current

account trade surplus can be somehow transformed into a capital

account stock, in the form of money invested in America as permanent equity shareholders, and more importantly permanent stakeholders of a stable and prosperous Sino-U.S. economic relationship. This could be a win-win mode for both countries."

[<https://news.cgtn.com/news/79596a4d33677a6333566d54/>

share_p.html]

So that's Dr. John Gong.

GALLAGHER: Now, that's very important, in the way it is formulated, in the precision of it. He's talking about Treasury

holdings, – he's not the first Chinese official to do this.

In

fact, a year ago, in late January of 2017, Ding Xuedong, the then-chairman of the Chinese Investment Corp., which is one of their two big sovereign wealth funds, made essentially the same

proposal. He said, we have such and such a volume of long-term

U.S. Treasury holdings, they're not earners, their interest

rates

are very low, their return is very low; we would like to trade them for a long-term investment in a U.S. infrastructure bill, as

he put it. And he, at the time, estimated that really, the need

for investment in the United States for new infrastructure, was

{\$8 trillion}, a figure which may seem impossibly large to many,

but actually isn't.

[http://www.larouche.com/pr/2017/170116_chinese_invest.html]

Nonetheless, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has written in articles which have been published in the Chinese press, she's frequently

interviewed and quoted there, – she has written exactly this proposal in articles which have been published there. I have presented exactly this idea to Chinese officials in Washington.

This is part of LaRouche's Four Laws.

But to start with, the first action implied by his four actions that have to be taken legislatively and from an executive

standpoint, is the restoration of the Glass-Steagall Act and the

breakup of the Wall Street banks and the hiving off of all of the

casino speculative investment vehicles, special purpose vehicles

and all of that, in order to protect and use the commercial banking system for investments.

You cannot get to real, major infrastructure renewal without doing that, and you could see this in the meeting that you played

the clip from. There was at least one representative from Missouri, who brought up the issue, when the discussion was

about

trade, and specifically whether there might be tariffs against aluminum imports from China, he brought up the fact that there is

a grave lack of capacity to produce sufficient aluminum for industry in the United States, and where is that lack coming from? The lack of power supplies. So that, this is an infrastructure question, although if you ask the simple question,

“Is there an apparent sufficient amount of kilowatt-hours per year per capita in the United States?” Yes, there is. But is there sufficient, reliable electrical power supply – constantly

online, reliable, electrical power supply – for an expansion of

industry? The answer would in many cases be, “no.” And that was

what he was bringing up, in particular with respect to more aluminum plants in the United States. You have a grave inability

to produce enough power, particularly since the fiasco of electricity deregulation out on the West Coast 15 years ago: That

deprived the aluminum industry and shut down a very significant amount of it.

Now, if there’s going to be that kind of investment in infrastructure across the country, it’s not going to be one, or

two, or three, or four, very famous big projects, like the renovation of the whole Northeast rail corridor of Amtrak, and the bridges and the tunnels in New York and so forth. It’s not

going to be simply those things. It’s going to be, at many, many

levels around the country, the production of enough clean water

supplies, the production of enough electrical power supplies; the replacement and renovation – mostly replacement – of the river navigation systems, locks and dams, and many of these things. And for those, the commercial banks have to be ready to lend, because it takes a lot of employment, a lot of contracting, a lot of local borrowing: The banks have to be ready to lend and if you allow them to stay the big commercial banks, and the mid-size regional banks – if you allow them to stay in the Wall Street casino, that's where they'll stay. If you say, "no, your business as a commercial bank is lending," then you have a credit channel through the banking system through which national credit can flow, and cooperate in this kind of thing. So it starts with restoring bank separation under Glass-Steagall. We're going to have a group of elected officials from Italy in a couple of months come over and help us organize in Washington on this, because they're fighting for it in Italy at the national and also the local level. Then, the specific second law of LaRouche, a national credit institution, which is able to produce large volumes of productive credit for productive employment of the people, and for increased productivity. And that is where not only the White House plan, but many other plans that have been put forward, are really completely inadequate, where we do have to talk about several trillions of dollars at least of investment, and the way to do that, is exactly the way that was reflected in that comment by

Dr. Gong: That is, there is a lot of long-term Treasury debt held out there; three major holders of this long-term Treasury debt, which totals \$7.5-\$8 trillion, are the commercial banks of the United States, again, which hold it in their reserves and all their excess reserves which are very large right now; second, Japan, which holds more than \$1 trillion in primarily long-term U.S. Treasury debt; thirdly, China, which actually holds now somewhat more than Japan; about \$1.2 trillion of the same kind of debt. Those are potential shareholders, equity holders, subscribers of that Treasury debt into a new bank created by Congress for the purpose of generating this kind of credit. That is exactly how we have proposed and circulated and organized that this is the way to form – without a tremendous amount of new borrowing – to form a sufficiently large national bank for infrastructure; essentially by swapping existing long-term Treasury debt holdings for equity in such a new national bank created by Congress with a guarantee from the Treasury for the payment of the dividends on that equity. And with taxes – this is not free; it's never free, – but with taxes assigned to make sure that those dividends can be paid. That's where the increase in the Federal gasoline tax and potentially the use of other what you would call infrastructure excise taxes, like the port excise tax and the navigation tax on the locks and dams, that's where these would come in. Because if you simply go and raise the gas tax by 25 cents and spend the money for infrastructure projects, it will not produce nearly, nearly enough. But if you use it in this way as leverage to guarantee the equity in a new national bank in exactly the way that we're seeing reflected in that proposal, that article

from

Dr. Gong, then it'll work. As I said, he's not the only person,

not only among leading Chinese thinkers about this, but also from

Japan, there's the same kind of positive view of this idea.

Potentially, there you have it – an infrastructure bank.

Then you have to go on and what are you going to use that credit for? It can't be used simply to repair roads and repair

bridges. There are entirely new areas of technological and scientific breakthroughs which will raise productivity in the economy to a far greater extent. One of them that we identify is

that a crash program is necessary to develop not only thermonuclear fusion electric energy, but the plasma technologies

of infrastructure, which will probably come from such a crash program even before commercial nuclear fusion electricity arrives. We will have plasma technologies being spun off from that crash program, which will address themselves exactly to the

production of the kinds of capacities that have died out in deindustrialization in the United States. But they'll do it at a

higher level of technology. Those kinds of investments, are one

of the Four Laws that LaRouche has called for. Also, a big increase in NASA's capabilities, going back to the Apollo Project

level of effort by NASA to really go back to the Moon; industrialize, develop the Moon, develop the raw materials there,

including for fusion energy production. And from there, go deeper into the Solar System and ultimately into the galaxy.

This is the kind of science driver which leads up-shifts in productivity in industry. And infrastructure is really the

way

that these up-shifts get introduced to the economy. For example,

in a high-speed rail system of cars using magnetic levitation and

similar technologies, this is the way it gets introduced.

So, that opening from the President is very important.

Yesterday you had comments which I think are very significant from the two leaders of the House Transportation and

Infrastructure Committee – the Republican chairman William Shuster of Pennsylvania, the Democratic ranking member Peter

DeFazio – they are normally quite a bit at odds. But in interviews yesterday which were reported today, they were

reporting that they are already jointly working on a legislative

alternative to exactly what you saw the President asking for

there. A legislative alternative again, with real Federal dollars; the language which Senator Brown used – actually it

was

Senator Wyden was the other Senator – real Federal dollars.

An

alternative to present which the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is where legislation along these

lines

will have to start. So, you're seeing that; you're seeing the gas tax being discussed very widely, including by those same

two

leaders of that committee. You're already seeing an

infrastructure bank act in the House – HR547 – of

Representative Rosa DeLauro, Democrat from Connecticut, which has

the backing of fully half of the Democratic Caucus in the House

and is not a national infrastructure bank which would operate in

the way that we've described and therefore would not be as large

or as capable. But nonetheless, it's legislation which in my view is quite similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which operated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration and did so much to recover the country and then to lead the mobilization for the war and through the war in the 1940s. So that is also something definitely within the purview of LaRouche's Four Laws.

OGDEN: The idea of national banking is, I think, really the critical idea; and it takes us obviously directly back to Alexander Hamilton. If you look at Hamilton's view on infrastructure, the idea of public infrastructure is very much an American idea, and is a major pillar of the American System. Hamilton's emphasis on the necessity for the rapid upgrading of the national infrastructure, the ports and dredging the harbors and things like this, what was called "internal improvements." But this idea of public infrastructure has an American idea to it. In fact, it was written directly into the Constitution in the form of the General Welfare. There were huge fights, including Hamilton's defense of the Constitutionality of a national bank against Thomas Jefferson around this idea of the General Welfare. I know you have to go, so maybe one more aspect that you can address before you leave, and then I can conclude the remaining portions of the show on my own. But just on this subject of the idea of the public good, the United States used to be the world's gold standard, in great modern infrastructure, public infrastructure. You can see that obviously by what Franklin Roosevelt did during the New Deal. Nations around the

world were banging on our door to try to imitate what we accomplished with the Tennessee Valley Authority and so forth and

so on. But now, the gold standard is swiftly being set by China

and what China has done in an unparalleled way. Create this amazing public infrastructure in a very rapid and swift manner.

Two things I think maybe could be addressed in what we need to now learn from China or relearn in terms of what we used to be committed to, is: 1) the policy approach that has made this possible in China; but also, 2) the philosophy that China is clearly committed to when it comes to this idea of the public good, the common good, or what we call in American Constitutional

language, the General Welfare. Maybe you can address that just

briefly before you leave, Paul.

GALLAGHER: There was, in the 19th Century, the American Whig and then Republican leaders were all very conscious Hamiltonians. They realized that they were attempting to develop

the country, and they were doing it – at least a lot of the time

– extraordinarily successfully with a commitment to the “internal improvements” what we call infrastructure, but the internal improvements, the national credit provision, the protection of industry; which came from Alexander Hamilton.

But his overriding premise was actually none of those particular policies, but rather his stating against the tide of

opinion in the 1790s when he was Treasury Secretary and the decade before and after. He definitely took on the tide of opinion that the United States was going to be an agricultural country, a country of yeoman farmers with all of their well-known

virtues and so on and so forth. He said that the wealth of a country is found in the inventive qualities of its people, and in the freedom and opportunity that they have to turn their inventive qualities into enterprise. And he really was responsible for the emergence of the first banks of the United States; not only the First Bank of the United States, the first national bank, but also the first private banks of the United States, of which there were very few at that time. He saw the creation of a national bank as essentially the necessary link or liaison between the actions of the government to assist the economy and the actions of the private banks; that this was the necessary way, in which they should be related. But his principle was that the mind of the individual and the freedom of the individual and opportunity to make that into enterprise, that that was what defined the ability to produce the wealth of a country and that the wealth of a country was produced within it; it was not gained by trading with other countries – fairly, freely or otherwise. It was gained primarily by producing the wealth which the inventiveness of the people and the resources of the country made possible. And that was the function of protection when it was used, but of course, Hamilton favored more what we would call industrial subsidies than he did what we call tariffs. So that, right through Abraham Lincoln, was the creed of the great leaders of the United States in the 19th Century and considerably thereafter. We became the greatest industrial nation on Earth that way.

Franklin Roosevelt revived that general outlook, although he did so without the creation of a national bank, really because of what he was working with in Congress. Otherwise, he might have preferred to do that. But he did it through such institutions as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the TVA, which became wonders of the world. We have not really improved on that much in the 70-80 years since. But that idea, Hamilton's ideas spread very rapidly through Friedrich List, who spent a lot of time in the United States and was a leading Hamiltonian in the 1820s and 1830s, and then was in the middle of the unification of Germany for the first time in the Customs Union of Germany in the middle of the 19th Century. This spread through Bismarck's policies, who knew that he was a Hamiltonian, later in the 19th Century. They spread through the Japanese adopting and learning a lot of the works of Hamilton; late in the 19th Century inviting Hamiltonian economists from the United States to come over and advise them. This kept being repeated in Korea again. China has taken this far beyond, because as you said, they're not only applying those policies, but they're also as they always say doing them with Chinese characteristics. Particularly now with Xi Jinping as the President of China, he has really defined and enshrined in their Constitution the principle of what a country's

leadership is judged for its ability to strive for the common welfare, the common aims of the population; what we call in the Constitution, the General Welfare. That has really had a very distinctive effect on Chinese policy in the country and also on the policy of the Belt and Road Initiative which Xi Jinping launched, but was really already underway before he made the formal speech three and a half years ago. Already the investments by big Chinese commercial banks outside China, in these projects of energy, mining, but also a lot of infrastructure projects. These big investments were already underway in 2011, 2012; then he made the announcement in 2013, which was so very close to the policy of the World Land-Bridge which had been promoted by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche since the later 1980s. And since that time, that has really been recognized in China; they call Helga the Silk Road Lady. This policy of the common welfare is clearly one reflected in the way that they've eliminated almost entirely down to the last few tens of millions of people, they've almost entirely eradicated extreme poverty in China. I just heard the World Bank chairman the day before yesterday praising that to the skies and saying it's the one model for the world. He said the World Bank has been trying to do this for so many decades, to eradicate poverty, without making too much progress. China has done it, and now they are seeking to help do it in Africa and other places. They want to invest in the Middle East in reconstruction. But this is really the test that you are acting for the general good, for the

common

welfare, which is what our Constitution commits us to.

So, in that sense, they've gone beyond, and in the process, really developed a lot of technological breakthroughs in infrastructure; and that's where you find them. That's where Roosevelt found them. The projects of the 1930s, which many people think of as just creating a lot of work for people, and building a lot of airports and roads and bridges and things like

that; those projects – especially the hydro-electric projects and especially the Tennessee Valley Authority – were technological breakthroughs at the time. They built dams, navigation systems, hydropower systems technologically in ways which not only hadn't been done, but had been denied that they could be done even right up to that time. John F Kennedy spoke

about this later, that experts were saying that you couldn't build dams that were simultaneously for water management, for navigation, and for hydropower. The TVA did 57 such dams.

So,

they completely transformed an area of the country. These breakthroughs were made in all of this infrastructure building in

such a way, that the productivity of the U.S. economy leaped up in

the 1930s at the fastest rate of the last 150 years. A close second was the 1940s, including the war mobilization.

So that's what China is experiencing now, as they make these kinds of investments; and they're doing it with a very common welfare orientation.

OGDEN: Wonderful! So, thank you very much, Paul. I'm going to let you go before we finish the remainder of our show.

But I think you've made it very clear that we are uniquely positioned to inform and ultimately shape this counterproposal and what must ultimately become the infrastructure and general

economic policy of this Presidency. So, I know we have a lot of work to do. Thank you for joining us, Paul.

GALLAGHER: Thank you. I'm sure you'll talk about the necessity to bring this up from the bottom as well; from the local elected officials, from the state legislatures in particular and apply it to the election campaign. I think it's probably true what Chairman Shuster said, which is that work on this legislation will be going on until the summer. I think that's definitely true. It will become a part of the election campaign, no question. If we can get candidates out there and local elected officials out there who are for the Four Laws, we're going to shape this. So, thanks for the opportunity and having me on, and have a good time.

OGDEN: Thank you, and we'll talk to you again soon. What Paul said is absolutely correct. This is the ultimate principle or thought behind the campaign to win the future. This is the LaRouche PAC election mobilization in 2018. We've already had a number of state legislators endorse this campaign. We're really on the ground in various places, including in West Virginia; doing some very significant meetings with people who are involved in the China-West Virginia deals. We've also mobilized in a very big way in the Midwest, which was key to the Trump election victory. We know that these former industrial states really are the most significant in swinging these elections and creating the constituency blocs around this idea of the LaRouche Four

Economic

Laws and everything that you just heard Paul go through. This is the urgent necessity as we mobilize around this kind of program.

I think everything that you just heard from Paul, makes it very clear that we are uniquely well-positioned to shape this entire discussion. I think the opportunity is even greater now than it was previously.

Now, let me just go over a few things that I think will make it very clear to you that there is an opportunity for a moment of awakening, you could say, among people who have recognized that

everything that we've been committed to for the last several decades up to this point has completely failed. There were two very informative or entertaining articles over the last week and

a half, which point to exactly this; indicate exactly this opportunity for people to perhaps open their minds and begin a more sober and serious discussion around the true principles of

economics. One of these is an article which appeared in Bloomberg, this was {Bloomberg Business Week} I believe. The title of this article was "What if China Is Exempt from the Laws

of Economics?" This is by a fellow named Michael Schuman, but the subtitle is "Beijing's policymakers seem to be doing a lot of

things right – and that may upend much of basic economic thinking, especially our faith in the power of free markets."

So, here are a couple of excerpts from that article. He says:

“Over my two decades of writing about economics, I’ve devised a list of simple maxims that I’ve found generally hold true....

“But recently, my faith in this corpus of collected wisdom has been badly shaken. By China.

“The more I apply my rules of economics to China, the more they seem to go awry. China should be mired in meager growth, even gripped by financial crisis, according to my maxims. But obviously it’s not. In fact, much of what’s going on right now in

that country runs counter to what we know – or think we know – about economics. Simply, if Beijing’s policymakers are right, then a lot of basic economic thinking is wrong – especially our

certainty in the power of free markets, our ingrained bias against state intervention, and our ideas about fostering innovation and entrepreneurship.

“On the surface, that probably sounds ridiculous. How could one country possibly defy the laws that have governed economies everywhere else?...

“Yet as China marches forward, we can no longer dismiss the possibility that it’s rewriting the rulebook. Beijing’s policymakers are just plain ignoring what most economists would

recommend at this point in its development. And, so far, they’re getting away with it....

“... Perhaps China really is refashioning capitalism.

“Perhaps. I, for one, am still clinging to my maxims....

“... Maybe my rules of economics will hold firm after all. But thanks to China, I’m prepared to edit them.”

Now, it’s not that China is rewriting the rule book. I think that what you just heard from Paul is that it’s the West,

it’s the United States under the influence of British free market

ideology; this free-market school economics. It's the United States and the West which have been playing by the wrong rulebook

for decades, if not generations. We've neglected the rulebook that we originally wrote. It was Alexander Hamilton, it was our

first Treasury Secretary; that's why it's called the American System of economics. Other countries have applied these principles of Hamiltonian economics and experienced the same phenomenal growth that we experienced under the influence of Hamiltonian policy. That is exactly what China is experiencing

right now. It's leaving these economists scratching their heads,

but perhaps they merely have to open a few history books.

I think as you can tell from that Bloomberg article, it's

beginning to dawn on people. "Gee! Maybe we've been wrong.

Maybe we've been duped by this British free trade, free market ideology. Perhaps that's why our economies are in shambles right

now."

Here's another article. This is in the {New York Times Magazine}. It came out earlier this week. This one is very interesting and goes through a lot of the history you just heard

Paul elaborate on. This is called "The Rise of China and the Fall of the 'Free Trade' Myth." The subhead is "China's economic

success lays bare an uncomfortable historical truth. No one who

preaches free trade really practices it." So, here's an excerpt

from the article:

"[T]o grasp China's economic achievement, and its ramifications, it is imperative to ask: Why has a market economy

directed by a Communist state become the world's second-

largest?

Or, to rephrase the question: Why shouldn't it have? Why shouldn't China's rise have happened the way it did, with state-led economic planning, industrial subsidies and little or no regard for the rules of 'free trade'?...

"Indeed, economic history reveals that great economic powers have always become great because of activist states. Regardless

of the mystical properties claimed for it, the invisible hand of

self-interest depends on the visible and often heavy hand of government. To take only one instance, British gunboats helped impose free trade on 19th-century China – a lesson not lost on the Chinese.... The philosophical father of economic protectionism is, in fact, Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the

American financial system, whose pupils included the Germans, the

Japanese and, indirectly, the Chinese."

After some history, he lays out the case of Germany, and this one is interesting to focus on. He says:

"... Unified in 1871, Germany was scrambling to catch up with industrialized Britain. To do so, it borrowed from recipes

of national development proposed by Hamilton soon after the Americans broke free of their British overlords. In his 'Report

on the Subject of Manufactures', submitted to Congress in 1791,

Hamilton used the potent term 'infant' industries to argue for economic protectionism.

"... In his view, infant nations needed room to maneuver before they could compete with established industrial powers. The

United States embraced many of Hamilton's recommendations; the beneficiaries were, first, the textile and iron industries and

then steel.

“It was Hamilton’s formula, rather than free trade, that made the United States the world’s fastest-growing economy in the

19th century and into the 1920s. And that formula was embraced by

other nations coming late to international economic competition.

Hamilton’s most influential student was a German economist named

Friedrich List, who lived in the United States from 1825 until the 1830s and wrote a book titled {Outlines of American Political

Economy}. On his return to Germany, List attacked the free-market

gospel preached by Britain as sheer opportunism... Applying List’s lessons, Germany moved with spectacular speed from an agrarian to an industrial economy.

“... Closely following Germany’s example, Japan heavily subsidized its first factories ...

“... South Korea, too, found solutions for its problems in Friedrich List rather than Adam Smith. The country’s leader, Park

Chung-hee ... was also deeply familiar with German theories of protectionism. (The economist Robert Wade reported coming across

whole shelves of books by List in Seoul bookstores in the 1970s.)...

“But little did I know that Hamilton (and List) would achieve their greatest influence in post-Mao China. ‘The rise of

China resembles that of the United States a century ago,’ the Chinese scholar Hu Angang writes. He is not exaggerating.”

Now, that’s a very interesting article to appear at this moment. I’m not saying that everything the author says in his analysis is entirely accurate, or that all of the conclusions that he draws are necessarily correct. But what he does make

clear is that what made America great was the policies of Alexander Hamilton. And what's making China great today are those very same Hamiltonian policies. This realization shows you that we have a very fertile field for the reception of our so-called Four Laws campaign – Lyndon LaRouche's revival of Hamiltonian policies. The fight which Lyndon LaRouche has led for decades to liberate the United States from this imposed free market, free trade hoax; this British ideology. To return us to the principles of Alexander Hamilton. What he did simultaneously abroad to educate these other nations on the policies of the American System and Hamiltonian economic policies. That's where China got this from; that's where you can credit the great Chinese economic miracle of the last 15 years. Do not write out of the equation the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played as spokesmen for this great Hamiltonian tradition, and urgently with updates and a profound scientific depth that Lyndon LaRouche has brought to this discussion. But the time is now, and the field is very fertile for the reception of this idea that the time has come for a Hamiltonian coalition of nations. We must join hand-in-hand with China to do exactly that; to bring development to all the nations on the planet using these American, but universal, economic principles. Now, let me just play a very short clip from a broadcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had yesterday. Because the biggest problem that you run into – and I think this is something that you run into as an organizer or as an activist – is that people fail to make the necessary leap in terms of understanding these

principles because they have an axiomatic problem. There's a disconnect. The biggest problem that we have when it comes to economics today is that money is essentially God. Money has achieved this status in economics where it is everything to everyone. It's the Genesis of economics; it's the root, it's the prime mover; it's the measuring rod, it's the purpose, it's the medium. Money is everything. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed exactly this pathology in her webcast yesterday. And she called for a public debate on this. She said, as it begins to dawn on people who have believed that everything that they had believed about economics may perhaps have been wrong, we need to question some of the most basic economic assumptions that we hold dear, and ask ourselves the question, "What is the ultimate purpose of an economy and what is the true source of true economic wealth?"

So, here's Helga LaRouche:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators, so that the rich become richer, and the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking. This article by Bloomberg which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to

his theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he says that China is doing everything which according to his theory are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says, he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections. There will be a lot more corrections, because I think we need a public debate, what are the economic criteria for a functioning economy? And obviously, the works of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and his development of physical economy, going back to Leibniz, to Friedrich List, to Henry C. Carey, to Wilhelm von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things. We need a discussion about that, because the notion of what is economy, equating that with money, has really become one of the axiomatic assumptions of a failing system. So we need a debate about that. [end video]

OGDEN: So the time has come. As I said, it's a very

fertile field, and this is one of the most important reasons why we've now launched a new LaRouche PAC class series, which gets directly at these principles; not only of economics, but this is what drives global policy. What is the purpose of economy? What is the true identity of man? And what should be the collaborative between peoples and between nations, to what end? So, I'll take that as an opportunity before concluding, to remind our viewers that tomorrow we will have the second class in our 2018 class series. This class will be titled "The End of Geopolitics, Part I: The History of Geopolitics." The guest speaker will be Harley Schlanger. Again, you can register for this entire class series, which is called "The End of Geopolitics. What Is the New Paradigm?" The registration is now open. If you have not registered for this class series, I strongly encourage you to. The link is available on the screen – lpac.co/np2018. You can also visit discover.larouchepac.com which will be the central hub of all of the material for this class series. Again, if you're a registered participant, not only do you have the opportunity to participate in the live public forums, such as the inaugural class that was delivered last Saturday by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, but you also have the opportunity for an in-depth engagement around the syllabus, the required reading materials, the homework assignments, the live feedback from the teachers and from the leaders of the LaRouche PAC class series, and also some discussion periods which are only open to registered participants. Registration has continued to

increase. We have a large number of registered participants from all across the United States and elsewhere around the world, too. So, we're putting together the educated grouping, the cadre which will be able to lead this discussion for a new economics, a New Paradigm. The field is wide open. The door is there, and all we have to do is walk through it. We are in a unique position to inform this discussion today; and it is a very urgent debate which needs to take place as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said. So, thank you for joining me here today. I thank Paul for joining me. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do, and we'll see you next week.

Russiagate? Alle veje fører til London!

LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 9. feb., 2018.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Russiagate? Alle veje fører til London«. Planen er virkelig blevet kompliceret i løbet af en uge til halvanden, med offentliggørelsen af Nunes-memoet fra Husets Efterretningskomite, der efterforsker Christopher Steele; og dernæst afklassificeringen af senator Grassleys brev, som henviser Christopher Steele til Justitsministeriet til efterforskning for kriminelle handlinger. Sandheden bag det, der er blevet kaldt Russiagate, er nu hastigt ved at komme i fokus. Hver eneste tråd i denne historie, når man trækker i dem og følger dem, fører dig direkte til London.

Denne Russiagate-skandale er faktisk blevet til »Londongate«; og historien om det virkelig, aftalte spil er nu ved at blive åbenlys. Der var virkelig en fremmed efterretningstjeneste, der forsøgte at intervenere, blande sig, og forme udfaldet af valget i USA. Men denne efterretningstjeneste havde sit hovedkvarter hvor? I London, på Themsens bredder ved Vauxhall Cross; lige dér, i MI6's hovedkvarter. Historien kommer nu i fokus. Det er præcis, som vi oprindeligt beskrev det i LaRouche PAC's brochure, som vi udgav i september 2017. Det eneste aftalte spil, der fandt sted, var dét mellem USA's og UK's hemmelige efterretningstjenester, i liga med DNC og Hillary Clintons kampagne. Undermineringen af vores demokratiske

valgssystem kom fra vore såkaldte nærmeste allierede – briterne; som ikke skyede noget middel for at forhindre, at deres geopolitiske verdensorden blev afsat, og der i stedet voksede en stormagtsrelation frem mellem USA, Rusland og Kina.

Lad os huske på, hvad denne brochure, som blev udgivet for seks måneder siden, sagde. Brochuren er nu i færd med at blive revideret og opdateret og vil snart udkomme i andet oplag. Men lad os se på [brochuren](#) og se, hvad den siger.

»[Præsident Trump] truede det angloamerikanske, britiske imperiesystem efter krigen ... ved at afvise evindelig krigsførelse, søge bedre relationer med Rusland, kræve gennemførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, gå ind for det, han refererer til som det Amerikanske System for politisk økonomi og love massiv infrastrukturudvikling og en moderne varefremstillingsplatform for produktive jobs.«

»Briterne kræver skalpe, på baggrund af deres opfattelse af at være truet, der specifikt findes i ønsket om en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og en afslutning af den 'unipolære' ramme for relationer mellem nationer.«

Den fortsætter med at sige:

»Kuppet mod Donald Trump startede faktisk i 2013-2014. Den populære forklaring på nederdrægtighederne og forbrydelserne mod præsidenten er, at Hillary Clinton og Barack Obama ansatte deres netværk, inklusive oversiddende loyalister i regeringen og efterretningssamfundet, med det formål at ændre resultatet af det amerikanske valg og at iscenesætte det igangværende kup. Denne forklaring, der primært fokuserer på begivenheder i 2016, overser, alt imens det er sandt nok i en umiddelbart national forståelse, det større billede. Som vi vil vise, så begyndte briterne at kræve Donald Trumps hoved, iflg. deres egen redegørelse, i 2015 og blandede sig og blandede sig i USA's valg og [har forsøgt at iscenesætte] et kup for at omstøde valgresultatet hver eneste dag herefter.«

Herefter sporer brochuren den relevante historie, der går helt tilbage til kinesernes annoncering af en ny, international, økonomisk orden i 2013, i form af det, de kaldte Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Som de ligeledes annoncerede, ville blive tæt koordineret med Ruslands Eurasiske Økonomiske Union i en bestræbelse på økonomisk udvikling til hele det eurasiske kontinent. Dette er præcis, hvad Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i over 20år har været fortalere for, i form af den Eurasiske Landbro, og som dernæst blev kendt som den Nye Silkevej.



Fig. 1

Denne del af verden, som Kina og Rusland nu aktivt forfølger udviklingen af; dette eurasiske område af verden er, hvad geopolitikkens fader, den britiske geopolitiks fader – Halford Mackinder – kaldte Hjertelandet. Han skrev en artikel i begyndelsen af det 20. århundrede ved navn, »Historiens geografiske omdrejningspunkt«. Den blev udgivet i 1904. Det, han sagde i denne artikel, og som gjorde ham til faderen af moderne geopolitik, det 20. århundredes britiske geopolitik, er, at Hjertelandet er det geopolitiske omdrejningspunkt for hele verden. Vi ser her hans kort [Fig. 1], og lige i centrum finder vi Eurasien med betegnelsen, »omdrejningspunkt«. Hele hans geopolitiske teori opsummeredes i denne udtalelse: »Den, der regerer over Østeuropa, hersker over Hjertelandet. Den, der regerer over Hjertelandet, hersker over verdensøen. Og den, der regerer over verdensøen, hersker over verden.«

Spørgsmålet om, hvem, der regerer over Østeuropa, handler stort set om, hvem, der regerer over Ukraine. Og da den behørigt valgte ukrainske præsident Victor Janukovitj annoncerede, at han ikke ville underskrive Memorandaet for Samarbejde med den Europæiske Union og i stedet ville opretholde sin tætte relation med økonomisk samarbejde med Rusland, var det det sidste strå. Mange af de samme personer,

vi nu ser nævnt i Grassleys og Nunes' efterforskning af Udenrigsministeriet, såsom Victoria Nuland; mange af de samme personer besluttede, at tiden for regimeskifte var kommet. Ved at aktivere et netværk af oversiddere fra højrefløj og ekstreme ukrainske nationalister, der under Anden Verdenskrig havde samarbejdet med Hitler; denne flok – Victoria Nuland og andre – iscenesatte et voldeligt kup i Ukraine; det såkaldte Maidan. De væltede den demokratiske valgte, ukrainske regering og installerede deres egen regering; Victoria Nuland er berømt for at være blevet taget på fersk gerning i at indrømme dette, på bånd.

Den, der således regerer over Østeuropa, hersker over Hjertelandet. Den, der regerer over Hjertelandet, hersker over verden. Dette er britisk geopolitik, og i årtier har den særlige, amerikansk-britiske relation været et instrument for håndhævelse af dette Mackinders synspunkt af, hvad verdensordenen bør være. Når som helst en præsident; når som helst en ledende, politisk person i USA kom og truede dette synspunkt, ville elementer i de amerikanske og britiske efterretningssamfund slå alarm og på den ene eller anden måde neutralisere denne trussel. Som LaRouche PAC's brochure dybtgående forklarer, så var det præcis, hvad der skete i kampagnen imod Lyndon LaRouche. Som brochuren forklarer, så må man forstå, at dette præcis er tilfældet med den operation, der køres imod præsident Trump. For at kunne forstå operationen imod præsident Trump, må man forstå det ud fra dette perspektiv. Fra det øjeblik, det stod klart, at Trump var en seriøs deltager i kapløbet om USA's præsidentskab, og at han helt tydeligt hældte mod at afslutte Obama-Clinton-Bush-politikken med inddæmning, begrænsning og konfrontation med Rusland og Kina og i stedet hældte mod et gensidigt fordelagtigt, økonomisk og strategisk samarbejde med disse to lande – Rusland og Kina. Og fra det øjeblik blev han mål for dette apparat.

Så vær ikke naiv og lad dig blive indfanget i det daglige

mediespin på talkshows på fjernsynet. Dette handler ikke om, hvorvidt du rent personligt støtter eller bryder dig om Donald Trump. Dette er et opgørets øjeblik i den årelange kamp for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl og kampen for at frisætte, befri, USA fra dette britiske Mackinder-synspunkt om geopolitik, der har bragt os helt ud på kanten af atomkrig. I stedet bør USA fuldt og helt deltage i det Nye Paradigme, der nu er vokset frem, med at bringe økonomisk udvikling og moderne økonomisk fremskridt til enorme områder af den tidligere tilbagestående, koloniserede og underudviklede del af verden.

Som vores brochure, der blev udgivet i september 2017, for seks måneder siden, stiller spørgsmålet: »Har vore efterretningstjenester faktisk ulovligt anstiftet aktive forholdsregler for et kontraefterretningsprogram, imod en siddende præsident?« Vi ved nu, at Comey løj eller vildledte Kongressen om aflytningerne af Trump Tower. FISA-kendelserne beviser dette. Senator Grassley har spurgt FBI, hvorfor, hvis I aflyttede en nær medarbejder til præsidenten, ville I ikke advare præsidenten imod ham, som det er sædvanen? Det sande svar er, at præsidenten selv var og er målet for et hidtil uset og illegalt kupforsøg, udført af dem, der har aflagt ed på at overholde Forfatningen og nationens love.

Så nu ved I det. Siden valget, og før valget, har vi siddet fast i et meget uddybende og farligt, britisk svindelnummer; med et hasardspil om vores nations fremtid i et koldt kup imod en valgt præsident. Der er begået regulære forbrydelser; ikke af præsidenten, men mod præsidenten og Forfatningen. Det, der er sket, er, at divergerende, politiske standpunkter, ideer, er blevet gjort til noget kriminelt; den selv samme fare, som de fleste bestemmelser i vores Forfatning og dens borgerlige frihedsrettigheder (Bill of Rights) blev udtrykkeligt udarbejdet for at værne imod. Vi har fortalt jer den virkelige årsag til, at præsidenten er blevet angrebet af en fremmed magt – briterne og deres allierede i vort land.

Så igen: Denne brochure blev udgivet i september 2017; for næsten seks måneder siden. Men alt det, vi dengang hævdede, bekræftes nu som sandt af kendsgerningerne efterhånden, som de kommer ud; som med tilfældet med Nunes-momoet, Grassley-brevet og hvad vi ellers kan forvente, vil komme ud af disse efterforskninger i den nærmeste fremtid. Hvis man træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede her, og ser på det ud fra dette perspektiv, er det nu uigendriveligt. Hvis man vil identificere den virkelige kilde til forbrydelserne mod vores republik og mod vort demokrati, så træk blot i tråden, og man vil finde, at alle veje fører til London.

I sin ugentlige webcast (torsdag) talte Helga Zepp-LaRouche meget direkte om dette. Jeg vil gerne afspille et kort klip for jer fra dette webcast af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, hvor hun identificerer netop dette aspekt; at alle tråde i denne sag, hvis man følger dem hele vejen, viser, hvorfra den virkelige kriminalitet kommer. Her kommer Helgas klip:

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Planen bliver mere kompliceret, som man siger. Historien er faktisk helt utrolig, og jeg er stolt over at have skrevet en artikel helt i begyndelsen af denne affære, hvor jeg sagde, at der er et aftalt spil med briterne, og ikke med russerne – og det er præcis det, der nu kommer frem og er ved at blive et offentligt spørgsmål. Jeg vil begynde med sagen mod Steele, som det var meningen, skulle for retten i Højesteret i London, hvor Steele skulle møde frem, men i sidste øjeblik blev repræsenteret af sin advokat; argumentet var, at dette kunne berøre britiske nationale sikkerhedsinteresser. Og minsandten, om ikke en repræsentant fra Udenrigsministeriet også var til stede med deres advokater, og de kom med den samme erklæring.

Så den britiske regerings, britisk efterretnings rolle er nu et spørgsmål, og det står helt klart, at Christopher Steele ikke var en eller anden tilfældig, tidligere MI6-agent, men at han derimod virkelig var en agent for ikke alene briterne, men også for FBI. Denne pointe er kommet frem i en meget

interessant artikel på Pat Langs weblog, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. En fast, respekteret bidrager til denne blog, som udlægger på bloggen under pseudonymet »Publius Tacitus«, spørger i sin overskrift, »Forsøgte britisk efterretning at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab?«, hvilket er præcis, hvad vi har for os.[\[1\]](#)

Værten for denne blog, Pat Lang – for folk, der ikke kender ham; han er en pensioneret, højtrespekteret efterretningsmand i USA, og slet ikke en eller anden russer eller en anden kilde, der kunne være tvivlsom i denne sammenhæng – han arbejdede i lang tid for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) – og han er højt respekteret.

Hvorom alting er, så peger »Publius Tacitus« på den kendsgerning, at de nye memoer, der er kommet frem fra senatorerne Grassley og Graham, og fra Senatskomiteen for Homeland Security og Regeringsanliggender, som alle bekræfter det, der står i Nunes [Husets Efterretningskomite]-memorandaet. Og der er virkelig kommet mange nye aspekter frem. De indikerer, at Comey måske løj under ed, for, da han holdt den berømte pressekonference, der frikendte Hillary Clinton, påstod han, at han ikke havde koordineret dette med nogen andre. Dette står imidlertid i skarp kontrast til nogle flere beskeder, som blev udvekslet mellem Peter Strzok og Lisa Page, to FBI-ansatte, der var involveret i både Hillary Clintons e-mail-affære og ligeledes i Russiagate. I disse beskeder indikerede de, at Hillary vidste, der ikke ville komme nogen anklager mod hende. Der er behov for yderligere efterforskning herom.

Der er desuden fremkommet et andet, meget ildevarslende resultat, og det er en anden udveksling af tekstbeskeder mellem de to, hvor de den 2. sep. 2016 siger, at »POTUS«, dvs. 'President of the United States', nemlig Obama, ønskede at vide alt, de foretager sig. Hvad refererer dette »alt« til? Det refererer enten til efterforskningen af Hillary Clinton, eller også til Russiagate, og sidstnævnte ville betyde, at

Obama nu er direkte forbundet med Russiagate og ikke kun indirekte via betalingen til Fusion GPS og Steele, hvor Obama-administrationen også betalte, sammen med DNC og Hillary Clintons kampagne.

Dette er alt sammen ekstremt, ekstremt varmt, og vi har nu alle disse Senats- og Kongreshøringer og komiteer, der efterforsker det. Kongresmedlem Nunes, der havde offentliggjort dette memo – eller rettere, præsident Trump havde godkendt at få det afklassificeret og offentliggjort sidste fredag – han sagde, dette er kun »Fase 1«. Der kommer flere faser, og de vil blandt andet omfatte Udenrigsministeriet, hvilket selvfølgelig også involverer Victoria Nuland, hvis navn nu er dukket op. Der har ligeledes, omkring et andet spørgsmål, været mange udvekslinger mellem Christopher Steele og Victoria Nuland med hensyn til kuppet i Ukraine, det berømte Maidan-kup i februar 2014.

Dette er alt sammen meget interessant, meget 'varmt'. Russiagate er praktisk taget en død sild, men det, der nu i stedet er på bordet, er den britiske regerings, britisk efterretnings indblanding i valget i USA, der forsøgte at sabotere Trumps sejr, først, og da han alligevel vandt, da at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab ved hjælp af en totalt opdigtet anklage. Det er nu kommet offentligt frem, og det er stort! Jeg kan, selv om dette er foregået i nogen tid, stadig kun være totalt chokeret og overrasket over, hvordan de gængse vestlige medier lykkedes med ikke at dække dette, som tydeligvis er ved at nå dimensioner, der går langt, langt videre end Watergate.

(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet. Hele Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra torsdag kan læses på dansk her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23759>)

OGDEN: So, worse than Watergate, in Helga LaRouche's words.

As Helga mentioned in her remarks there, earlier this week, there was a very significant article which was published on the blog "Sic Semper Tyrannis" by Pat Lang, who is former Defense Intelligence, a very high level, very connected person. The article is titled, "Did British Intelligence Try to Destroy the Trump Presidency?" Let me read you few excerpts from Pat Lang's article. He says:

"Last night's release of the memo by Senator's Grassley and Graham asking the Department of Justice to open a criminal investigation of Christopher Steele for possible violations of 18 U.S.C. Â§ 1001 provides critical confirmation of charges presented in the HPSCI memo prepared under the leadership of Devin Nunes, but it also confirms that Christopher Steele was not just some random guy offering good gossip to the FBI. He was an official intelligence asset. He was, in John LeCarre's parlance, our 'Joe.' At least we thought so. But, there is growing circumstantial evidence that Steele was acting on behalf of Britain's version of the CIA—aka MI-6. If true, we are now faced with actual evidence of a foreign country trying to meddle in a direct and significant way in our national election. Only it was not the Russians. It was our British cousins".

"[T]wo developments in the last two days suggest that British intelligence officials, at least some key officials, were witting of Steele's activities in gathering information for the FBI.

“First, Steele is resisting efforts to face a deposition in a lawsuit over his infamous dossier. Steele’s lawyers argued in a court in London this week that a deposition would endanger the former spy’s dossier sources as well as harm U.K. national security interests. If the Judge buys this claim then we will not have to speculate anymore about whether or not Steele was acting on his own or had a ‘wink-and-a-nod’ from his MI-6 bosses. “Second, in my mind more telling, were the comments made this week by former MI-6 Chief, Richard Dearlove, on behalf of his former protege:

“Among those who have continued to seek his expertise is Steele’s former boss Richard Dearlove, who headed MI-6 from 1999 to 2004. In an interview, Dearlove said Steele became the ‘go-to person on Russia in the commercial sector’ following his retirement from the Secret Intelligence Service. He described the reputations of Steele and his business partner, fellow intelligence veteran Christopher Burrows, as ‘superb.’ But we do not have to rely solely on Dearlove’s glowing remarks about Steele. There is other information indicating that the Brits played a substantial, if not leading, role in spying on Trump and building the Russian meddling meme. The *Guardian* reported in April 2017 that:

“|’Britain’s spy agencies played a crucial role in alerting their counterparts in Washington to contacts between members of Donald Trump’s campaign team and Russian intelligence operatives, the {Guardian} has been told.

“|’GCHQ first became aware in late 2015 of suspicious

“interactions” between figures connected to Trump and known or suspected Russian agents, a source close to UK intelligence said.

This intelligence was passed to the US as part of a routine exchange of information, they added.

“|’Over the next six months, until summer 2016, a number of western agencies shared further information on contacts between

Trump’s inner circle and Russians, sources said.’

“So much for our special relationship. As the evidence of British intelligence meddling in the U.S. election piles up, it

will create some strains in our bi-lateral ties. It has the potential to harm cooperation on military, law enforcement, and

intelligence fronts. I suspect there is some scrambling going on

behind the scenes to come up with a strategy to contain the damage while rooting out the sedition. Stay tuned.”

Now, speaking of Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI-6 and his relationship to Christopher Steele, there is a very significant article which was published this week in the *Washington Post*. And that article is published under the title, “Hero, or Hired Gun? How a British Former Spy Became a Flashpoint in the Russia Investigation”. And under the subtitle

“He’s the Spy”, the article lays out Steele’s pedigree as a very

high-level British intelligence operative, and his extremely close relationship with Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI-6. So, here’s what the article says:

“Steele had all the right credentials for the job.

“He was steeped in Russia early on after being recruited to Britain’s elite spy service from the University of Cambridge. He

spent two decades working for the MI6 spy agency, including a stint in his mid-20s in Moscow, where he served undercover in

the

British Embassy.

“When he returned to work for the agency in London, he provided briefing materials on Russia for senior government officials and led the British inquiry into the mysterious 2006 death in London of Alexander Litvinenko, a former KGB official and Putin critic.

“In 2009, after more than two decades in public service, Steele turned to the private sector and founded a London-based consulting firm, Orbis Business Intelligence, drawing on the reputation and network he developed doing intelligence work.

“Among those who have continued to seek his expertise is Steele’s former boss Richard Dearlove, who headed MI6 from 1999

to 2004.

“In an interview, Dearlove said Steele became the ‘go-to person on Russia in the commercial sector’ following his retirement from the Secret Intelligence Service. He described the

reputations of Steele and his business partner, fellow intelligence veteran Christopher Burrows, as ‘superb.’

“In the early fall, he and Burrows turned to Dearlove, their former MI6 boss, for advice. Sitting in winged chairs at the Garrick Club, one of London’s most venerable private establishments, under oil paintings of famed British playwrights,

the two men shared their worries about what was happening in the

United States. They asked for his guidance about how to handle their obligations to their client and the public, Dearlove recalled.

“Dearlove said their situation reminded him of a predicament he had faced years earlier, when he was chief of station for British intelligence in Washington and alerted U.S. authorities

to British information that a vice presidential hopeful had

once

been in communication with the Kremlin.

“He said he advised Steele and Burrows to work discreetly with a top British government official to pass along information to the FBI.”

Now, that entire story sounds very much like a scene directly out of a John LeCarre novel, if you ask me. But this character, Richard Dearlove, is somebody of whom Helga Zepp-LaRouche asks “What is his pedigree, and what is he famous

for when it comes to dodgy dossiers?” in that webcast that she delivered yesterday. So, here’s what Helga LaRouche had to say

about Richard Dearlove:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The fact that Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI6, absolutely defended the reputation of Steele, is very interesting in this respect, because who is this Dearlove? He is the infamous author of the famous dossier which led to the attack on Iraq in the Second Gulf

War, supposedly because Saddam Hussein was in the possession of

weapons of mass destruction, which we know was a blatant lie, which led Colin Powell to make this infamous speech in the United

Nations in February 2003, which he later characterized as the biggest mistake of his life, because it led to the intervention,

including the United States, in the war against Saddam Hussein.

That is something which eventually must also be tried. And I know

that Ramsey Clark tried to make that an issue before the international legal authorities.

So, this is not just the attempt of a coup against the

United States, but this is a paradigm of policies which have led to the present condition in the world, including the destruction of much of Southwest Asia, including the refugee crisis. So these are not small things, and I think it is high time that this whole paradigm should come out in the open and is being replaced by a completely different policy.

So, I think the stakes here are extremely high, and I think people should really rethink everything and look at the material which is coming out, because it is an unbelievable scandal.

[T]he dossier which was published by LaRouche PAC, written by Barbara Boyd. This was written half a year ago, but if you read this dossier now, it is incredible, how absolutely on the mark this dossier was, concerning the role of British intelligence. So I think the circulation of this dossier is something which everybody can do very easily. Get it in the social media, get it in the alternative blogs, get it into any newspaper, which has the honesty to follow events in a truthful

way. And right now, things are coming out in the open. There were

articles by Ray McGovern, by William Binney, Pat Lang, by Russia

Today, – naturally, they pick up on the fact that Russiagate is

now completely falling apart. So I think the more people can do,

to get the public attention on what is going on in this absolutely gigantic fight in the United States, the better; because some of these spooks shy away from daylight, and the more

the Sun is shining on them, all the better.

OGDEN: So again, this pamphlet that was put out by LaRouche PAC six months ago, this was a very prescient and very insightful

pamphlet. I guarantee you it has served a major role in informing the threat of the investigations for the people who are

serious about getting at the truth of this. We've witnessed Russiagate transformed into Steelegate, and Steelegate means Londongate. All threads, if you follow them and pull them, will

lead you back to London. This pamphlet is being updated as we speak, and it will be going into a second [sic] printing very soon, and you can expect that this will continue to have a very significant impact.

I just want to, in conclusion, recommend that our viewers, in understanding the context as I went through it earlier, and as

that pamphlet elaborates it very clearly, the context of this entire thing is the fight over the soul of the US Presidency and

the future of US policy on the world stage. We've witnessed decades and administration upon administration of this so-called

US-UK special relationship; which has merely perpetuated this Mackinder geopolitics on the entire planet. It has brought us to

the point of confrontation which could threaten thermonuclear war. This has become all too real. The fight over the paradigm

– will we remain the satrapy of this British geopolitical world

order, or will we break from that? Will we be liberated from that? Will we embrace the New Paradigm which is now sweeping the

planet? That is the question which is at stake here, and the stakes could not be higher.

For that reason, I want to strongly encourage all of our viewers to return here to larouchepac.com tomorrow, February 10th

at 12noon. That's 12noon eastern time. We will be treated by a

live address by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who be delivering the inaugural class in the LaRouche PAC 2018 online class series. That class series, as you can see here on the screen, is titled

"The End of Geopolitics. What Is the Global New Paradigm?"

It

will be hosted at the url, which is on the top of the screen there

– <http://discover.larouchepac.com>. This will be a 12-week class

series, which will follow up on the very successful class series

which we hosted here on larouchepac.com last year during 2017 on

LaRouche's economic discoveries. The invitation to this year's

class series is available there on

<http://discover.larouchepac.com>. Let me just read to you from the invitation:

"The American people are faced with a historic choice: join China's revolutionary New Silk Road program and secure a new paradigm of win-win global development, or continue the suicidal

geopolitical policies of Obama and Bush, guaranteeing confrontation with Russia and China and threatening world war.

While President Trump is inclined to move in the direction of cooperation with China and Russia, he is being threatened with a

palace coup by those desperately clinging to the old geopolitical

view of unchallenged Anglo-American global dominance.

"You can play a role in this decisive point in history. Help

secure the New Paradigm.

“LaRouche PAC is launching a new class series, “What is the New Paradigm?” to prepare you to lead the population at this critical time. 2018 must be the year we end geopolitics.”

Then, it lists what these classes will cover:

“Introduction: What is the New Paradigm?” This is Helga LaRouche’s address tomorrow.

“What is Geopolitics, Part I – History

“What is Geopolitics, Part II – Philosophy

“Culture – Beauty & Freedom vs. the CCF [Congress for Cultural Freedom]

“Confucian and Western Philosophy

“Science: Man’s Relation to the Universe

“Wrap-up and Mobilization – End Geopolitics”

So, the invitation invites you to register now for access to the syllabus, to the homework, to the reading assignments, and to

the special live discussion sessions which will be available only

for registered participants. Registration is now open at <http://discover.larouchepac.com>. Questions can be emailed to classes@larouchepac.com.

We strongly encourage you to register now for this class series, to become an active participant in this class series; to

build class hosting sessions in your location wherever you are in

the United States or even abroad, to build a group of people who

will participate in these classes on a weekly basis with you.

You can host it at your house, or at the local library, or on your college campus. And create a national mobilization of

participants around this series of classes so that we have the cadre of people who are educated and who understand this global

context for the ongoing fight that we now find ourselves in here

in the United States.

So again, tomorrow at 12noon, Helga LaRouche will be addressing this class series live. This will be the inaugural address, and we encourage you to register now for the entire class series for 2018. That brings a conclusion to our webcast

today. But I think if you reflect on the theme here – Russiagate has now become Londongate; all roads lead to London.

Let me put the graphic of our title right back on the screen here

one more time, and you'll see the image there of the MI-6 headquarters. This is where all roads lead; pull the threads and

you'll discover the truth about who really colluded with US elections in 2016, and is continuing to meddle with our political system.

Thank you very much for joining me here at larouchepac.com and please stay tuned.

[1]

http://turcopolier.typepad.com/sic_semper_tyrannis/2018/02/british-intelligence-tried-to-destroy-the-trump-presidency.html

**Breaking: Hemmeligt Nunes-Memo
offentliggjort! Sandheden om**

Russiagate.

LaRouche PAC Internationale

Webcast,

2. feb., 2018.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Jeg vil starte med at annoncere de seneste nyheder: Nunes-memoet, det fire sider lange memo, der blev udarbejdet af formand for Husets Efterretningskomite David Nunes, er nu officielt blevet afklassificeret af præsident Trump og er blevet frigivet til den amerikanske offentlighed. På trods af det Demokratiske lederskabs, efterretningssamfundets, selve FBI's og endda britisk efterretnings trusler, bagvaskelser og intimidering, har præsident Trump og det Republikanske lederskab på Capitol Hill besluttet at afklassificere dette memorandum, og *det er en bombe!*

Det afslører præcis det, som LaRouche PAC har dokumenteret lige fra begyndelsen af dette: Det såkaldte slibrige og ubekræftede, britiske efterretningsprodukt, kendt som Steele-dossieret, blev brugt som såkaldt »bevis« for at indhente en FISA-kendelse til at udspionere ledende medlemmer af Trumps kampagne. Det, som dette memo fortæller, er, at det nu er officielt, at Christopher Steele selv sagde til seniorembedsmand i Justitsministeriet, Bruce Ohr, at han var »desperat for, at Donald Trump ikke blev valgt og havde meget stærke følelser imod, at han blev præsident«. Det er Christopher Steeles egne ord, og dette sagde han til Bruce Ohr, *før* den første FISA-ansøgning overhovedet blev indgivet.

Og selv om det var kendt, at dette såkaldte dossier var et helt klart partisk stykke researcharbejde for oppositionen,

som blev finansieret af Hillary Clintons præsidentkampagne, imod hendes behørigt nominerede modstander i valget, Donald Trump, så blev denne anmodning om overvågning godkendt af FBI-direktør James Comey, og ligeledes af Andrew McCabe [daværende FBI-vice-direktør].

Dette memo vil helt bestemt markere et vendepunkt i hele denne operation og hele dette kupforsøg mod vores præsident og vil højst sandsynligt gå over i historien som et af de mest skamfulde kapitler i vores republiks historie. Hele Russiagate-operationen er et skamfuldt eksempel på det mest grove magtmisbrug fra FBI's side, der fuldt ud lever op til den berygtede arv efter J. Edgar Hoover, i et forsøg på at bruge dette lands efterretningstjenester, i aftalt spil med britisk efterretning, til at underminere og vælte en ledende, politisk person og efterfølgende, USA's behørigt valgte præsident.

Som indledning til denne udsendelse vil jeg gerne dele med jer, den fulde tekst af dette memo, der netop er blevet afklassificeret. Som I ser i toppen, »Afklassificeret«, og det blev afklassificeret af præsidenten, efter ordrer, den 2. feb., 2018. Vi læser teksten [LPAC's redaktørs bemærkninger: Følgende tekst er taget fra Husets Permanente Efterretnings-Udvalgskomites pdf-dokument. I pdf-dokumentet vises den originale understregning (her med enkeltkrøllede parenteser) og fed skrift (dobbeltkrøllede parenteser); kursivering (ligeledes her vist med enkeltkrøllede parenteser) bruges udelukkende til publikationer.

https://intelligence.house.gov/uploadedfiles/memo_and_white_house_letter.pdf

(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet):

{{Purpose}}

This memorandum provides Members an update on significant facts relating to the Committee's ongoing investigation into

the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and their use of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) during the 2016 presidential election cycle. Our findings, which are detailed below, 1) raise concerns with the legitimacy and legality of certain DOJ and FBI interactions with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), and 2) represent a troubling breakdown of legal processes established to protect the American people from abuses related to the FISA process. {{Investigation Update}}

On October 21, 2016, DOJ and FBI sought and received a FISA probable cause order (not under Title VII) authorizing electronic surveillance on Carter Page from the FISC. Page is a U.S. citizen who served as a volunteer advisor to the Trump presidential campaign. Consistent with requirements under FISA, the application had to be first certified by the Director or Deputy Director of the FBI. It then required the approval of the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General (DAG), or the Senate-confirmed Assistant Attorney General for the National Security Division.

The FBI and DOJ obtained one initial FISA warrant targeting Carter Page and three FISA renewals from the FISC. As required by statute (50 U.S.C. §1805(d)(1)), a FISA order on an American citizen must be renewed by the FISC every 90 days and each renewal requires a separate finding of probable cause. Then-Director James Comey signed three FISA applications in question on behalf of the FBI, and Deputy Director Andrew

McCabe

signed one. Then-DAG Sally Yates, then-Acting DAG Dana Boente, and DAG Rod Rosenstein each signed one or more FISA applications

on behalf of DOJ.

Due to the sensitive nature of foreign intelligence activity, FISA submissions (including renewals) before the FISC

are classified. As such, the public's confidence in the integrity

of the FISA process depends on the court's ability to hold the government to the highest standard— particularly as it relates to surveillance of American citizens. However, the FISC's rigor

in protecting the rights of Americans, which is reinforced by 90-day renewals of surveillance orders, is necessarily dependent

on the government's production to the court of all material and

relevant facts. This should include information potentially favorable to the target of the FISA application that is known by

the government. In the case of Carter Page, the government had at

least four independent opportunities before the FISC to accurately provide an accounting of the relevant facts.

However,

our findings indicate that, as described below, material and relevant information was omitted.

1) The "dossier" compiled by Christopher Steele (Steele dossier) on behalf of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and

the Hillary Clinton campaign formed an essential part of the Carter Page FISA application. Steele was a longtime FBI source who was paid over \$160,000 by the DNC and Clinton campaign, via

the law firm Perkins Coie and research firm Fusion GPS, to obtain

derogatory information on Donald Trump's ties to Russia.

a) Neither the initial application in October 2016, nor any of the renewals, disclose or reference the role of the DNC, Clinton campaign, or any party/campaign in funding Steele's efforts, even though the political origins of the Steele dossier

were then known to senior DOJ and FBI officials.

b) The initial FISA application notes Steele was working for a named U.S. person, but does not name Fusion GPS and principal

Glenn Simpson, who was paid by a U.S. law firm (Perkins Coie) representing the DNC (even though it was known by DOJ at the time that political actors were involved with the Steele dossier). The application does not mention Steele was ultimately

working on behalf of—and paid by—the DNC and Clinton campaign, or that the FBI had separately authorized payment to Steele for

the same information.

2) The Carter Page FISA application also cited extensively a September 23, 2016, {Yahoo News} article by Michael Isikoff, which focuses on Page's July 2016 trip to Moscow. {This article

does not corroborate the Steele dossier because it is derived from information leaked by Steele himself to Yahoo News.} The Page FISA application incorrectly assesses that Steele did not directly provide information to {Yahoo News}. Steele has admitted

in British court filings that he met with {Yahoo News}—and several other outlets—in September 2016 at the direction of Fusion GPS. Perkins Coie was aware of Steele's initial media contacts because they hosted at least one meeting in Washington

D.C. in 2016 with Steele and Fusion GPS where this matter was

discussed.

a) Steele was suspended and then terminated as an FBI source for what the FBI defines as the most serious of violations—an unauthorized disclosure to the media of his relationship with the

FBI in an October 30, 2016, {Mother Jones} article by David Corn.

Steele should have been terminated for his previous undisclosed

contacts with

Yahoo and other outlets {{in September}}—before the Page application was submitted to the FISC in October—but Steele improperly concealed from and lied to the FBI about those contacts.

b) Steele's numerous encounters with the media violated the cardinal rule of source handling—maintaining confidentiality—and demonstrated that Steele had become a less than reliable source for the FBI.

3) Before and after Steele was terminated as a source, he maintained contact with DOJ via then-Associate Deputy Attorney General Bruce Ohr, a senior DOJ official who worked closely with

Deputy Attorneys General Yates and later Rosenstein. Shortly after the election, the FBI began interviewing Ohr, documenting

his communications with Steele. For example, in September 2016,

Steele admitted to Ohr his feelings against then-candidate Trump

when Steele said he {{“was desperate that Donald Trump not get elected and was passionate about him not being president.”}}

This

clear evidence of Steele's bias was recorded by Ohr at the time

and subsequently in official FBI files—but not reflected in any

of the Page FISA applications.

a) During this same time period, Ohr's wife was employed by Fusion GPS to assist in the cultivation of opposition research on Trump. Ohr later provided the FBI with all of his wife's opposition research, paid for by the DNC and Clinton campaign via Fusion GPS. The Ohrs' relationship with Steele and Fusion GPS was inexplicably concealed from the FISC.

4) According to the head of the FBI's counterintelligence division, Assistant Director Bill Priestap, corroboration of the Steele dossier was in its "infancy" at the time of the initial Page FISA application. After Steele was terminated, a source validation report conducted by an independent unit within FBI assessed Steele's reporting as only minimally corroborated. Yet, in early January 2017, Director Comey briefed President-elect Trump on a summary of the Steele dossier, even though it was—according to his June 2017 testimony—"salacious and unverified." While the FISA application relied on Steele's past record of credible reporting on other unrelated matters, it ignored or concealed his anti-Trump financial and ideological motivations. Furthermore, Deputy Director McCabe testified before the Committee in December 2017 that no surveillance warrant would have been sought from the FISC without the Steele dossier information.

5) The Page FISA application also mentions information regarding fellow Trump campaign advisor George Papadopoulos, but there is no evidence of any cooperation or conspiracy between

Page and Papadopoulos. The Papadopoulos information triggered the opening of an FBI counterintelligence investigation in late July 2016 by FBI agent Pete Strzok. Strzok was reassigned by the Special Counsel's Office to FBI Human Resources for improper text messages with his mistress, FBI Attorney Lisa Page (no known relation to Carter Page), where they both demonstrated a clear bias against Trump and in favor of Clinton, whom Strzok had also investigated. The Strzok/Lisa Page texts also reflect extensive discussions about the investigation, orchestrating leaks to the media, and include a meeting with Deputy Director McCabe to discuss an "insurance" policy against President Trump's election.

[end memo]

So this is a bombshell. And what it absolutely makes clear is that these Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrants against leading members of the President Trump campaign {never} would have been requested or obtained without the so-called evidence presented in the Steele dossier. And this Steele dossier is completely discredited, and as it made clear, in Steele's own words, he was "desperate that Donald Trump not get elected and was passionate about him not being president." Now, exactly as Congressman Matt Gaetz two weeks ago, when he first read this memo, when it was still classified, he said, "the facts contained in this memo are jaw dropping... There is no higher priority than the release of this information to preserve our democracy... I think that this will not end just with firings. I believe there are people who will go to

jail...

The entire Mueller investigation is a lie built on a foundation

of corruption... This will vindicate claims by many of us: It is a real attempt to undermine the President, from the scariest of places."

President Trump was speaking to the media earlier today, and right before the official release of this memo, the decision to

release this memo by the Republican leadership in the House, President Trump had the following to say. This is what President

Trump's own words were, in anticipation of the probable release

of this memo. He said the following: "I think it's terrible. You want to know the truth? I think it's a disgrace. What's going on in this country, I think it's a {disgrace}. The memo was sent to Congress, it was declassified. Congress will do whatever they're going to do. But I think it's a disgrace what's

happening in our country. And when you look at that, and you see

that, and some of the other things what's going on, a lot of people should be ashamed of themselves, and much worse than that.

So, I sent it over to Congress, and they will do what they're going to do. Whatever they do is fine. It was declassified, and

let's see what happens. But, a lot of people should be ashamed."

So those were President Trump's words.

Now, LaRouche PAC has issued a statement, which is now posted on the LaRouche PAC website. This statement contains a short summary of what is contained in the Nunes memo, and then it

has a short analysis and some commentary, and it promises to

be

swiftly followed up by more marching orders in the coming 72 hours.

But this is what LaRouche PAC has to say: "...We have a clear abuse of FISA, a fraud on that court. Material facts about surveillance of an American political campaign, and an American citizen, set into motion by the campaign's political opponent and their allies in the Obama administration were concealed from the court by the FBI and the Department of Justice.

"But there is much, much more here. Steele's dirty work was used by the Clinton campaign and the Obama Administration, in collusion with the media, in an attempt to defeat Donald Trump's bid for the Presidency. The subsequent Russiagate and Mueller investigations have been used in an attempt to destroy the Trump Presidency. The entire Russiagate myth, promulgated by Obama and the British, have destroyed U.S. Russian relations and endangered the entire world.

"We published the full story and the reasons why this is occurring months back. It is not what you think. Read the dossier, sign the petition, all of it, {all of it}, needs to be investigated and prosecuted."

Now, this is the dossier [LPAC.co/ytdos] which LaRouche PAC released months ago. This is the full documentation on not only Robert Mueller's background in prosecuting Lyndon LaRouche, in covering up the crimes of 9/11, and now, in being a central player in this attempted coup against the President of the United

States; but it was also ahead of the curve in absolutely documenting exactly what this Nunes memo is discussing. Let me give you one short example: This is a quote from inside the Mueller dossier. It says the following: "Hillary Clinton used the Steele Dossier to paint Trump as a Russian dupe throughout her general election campaign against him. James Comey used it to justify his FBI counterintelligence probe of the Trump campaign which began in July of 2016, and has continued. "Thus, we have the British government ... {intervening in an election in the United States to sway the result.} Most certainly this raises questions about the applicability of election laws which bar foreign funding for exactly the reason that the United States elections should be decided by United States citizens. Most certainly, once this sequence of events is fully investigated, it will become clear that all government participants intended to sway the election unlawfully, using the powers of a state to vanquish the will of the voters." And that gets directly at the core of the matter. And we didn't need the Nunes memo to know that that what this was all about all along. Now, what this dossier also documented – this is now, I'm talking about the LaRouche PAC dossier on the Mueller operation – what this documented is that motivation is not what you think it is. The motivation has got to be contextualized within an understanding of what is this moment in history in which we find ourselves? And this entire Russiagate coup from the very beginning was intended to prevent the kind of collaborative relationship that President Trump was clearly inclined towards in his Presidential election campaign, to say we have to end this

World War III, thermonuclear game of chicken that the Bush administration and the Obama administration have been playing with the Russians, which has brought us to the very threshold of

the kind of nuclear war that the citizens of Hawai'i were frightened about during that so-called false alarm a few weeks ago. This is a very, {very} real danger!

And the American people knew that to be true, and they associated Hillary Clinton with nothing less, than the further escalation of Obama's World War III policy against Russia.

This

is the consequence of British Imperial geopolitics: Divide and conquer.

President Trump made clear that he was willing to reach out a hand of collaboration and cooperation with Russia, and also, as

has subsequently been clear, with China, and to say, "we're going

to turn the geopolitical chessboard over, and we are going to establish a new great-powers relationship with these leading powers, in order to address the common problems that mankind must

resolve." And that was President Trump's clear, clear inclination.

So why was the Russiagate thing cooked up from the very beginning? Well, it was to block President Trump from establishing that kind of collaborative relationship with Russia

and with China, and instead, to ensure the continuation of the Obama/Hillary Clinton policy of confrontation and potential thermonuclear war.

{So that's what's at stake here.} And the reason that the timing is so critical, is because a New Paradigm of economics and

strategic partnerships is emerging on this planet as we speak. It's rapidly escalating and it's a tide that very well could

not

be turned back short of that kind of thermonuclear war. What form that New Paradigm is taking is the Belt and Road Initiative,

China's initiative to create a new win-win economic, political,

and strategic partnership among the nations of the world for peace through massive economic development. The Belt and Road has already come to Central Asia, the Belt and Road has already

come to Africa, the Belt and Road has already come to Eastern Europe. And the Belt and Road, as we speak, is in the process of

coming to the Western Hemisphere with Latin America and Caribbean

fully on board. The question is, will the United States join?

That was the question which provoked this Russia-gate coup attempt against President Trump from the very beginning.

That,

and because we must defend the very fundamental facets of our Constitutional republic, of our Constitutional democracy; that is

why we must defeat this coup. Whether you consider yourself a Republican, whether you consider yourself a Democrat, an independent, whether you even personally support President Trump

or like him; you must defeat this clear and blatant coup against

the Constitution and the Presidency of the United States.

Now, what I'd like to do for you is to point out the irony that the Democratic Party which, going back to the dirty trick operations against the Kennedys, against Martin Luther King, by

J. Edgar Hoover, the Democratic Party led the charge on investigating this FBI operation. The Democratic Party has now

sold themselves out completely to be the party of Russia-gate

—
the new McCarthyism. There's a very ironic statement by attorney Alan Dershowitz; he went on TV just yesterday, pointing out exactly this irony. And I'd like to just read you some of what Dershowitz had to say, pointing out that the Democratic Party has now become the cheering section for the FBI. He says: "I'm just old enough to remember when liberals and major media organizations believed America's national security apparatus had to be closely monitored to protect our civil liberties. "The liberals and journalists brought to light the horrific abuses of power that J. Edgar Hoover's FBI and the National Security Agency undertook in the 1960s against Martin Luther King and others.... "But all of that was forgotten this week, as Washington liberals rushed to the microphones to demand that the Nunes memo from Representative Devin Nunes, Republican from California, be kept from the American people. Their sympathetic friends in the media were quick to give their complaints blanket and largely unskeptical coverage. "The four-page Nunes document is a House Intelligence Committee summary of Justice Department and FBI files that points to serious abuses of power involving the surveillance of US citizens in the run-up to the 2016 election.... But to leading Democrats, the possible discussion of intelligence agency abuses is akin to Armageddon. "Representative Adam Schiff, Democrat from California, the ranking Democrat on Nunes' Intelligence Committee, has read

the

Nunes memo, but curiously dismisses it by saying ... the memo is 'meant only to give Republican House members a distorted view of

the FBI.' Far from resembling the crusading liberals of the 1960s and '70s, who probed the FBI; Schiff has taken on the role

of the Bureau's lapdog.

"... All of this presents a rich stew of questions that you might expect Washington to be curious about. Instead, you have a

frenzy of denunciation of people who want transparency in government and a lack of curiosity about the activities of our most powerful intelligence agencies – entities that have been guilty in the past of clear abuses of power.

"If Americans are to have faith in their government, it must have people who watch the watchers in our intelligence agencies.

So far this week, we are seeing an awful lot of people blindly defend the bureaucracy rather than fulfill their duty to question

authority."

Again, that was Alan Dershowitz.

So, the Democratic Party has completely bankrupted itself.

This is moment in which the entire LaRouche PAC program – the Four Laws, the economic recovery program that we have documented

and we have put out, our campaign to win the future, and the campaign to bring the United States into the New Paradigm of development in the form of the New Silk Road – this has got to replace this morally and intellectually bankrupt behavior by the

Democratic Party; and this must become the policy for all American citizens who are interested in saving this country.

Now, Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered a very significant webcast yesterday – the founder and President of the Schiller Institute. During that webcast, she was asked by the

moderator

what we should expect from the release of the Nunes memo. Of course, this was before it was clear that the memo would be released; although we were all highly anticipating the release of

this classified document. But, I would like to play for you a short excerpt of what Helga LaRouche had to say. I think she very clearly situates this within the broader context which must

be understood.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Oh, I think this is reaching very interesting dimensions. As a matter of fact, on the way out

of Congress, Trump was asked if he would release this Nunes memo,

and he said "100%." And then also the White House Chief of Staff

John Kelly was interviewed, and he said the White House would release this memo "pretty quick," because the American people should make up their minds on their own, what their judgment is.

And that is very good.

So there, again, you have a complete freak-out, for example, the German media, which were absolutely not reporting about this

whole controversy, or {if} they would only report about it from

the standpoint of Russia-gate and soon Trump will be gotten out

of office. Now they have to sort of cover their behind, in reporting about it, but they're still on the line of the FBI-leaning version, but they do have to report it.

What happened this week was naturally dramatic: You have the decision of the House Select Committee on Intelligence to

release the memo. Then you had the firing of [FBI Deputy Director Andrew] McCabe; that is very good. Then you have the ongoing operation by Senator Grassley and Senator Lindsey Graham,

who, on the one side are insisting on a criminal investigation against Christopher Steele; but they also sent letters to all the

leading Democrats, Podesta, the DNC, the various other Democratic

officials, asking them detailed questions: What did they know about the Steele dossier? When did they know about Hillary?

Many, many questions.

Then, McCabe is also under a new investigation, because it seems that he delayed the whole Hillary investigation concerning

her emails by three weeks, trying to push it behind the November

election.

So I think there is a lot of fury: You have people warning that the outcome of this will decide the fate of the United States – for example, Paul Craig Roberts, who after all was in the Reagan administration, he had a very stern warning saying the

stakes are extreme; if the coup plotters would get away with their actions, then the United States would turn into a full police-state, where the intelligence services would create a dictatorship and there would be no more accountability of the government. So this is clearly one side.

And on the other side, naturally, there is expected hope that if this memo, which is due to come out, at the latest tomorrow, because the rules are such that it has to be five days

after the vote in Congress, and that can really be an earthquake.

Because if what seems to be in this memo becomes public, I think

it will change not only the situation in the United States,

but

also it will have an earthquake effect internationally. [end video]

OGDEN: So, we can expect that earthquake to occur internationally. This is a huge development. The point is, that this must be situated within this fight, this ongoing battle for the soul of the US Presidency. We can see even at this moment that there are still opposite tendencies at work at the highest levels of this administration; people who are working against the inclination that this President has for the kind of great powers relationship and a new paradigm of international partnerships. We saw a very inflammatory speech by Rex Tillerson just yesterday. We've seen the release of the National Security Strategy, which accuses China and Russia of being authoritarian dictatorships which are attempting to reorder the entire international order. And so forth and so on. But we also see that President Trump continues to reach out to Russia. He did not impose these sanctions against the Russian officials, even though it was sent to him by Congress, and he continues to reach out to President Xi Jinping. And he continues to emphasize that a good relationship between the United States and these two countries is a very good thing, and not a bad thing. That's the point, though; that he is being backed into a corner. He continues to have the highest levels of his own administration working against him, and this political earthquake

which we can expect coming out of the declassification of this memo which makes undeniably clear that this was a political operation through the use of the intelligence agencies of this country in pure J. Edgar Hoover style through and through. It was nothing more than that, and continues to be nothing more than that.

President Trump, obviously as we know, delivered the State of the Union address this Tuesday, just a few days ago.

Whereas

the LaRouche Political Action Committee has been in an intense campaign to put on the table LaRouche's Four Economic Laws and the necessity for the United States to join the Silk Road, that

campaign has not lessened one bit in the aftermath of the State

of the Union; but has, in fact, intensified. The persisting questions will continue to be on the table. If President Trump

wants \$1.5 trillion in infrastructure investment, where is that

going to come from? How are you going to do that? Should you use a Hamiltonian national banking approach, as opposed to this

other concoction which has been put together by Steve Mnuchin and

others? Also, as the trans-Atlantic financial system continues

to be perched on the verge of a meltdown, how will President Trump respond to that impending threat? God forbid, if the entire came down as it did in 2008, if not worse. We must preempt that threat with a Glass-Steagall reorganization of this

entire financial system, as has been called for by LaRouche for

years. The threats are very clear; we're in a Catch-22. We're

on the verge of either a hyperinflationary blow-out, or a total bottom dropping out of the entire trans-Atlantic system. So, in response to President Trump's State of the Union speech, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in that same webcast yesterday, had a little bit of analysis. I'd like to share that with you.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Obviously, he did not say what he should have said, namely to go with the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, Glass-Steagall, and a new credit system in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton. Now, we don't give up hope that that may still come, because, after all, if you remember, when my husband in 1983 had campaigned for what became the Strategic Defense Initiative, this was not mentioned by President Reagan in the State of the Union address; but then, on the 23rd of March, Reagan publicly announced the Strategic Defense Initiative. So therefore, we can absolutely hope that President Trump eventually, when he has to come to the question of financing the infrastructure he announced, he will come back to his promise from the election campaign to implement Glass-Steagall. Otherwise, the speech was not bad. I think it's quite significant that, according to CBS, in a poll, 75% of the people who saw the speech were in great support for Trump. So I think that domestically, he definitely touched on a sense of optimism, even so there are still many problems, obviously, with the

financial system which he did not address. But I think it's on a good course.

I think the strongest indicator that he is doing something good is the freak-out by the Democrats, and while he appealed to

a bipartisan cooperation on the immigrant issue, on infrastructure, the Democrats who basically were sitting there,

demonstrating not-applauding, and in a certain sense being quite

the war-party. I think that has become crystal clear, because in

the context of the State of the Union, actually one day before,

was the deadline for the implementation of the sanctions which the Congress had voted on half a year earlier; and nothing

happened. The Trump administration did not implement sanctions

against Russia and there was a complete freak-out by such media

as the {New York Times} or think tanks like the Atlantic Council

which basically accused Trump of completely going against what the Congress had mandated. But the simple answer of the Trump

administration on the sanctions against Russia was that it was not necessary.

Now, that's very good. I think that in spite of the fact that Trump in terms of the foreign policy aspect of his State of

the Union address where he called Russia and China "rivals," rather than partners or something more positive, to which the Chinese reacted quite strongly. They said that this was alarming

and provocative. But then, the Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said

that the United States and China should work together instead,

for a happier future of all of mankind. So that response was on the one side, expressing displeasure, but on the other side, keep reaching out for the kind of cooperation which already was demonstrated between Xi Jinping and Trump. The Russians even responded less harsh, because they, in a commentary said the speech by Trump was much milder those of all of his predecessors, referring obviously to Obama and Bush. So I think this is not the end of the world. It's not what it should be, but I think in the context of what is happening in the United States, one can also not expect, given the neo-con mobilization, given the really ridiculous behavior of the Democrats, I think he did pretty well. [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's Helga LaRouche's analysis of President Trump's State of the Union. Clearly, what this demands of us is an escalation on the front of the campaign that we've been waging. This is contained in the Campaign to Win the Future statement which is now being circulated across the country for endorsement; and in fact, has already received an endorsement from some members of state legislatures, including a Democrat member of the state legislature from Michigan. This is really on the verge of totally breaking through. This really goes to the core of what President Trump, I think, stands for in the eyes of those who elected him; especially those electoral victories which were decisive in the so-called "Rust Belt" states – in Pennsylvania, in Michigan, in Wisconsin. He flipped those three states in an unprecedented Election Night turnaround. That's

what secured him the victory.

During his campaign when he went to the Midwest, when he went back after his victory, continually President Trump has continued to stand by this idea that we are a nation of builders,

and we must revive and live up to that great legacy with great projects for our own generation. That was one thing that he mentioned in the State of the Union speech, but he elaborated it

last night in a speech at the Greenbrier in West Virginia for the

Republican Party retreat. This is the very conclusion of that speech by Donald Trump:

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP

: We're proud of our history, we're confident in our values, and we're grateful to our heroes,

and we are determined to create a brighter future for all of our

people. We are restoring the bonds of love and loyalty that unite us all, as friends, as neighbors, as citizens, as Americans. Because when Americans are united, nothing – nothing

at all – nothing can stop us. We win. (Applause.)

As I said the other night, we are a nation that built the Empire State Building in one year. Actually, to be exact, it was

– we built it in less than a year. Would you believe it?

Working 24 hours around the clock.

We built the Hoover Dam in record time. We built the Golden Gate Bridge. We linked our nation together with railroads and highways. We dug out the Panama Canal. We're the nation that won two World Wars, defeated fascism and communism, and put satellites into space and planted our great American flag on the

face of the moon. We've healed the sick, cured disease, and cared for the poor like no other nation. We've lifted millions into prosperity, and delivered millions into freedom. This is our legacy. This is our birthright. And this is the foundation on which we build our very glorious future. Because together, we are, indeed, making America great again. Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you very much. (Applause.) Thank you. [end video]

OGDEN: Now, that's exactly the spirit which I think has energized the American people, and which we must continue to inform with the specific policies to honor that birthright as a nation of builders, as a nation which has accomplished unprecedented things, and which we must continue to do. The great projects are there for the taking, and if we look at what China is now doing, China has become a nation of builders as well; not only domestically, but abroad. The building of the One Belt, One Road Initiative, this New Silk Road – both the land Silk Road and the new Maritime Silk Road which is spanning the globe – this is what the United States must decisively join. It has come to the Western Hemisphere to the southern nations; and now it is time for the United States to join that collaboration and to reach out a hand of partnership between the United States and China, and to renew our partnership between the United States and Russia. One thing that you just heard President Trump say is that we were the nation that won two world wars and defeated fascism. Well, today happens to be the 75th anniversary of the victory

at
the legendary battle of Stalingrad. This was a horrific,
six-month siege. The casualties are absolutely staggering;
over
1 million casualties reported on the Russian side alone. Half
a
million Russians died during the battle of Stalingrad; but
this
was a great victory, led by the legendary Marshal Zhukov. It
was
a decisive defeat of the Nazi army, which led to the following
two years of the war, which finally, in collaboration between
—
there you see on the screen — President Roosevelt and Stalin
of
the Soviet Union. Fascism, Nazism was defeated.
To conclude our show, this is a quote from President
Roosevelt's letter of congratulations to Josef Stalin on the
victory at Stalingrad, 75 years ago today. I would encourage
us
to take this as the paradigm of what we must revive in terms
of
that kind of great powers relationship. If we come together
as
great nations on this Earth against mankind's common enemies
and
for the common aims of mankind, we can accomplish great
things.
So, here's what President Roosevelt had to say; this is
addressed
to Josef Stalin.
"As commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the United
States of America, I congratulate you on the brilliant victory
at
Stalingrad of the armies under your supreme command. The 162
days
of epic battle for the city which has forever honored your

name

and the decisive result which all Americans are celebrating today

will remain one of the proudest chapters in this war of the peoples united against Nazism and its emulators.

“The commanders and fighters of your armies at the front and the men and women who have supported them in factory and field have combined not only to cover with glory their country’s arms,

but to inspire by their example fresh determination among all the

United Nations to bend every energy to bring about the final defeat and unconditional surrender of the common enemy.”

“[signed] Franklin D Roosevelt”

And as we know, it was Franklin Roosevelt’s vision, as documented in the book {As He Saw It} by his son, Elliott Roosevelt, that in the aftermath of World War II, in the aftermath of the defeat of fascism, we would work together with

those allies that we had during the war, including Russia and China and India, to bring about a new era of development for the

planet. To bring what Franklin Roosevelt demonstrated in the form of the New Deal with the TVA and the great projects that were built here in the United States, lifting hundreds of thousands of Americans out of poverty at that time, to bring those New Deal policies to the globe in collaboration with the allies who won the war against fascism, to continue the war after

the defeat of Adolf Hitler and to fight a war against the colonial and imperialist policies of the British Empire. And to

fight a war against the poverty and backwardness that had been imposed on the world from centuries of British rule. That was Franklin Roosevelt’s vision for after the war. That was unfortunately and tragically abandoned with Franklin

Roosevelt's

death. We experienced decades of a Cold War with the nuclear sword of Damocles hanging over our heads. We are now at the point at which finally we must make the decision – will we allow

that Cold War mentality of geopolitics to bring us to the point

now of World War III and the potential extinction of the human race through thermonuclear war? Or, will we embrace the revival

of that legacy which is now being accomplished by the Chinese and

the Belt and Road Initiative and all the nations that have joined

together for that New Paradigm of peace through great projects and development? Will we say now is the moment when we can pick

up where Franklin Roosevelt left off and reach out a hand of partnership and collaboration to Russia, to China, and to all the

other nations of good will on this planet, to bring development

– finally – to every corner of the globe.

Obviously today, we've seen a major turning point in the history of the United States. This is a huge development, and as

we promised, there will be more updates from LaRouche PAC in the

coming hours, the coming 24, 48, and 72 hours to come. So, please stay tuned to larouchepac.com and mobilize, mobilize, mobilize. Thank you for joining us; stay tuned.

Genopbyg Amerikas hjerteland: Fra 'Rustbæltet' til 'Bælte & Vej'.

LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast,

26. jan., 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: I dag har jeg en særlig gæst, Bill Roberts, som er med fra Detroit, Michigan. Bill Roberts er LaRouche PAC's kampagnekoordinator for Midtvesten, og vi har også set hans succes mht. at være kandidat til kongressen, hvor han vandt 41 % af stemmerne i det demokratiske primærvalg i Michigan.

Titlen på vores udsendelse i dag er »Genopbyg Amerikas hjerteland: Fra 'Rustbæltet' til 'Bælte & Vej'«. Vores tema i dag er at se på kampagneplatformen til 2018-valget, som LaRouche PAC har udgivet og nu mobiliserer for på nationalt plan, og se på dette gennem Midtvestens linser, det såkaldte 'Rustbælte', der engang var motor for økonomisk vækst i hele USA. Dette er vort lands produktive hjerteland, og dette har været epicentret for kollapset i vareproduktion og den specialiserede arbejdsstyrke i USA. Dette udgør kernen i vores evne til at bringe USA ind i en ny æra for store projekter og økonomisk udvikling, der typificeres af Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ; heraf titlen på vores udsendelse, »Genopbyg Amerikas hjerteland: Fra 'Rustbæltet' til 'Bælte & Vej'«.

Kerneindholdet i LaRouche PAC's valgplatform 2018 er, at USA's præsidentskab omgående må vedtage Lyndon LaRouches fire økonomiske love og gå ind i en win-win-relation med Kinas Nye Silkevej. LaRouches fire økonomiske love er præcis det, der er

nødvendigt lige nu, hvis vi ønsker at få midlet til at gå ud af det, der synes at være en »ingen udgang«-situation. Vi er nu i en nedtælling på fire dage til præsident Trumps State of the Union-tale på tirsdag. I takt med denne nedtælling, har vi optrappet vores kampagne nationalt for at sætte dette på dagsordenen: LaRouches fire økonomiske love, og USA må gå med i den Nye Silkevej.

At dømme umiddelbart ud fra præsident Trumps tale her til morgen på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum, så vil han få brug for en 'omvendelse på vejen til Damaskus' i løbet af weekenden for at komme til at forstå, at, nej – at tale om en aktiemarkedsboble og \$7 billion i såkaldt »tilføjet værdi« eller merværdi på Wall Street, udgør ikke en økonomisk genrejsning! Faktisk udgør det selve problemet. Dette er præcis, hvad William White, tidligere cheføkonom for Den internationale Betalingsbank (BIS), advarede om i et interview, han gav i Davos til Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, og hvor han diskuterede det faktum, at vi praktisk taget uundgåeligt har kurs mod det transatlantiske finanssystems kollaps, af præcis denne grund: de billige penge, nulrentepolitikken, der er blevet gennemført af Federal Reserve og den Europæiske Centralbank (ECB), har skabt det, som William White kaldte et »Catch-22«, et Punkt 22. Hvis disse rentesatser forbliver lave, vil vi have kurs mod en hyperinflationsekspllosion af penge i systemet, og det vil føre os til en Weimar-stil hyperinflation, som vi så det i 1923. Men hvis ECB og Fed beslutter at hæve renten, vil »zombiebankerne« og »zombieselskaberne«, der i de seneste flere år har eksisteret, baseret på denne politik med nulrente, billige penge og kvantitativ lempelse, kollapse indad, og vi vil få et kollaps af systemet i denne retning.

Ud fra William Whites standpunkt, så har denne advarsel »ingen udgang«.

Der er faktisk en udgang, og vi ved nøjagtig, hvad det er, og dette er, hvad præsident Trump omgående må vedtage. Udgangen

består i Lyndon LaRouches fire økonomiske love: Rejs en brandmur i form af Glass-Steagall mellem kommerciel bankvirksomhed og de produktive investeringer, og så alt det mæg, vi har i form af spekulativ værdi på Wall Street og City of London. Lad dette mæg tørre ud og blæse væk; men beskyt de nødvendige, produktive, kommercielle bankvirksomhedsaspekter af vores økonomi. Erstat den spekulative økonomi med et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, hvor man tager billioner af dollars i statslig kredit, via en ny Nationalbank, og dirigerer det, ikke til spekulation, men derimod til reel, fysisk værdi: til storskala infrastrukturprojekter, store projekter, nye industrier, vareproduktion og til en forøgelse af arbejdskraftens produktive evne i USA's arbejdsstyrke; og især – som vi skal diskutere her i dag – i Midtvestens tidligere produktive arbejdsstyrke, og ligeledes bringe USA ind i dette store nye projekts Nye Silkevej.

Dette er, hvad præsident Trump må forstå om økonomi, og vi er i en nedtælling på fire dage til State of the Union, til at sætte dette på dagsordenen. Vores job slutter på ingen måde her; men formålet med denne 2018-valgplatform, som LaRouche PAC har udgivet, er tværtimod at vinde en kampagne, essentielt, for USA's præsidentskab. Vi er naturligvis ikke i et præsidentvalgår, og præsident Trump er den behørigt valgte præsident og vil være vores præsident for de næste tre år, mindst, på trods af bestræbelserne fra Russiagate-kuppets side og hans opponenter, der forsøger at vælte hans præsidentskab; men den kampagne, vi kører, er en kampagne for USA's præsidentskabs *politik*: Det er en kampagne for at vinde *kampen om præsidentskabets politik*.

I dag skal vi diskutere strategien, og Midtvesten, eller USA's industrielle hjerteland, er et af de afgørende elementer i denne strategi. Om lidt vil I få at se, at præsident Trumps sejr i 2016-valgene, i realiteten skyldtes hans sejr i Midtvesten. Han var i stand til at bryde det, der kaldes den »Demokratiske blå brandmur«, og han vendte fire store,

tidligere industrielle rustbæltstater, der havde stemt demokratisk, siden valget af FDR i præsidentielle valg; og han vendte dem og vandt disse stater: Pennsylvania, Michigan og Wisconsin, for ikke at tale om hans sejr i Ohio.

Hvordan gjorde han det? Han adresserede selve det faktum, at både det Republikanske og det Demokratiske Parti havde indgået en 'aftale med djævelen' om en konsensus om, begge at være partiet for frihandel og post-industrialisering. Kandidat Trump sprængte hele denne konsensus i stykker, gik ind og sagde, »Jeg er imod frihandel, vi vil nedlukke NAFTA«, og han sagde i særdeleshed, »vi vil bringe industri tilbage til hjertelandet«. Vi vil få ny vareproduktion, nye jobs, og han krævede endda en »ny industriel revolution«.

Jeg vil gerne give lidt baggrund, før vi kommer til diskussionen, om, hvad det var, præsident Trump fik adgang til, hvad enten, han helt var klar over det eller ej. Men dette er i produktivitetens ånd, og jeg vil faktisk hævde, at dette ikke er Trump-vælgerskaren, men at det er »LaRouche-vælgerskaren«. Og det, vi vil gøre med denne kampagne for at lægge 2018 LaRouche PAC-plattformen på bordet, er, at vi vil organisere denne vælgerskare omkring denne vision, de Fire Loves økonomiske program, og vi vil bruge denne indflydelse til at skabe en revolution i USA's præsidentskabs økonomiske politik.

Lad os gå lidt tilbage i tiden, til det industrielle kraftcenter, som Midtvesten var kendt som, før det fik lov at sygne hen og blive til 'rustbæltet'. Dette skete pga. Franklin Roosevelts mobilisering under Anden Verdenskrig, med at tage det, som var bilindustriens maskinværktøj til biler – i Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin og i det vestlige Pennsylvania – og at tilpasse disse bilfabrikker og bruge den specialiserede arbejdsstyrke til at lancere det, der blev kaldt »Demokratiets arsenal«.

Så lad os nu gå lidt tilbage i tiden og se på denne nyhedsfilm

fra Anden Verdenskrig, og I vil få at se, hvad vi mener, når vi taler om Franklin Roosevelts Demokratiets arsenal.

(Engelsk udskrift af resten af udsendelsen:)

[Video]

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: We must be the great arsenal of democracy.

NARRATOR: President Roosevelt makes an unprecedented 9,000 mile tour of the United States, to see for himself the nation at war. Visiting armament plants from coast to coast, he stops at the giant Chrysler tank arsenal, where he sees the Army's latest mechanized monsters, tested as they come from assembly lines. Then, on to one of Henry Ford's great bomber plants, where the President and First Lady are greeted by Mr. Ford and General Manager Sorensen. Plane workers, delighted with the surprise visit, show the President that wartime production is meeting the goal set, many plants exceeding their quotas.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: We shall send you, in ever-increasing numbers, ships, planes, tanks, guns: That is our purpose and our pledge!

NARRATOR: And the President's words meant action. America became the Arsenal of Democracy. ... Working 24 hours a day, seven days a week, where General Motors is undertaking to produce more than 10% of all war matériel fabricated from metal. Thousands of workmen in four

GM

divisions turn out machineguns in a mass-production basis.
Output is months ahead of schedule...

General Motors has pioneered in applying mass production methods to the manufacture of aircraft. Work goes on day and night under the adept fingers of General Motors men and women. They are producing an avalanche of weapons for victory in General

Motors manufacturing centers all over America. Machine tools, the master tools of industry and of victory are made at a constantly increasing rate... [end video]

OGDEN: So "machine tools, the master tools of industry and victory" are made at an ever-increasing rate. *That* was the Arsenal of Democracy. *That* was Franklin Roosevelt's economic program.

Now, what happened? President Trump, in the 2016 election did what all other candidates have refused to do: He refused to take what he called the "forgotten men and women" of the United

States, very much so, these formerly industrial, skilled labor force, and he said, you will be the forgotten men and women no more.

Contrast that to what Hillary Clinton did, where she took these states – Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin – took them

for granted, and in fact, never even *went* to Wisconsin for a campaign event – and lo and behold, on Election Night, surprise,

surprise, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin, all went for Trump. And in fact, that was the key to his winning the U.S. Presidency.

How did he do it? Well, let me play this clip for you from President Trump's going to Ypsilanti, Michigan to the Willow Run

auto factory, and where he discusses the Arsenal of Democracy,

and calls for the creation of new industrial revolution.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Great Americans of all backgrounds built the Arsenal of Democracy, including the legendary Rosie the

Riveter, who worked here at Willow Run. You know that. [cheers]

Seventy-five years ago, during the Second World War, thousands of

American workers filled this very building, to build the great new airplanes, the B-24 Liberator, at peak production – listen to this – it's not the country that we've been watching over the

last 20 years: They were building one B-24 *every single hour*.

[cheers] We don't hear that, we don't hear that any more, do we?

We'll be back, we'll be back, soon. The most amazing people.

And while that's incredible, it's a tribute, really, to the teamwork, determination and patriotism that lives on today, in each and every one of you. Great people – you're great people.

Now, these hundreds of acres that defended our democracy are going to help build the cars and cities of the future. So I ask

you, – that's fine, 'cause you're rushed – so I ask you today to join me in daring to believe that this facility, this city, and this nation, will once again shine with industrial might.

[cheers]

I'm asking you to place your faith in the American worker and these great American companies. [applause] I'm also asking

you, to respect, and place your faith in companies from foreign

lands that come here to build their product. We love them, too.

Right? We love them, too. [applause]

I'm asking all of the companies here, today, to join us, in this new industrial revolution: Let us put American workers, American families, and American dreams first, once again. May God bless the American worker. May God bless the Motor City. And may God bless the United States of America. Thank you, thank you. [cheers]
[end video]

OGDEN: And there you have it. So let's put on the screen here, the electoral map, and this is a very interesting map [Fig. 1] and I'm actually going to ask Bill Roberts to discuss it with us a little bit. But this was published by the *Washington Post* immediately after the election victory by President Trump. And you'll see here, the title is "The Former Obama Strongholds Sealed the Election for Trump." And I'll let Bill describe what we're looking at, but you'll see there, the concentration is in the rust belt, in the former industrial heartland, there, and that's the region of the country we're talking about here, right now. So Bill, tell us what we're looking at in that map and explain to us exactly what the strategy for victory here, has to be.

BILL ROBERTS: Sure. Matt, let me just start out by saying that there was recently an article published by a local representative, representing Macomb County [Michigan], I think one of those counties that was an Obama-voting county,

probably

voted for Obama twice, and then shifted and voted for Trump. What this local elected official was arguing for a decent high-wage, what's called a prevailing wage, for union employees.

And he made the point in that document that this policy actually

started with Henry Ford; it started with Henry Ford's decision that he was going to pay his workers \$5 a day to produce cars, and this wage would allow them to be able to buy the car that they were producing. So this is the coalition of producers which

we now have to mobilize to define, the standard of competence on

which national elected officials are going to run their campaigns.

Now, let me bring back up this map, here: What you're looking at, these are the districts across the country that voted

for Obama twice, as in the dark yellow; and in the light yellow

are districts that voted for Obama once. But all of these shaded

areas then were the counties that switched, that swung and voted

for Donald Trump in 2018. So these are traditionally Democratic

areas, where Trump went in and campaigned, where Hillary Clinton

did not, and he really made his focus the "forgotten men and women," who were part of this very advanced – I think "rust belt" is a kind of derogatory term, because in fact, the labor forces associated with these regions, whether they be farmers or

skilled workers, produce extremely advanced products, to the tolerances of a thousandth of an inch, or even smaller. And Trump tapped into something that Lyndon LaRouche identified

later, which is that, this was part of actually a global process of voters rejecting the failures, the failed policies of the trans-Atlantic financial system, the destruction of the skilled workforce; the overrunning of these areas with an epidemic of drugs, of opiates; the failed regime-change wars. And they voted for the policy, and not the party. And so, these are obviously going to be areas in which both the parties are going to be looking in the election to try to swing the vote. The problem is, neither party has the policies that can address the dire situation that these forgotten men and women find themselves in. Neither party's leadership has a competent program to be able to directly address these blue collar and rural districts in the upper Midwest, in terms of the kind of economic destruction they've seen. So, it really falls upon the campaign of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, and what we have to find is the standard of competent that can actually rebuild these areas. The LaRouche Four Laws, the identification of the necessity of the United States cooperating with China and countries that we can align our credit systems with, in order to actually capitalize a national infrastructure bank and a full economic recovery. I would just say that, you know, you have Democrats on the one hand, who continue to push the fraud of the Russiagate investigation, as if this hasn't been disproven, and moved to other slanders against Trump, such as the Durbin fraud of the racist remarks that Trump allegedly said. None of the voters in these swing areas, they absolutely hate this kind of stuff. And

then, on the Republican side, Trump has really got to be able to break with this GOP/Wall Street backed leadership orientation within his own party, in order to be able to address, similarly, this voting base. Because Wall Street- backed policies are not going to finance an economic recovery. Trump has already said that the public-private partnerships are not going to function to build the vast amount of infrastructure that's required. So the LaRouche Political Action Committee and our team here in the Midwest, are looking at races of interest, not necessarily ones that are going to come down to Republicans versus Democrat, but maybe even ones where there's an interesting difference in the party primary first – in other words, in the immediate period, in the immediate campaigns, is there an Obama-backed candidate, for example, who is running against someone who has the support of building trades, of engineering societies? Has a real interest in the revival of the productive economy, and this is our domain to shape. As you said Matt, this is really a LaRouche constituency. And I've been in these areas: I mean, these are people, that voted Democrat in every election in their entire life, and then they voted for Donald Trump. And it was the question of the "fair trade not free trade," it was the issue of bringing back manufacturing; it was the commitment to seeking solutions beyond geopolitics, beyond the regime-change wars that have been, really disproportionately hitting these post-industrial and urban communities that have made up a disproportionate number in the

Armed Forces recruitment.

So, if you look, there is 53% of these communities that shifted over and voted for Trump after having voted for Obama: This is an interesting demographics of producers who are clamoring for real leadership. There is a profound, profound vacuum of leadership, that I know from our forays into the state

legislatures in the recent weeks, are really demanding a way in

which – and they have not found this solution outside of what we

have presented to them – but a way in which you can actually capitalize, a sustained and thorough, scientific-driven, infrastructure-driven economic recovery over the next 10, 15, 20

years. And what strikes these local elected officials more than

anything, is that they have not been presented with any other plan at all that even identifies an approach to amassing the kind

of investment that you will get with the LaRouche plan and that

you will get with the cooperation of the United States with China

and with countries like Japan.

So, I think it's an extremely fertile situation if we intervene with a kind of vigor now to define the only competent

solution which exists for candidates and for constituency groups

to demand that those candidates campaign on.

OGDEN: And that's exactly the declared intention of this 2018 Platform from LaRouche PAC, is to seek out those constituency groups, but more so to create those constituency groups that are going to, through leadership and organization, will demand this scientifically informed economic agenda; what

LaRouche has laid out. Glass-Steagall to erect a firewall; reorganize the financial system; national banking as Alexander Hamilton did it; trillions of dollars in Federal credit for infrastructure, new industries, productive employment; and then all under a driver. Like the same kind of driver you saw there for the Arsenal of Democracy; that was a mission orientation. The kind of mission orientation that we need today is the space program and for fusion power. These are the kinds of drivers that create the top-down organization that economic activity can participate in, and then will feed into and have a self-reproducing kind of increase in productivity. Now what happened in Detroit, and what happened in Michigan, and what happened in the Midwest, was not something that was just a crisis of the last few years. This has been decades and decades in the making, and it goes back even before NAFTA. What occurred was a loss of that commitment that Franklin Roosevelt had to productivity and to productive employment. We actually, Bill, you and I worked together to produce a video several years ago, around the time that Detroit was forced to declare bankruptcy. It was called "Detroit: A Test Case for Genocide". In that video, we put together an animated graphic that showed the population increase in Detroit due to the mobilization around the Arsenal of Democracy; but then following that, and with the abandonment of that commitment to industrial production, the population decrease which has occurred for several decades, and

which has now gotten to a critical point. So, this is actually an animated population graphic, and I would like to just put this on the screen. You can listen to the narration there. This is from the original video, "Detroit: A Test Case for Genocide".

VIDEO: The population of Detroit began to explode around the turn of the 20th Century; increasing exponentially around 1910. However, with the crash of 1929 and the onset of the Great Depression, the population of Detroit began to level off and even decline for the first time in its history. It wasn't until Franklin Roosevelt's Arsenal of Democracy that the population began to grow again, surging to its maximum in 1950 with a population of over 1.8 million people; making Detroit the fifth largest city in the United States at the time. However, after 1950, the population began to drop once again, slowly at first, but accelerating over time. By the year 2000, the population had collapsed to under a million, and by 2010 to 713,000; less than the population was a century before.

A more than 60% drop from its peak in 1950; a loss of over 1 million people. This will only continue to accelerate at an ever-increasing rate under the bankers' dictatorship now controlling the city. [END VIDEO]

OGDEN: That was the despair and the crisis which really has been many generations in the making in Michigan, in Detroit, that Lyndon LaRouche was seeking to resolve when he called for a new re-tooling of the auto industry back in 2012 to 2013, and even

prior to that around the bankruptcy of the Big Three [automakers]. What he was calling for at that time, was to say

“Let’s re-tool the auto industry, and let’s use this machine tool

capability – the ‘make anything’ industry – to build the kinds of lock and dams, the bridges, the high-speed rail, the components for nuclear power plants; the kind of materiel that you would need to mobilize an emergency economic recovery of the

United States. The fact that that wasn’t done, has created even

worse conditions of impoverishment and despair. As you pointed

out, Bill, some of the pockets of the worst opioid epidemic are

in these former industrial, former skilled labor communities.

This is the constituency which elected President Trump, but what

has to happen if President Trump is going to deliver on the promises that he made? How is this going to be mobilized? What kind of economic recovery, what form is that going to take now from the standpoint of the Midwest?

ROBERTS: Well, if the news media had actually reported what Trump did when he was in China, Trump secured \$254 billion in direct investment into these various states you’re talking about.

West Virginia, which has been decimated by Obama and by the drug

epidemic, West Virginia is set up to receive \$84 billion in direct investments from a Chinese company, as a result of the trip that Donald Trump took to China and the friendly cooperation

of China and the United States, facilitated through these two leaders – the President of China and President Trump. Now, that’s more money than any known proposal proposes to have the

Federal portion, the Federally-funded, matched portion of investment in U.S. infrastructure. You look at any plan coming from Democrats, that's more money than the Federal government is going to capitalize in an infrastructure program. So, the first question on anyone's mind who now knows that – if you tell that to them – since the media is not readily reporting that is, "How is China able to invest so much in infrastructure?" Of course, the answer is that China has an American System policy bank; that's how China is able to capitalize these vast development programs across the continent of Asia into Africa. Now of course, China and Japan are both willing to put probably a total of about \$1 trillion or more into capitalizing a policy bank in the United States. It doesn't have to be a direct investment. A number of direct investments by China were rejected on the basis of supposed security concerns. So, they don't have to be direct investments, but we can simply capitalize a national bank and then utilize the approach we have in the past, such as a new gas tax, to finance such debt, such a national banking structure. I think this is something that used to be very commonplace; this is how Franklin Roosevelt did things, this is how Abraham Lincoln did things, and it's a kind of forgotten method. If this would have been reported that, in fact, this is the dynamic that exists in the world that is driving massive development throughout the planet, then everyone

would be talking about this already. Everyone would be wanting to know how China is able to do this. They would be demanding that the very Henry C Carey system that the Chinese love to study so much is exactly the basis on which we now unleash a 10-15 year process of massive infrastructure investment; and that the way that you pay for this, is through massive revolutionary breakthroughs in technology keyed off of breakthroughs in the manned space mission and the expansion of NASA, and in fusion power. That it's the revolutionary scientific advancements, not money per se, which actually is what pays for this process. The Chinese understand this, too; which you can see in their fusion program and in their highly developed and growing space program. The media has certainly been aiding and abetting an unfortunate process in this country; where the elections will tend to be very partisan, low level, least common denominator kinds of discussions; hot-button topics. But it doesn't have to be. Everything that we've just gone through here in terms of the history of how the United States has been a productive country and has been a scientifically revolutionary country driven by the machine tool sector, and has had institutions that make it possible to finance such revolutionary developments; that these are not only available to the United States, but that this is already a process driving most of the world. In fact, the President of the United States has been the most open President, and is very open to working with these other countries within

this very sort of dynamic. So again, our objective – we have to sort of evangelize; because there are so many people out there who, if they simply knew what was happening in the world and if they had the LaRouche Four Laws solution at their fingertips, they would gladly demand it. They would gladly reach across the aisle to work – Republicans working with Democrats on mobilizing big Federal expenditures for infrastructure; Democrats gladly dropping the insane anti-Trump tirades, and instead urging him to break with Wall Street, and reach across the aisle and work with Republicans who are willing to collaborate on an anti-Wall Street policy, an American System policy along with Trump. So, we found tremendous openness.

But we don't want to just go to the candidates for the endorsement and for them to campaign on these policies – on the New Silk Road, on ending the coup against the President, and on LaRouche's Four Laws. But rather, we want to get to their base of support – the skilled labor unions, the professional organizations, the engineers, the voting blocs in general and the state legislatures, the super constituents. We have to have an accelerated process of educating these individuals on the unique LaRouche solution that you are not going to get from the party leadership at this point, who are really too much stuck in the old paradigm. But if we introduce these constituents to the

New

Paradigm, sure, of course, gladly they will take that instead of this lame discussion that you'll otherwise get at these candidates' debates.

OGDEN: And LaRouche PAC is uniquely positioned to do that; that's why it's so necessary that we put out this platform, this statement of intent and that we're conducting a national mobilization. LaRouche PAC, especially there in the Midwest with the productive labor force, the working class constituency, LaRouche PAC has an extraordinary amount of authority on the ground among those kinds of labor organizations and productive workers. I would say also Bill, you personally have an extraordinary amount of authority because of what you have been engaged in there for years; including, as I mentioned at the beginning, a Congressional campaign that you ran in 2012 there. You got 41% of the vote in the 11th Congressional District there in the 2012 Democratic primary. Now, I'd actually like to play a clip for our viewers of testimony that you gave in front of the Detroit City Council in 2012, when this entire rigging of the LIBOR rate came up and the city was dealing with "Oh my gosh! How are we going to repay these debts and are we going to have to declare bankruptcy?" Here's the intervention that you made around Glass-Steagall and the necessity of immediately instituting this kind of Franklin Roosevelt policy. So, this is testimony from July 24, 2012 at the Detroit City Council.

ROBERTS

: My name is Bill Roberts. I am running for U.S. Congress, and I do so for the same reason I'm here today, which is that if I were not here to say what I'm saying today, no one would say it. I'm calling on the Detroit City Council to reject any cuts that endanger the lives of human beings, and instead to publicly call for and fight for the reinstatement of House Resolution 1489, the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall; which both Congressmen from Detroit are co-sponsors of, to break up the too-big-to-fail banks. The reason why I bring this up today is because it is clear that 75% of major cities enter into interest rate swaps. These interest rate swaps were rigged against cities at the highest level; at the LIBOR – the London Inter-Bank Offered Rate. This is murder. This is not insider trading; this is murder. It has resulted in cuts to departments that have killed people. There are people at the highest level involved in this. I call upon the Detroit City Council to stand up and have the guts to tell the private bankers that they are going to jail.

OGDEN: Now, within the next year, Detroit was forced to declare bankruptcy under Rick Snyder and financial manager Kevyn Orr. And exactly one year later, in July of 2013, Lyndon LaRouche went on record and was asked what has to be done to save

the city of Detroit, to save the entire industrial heartland, and what kinds of solutions are on the table? He talked about Glass-Steagall, but he talked about an expanded Glass-Steagall solution. So, I'd like to just play this clip from Lyndon LaRouche for you.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: What is the situation of the United States in terms of its economic development over the period, say the last really effective Presidency went down? What happened, particularly with two terms of the Bush family and this latest phenomenon, is that the economy of the United States virtually does not exist. And that's true in the case of the auto industry in particular, which is the center of this whole thing with Detroit, is the auto industry. It's not just the auto industry in Michigan, nor is it in the northern states around Michigan. It goes all the way through the entire system – north, south, east and west. The U.S. economy does no longer function! And there is no hope for this nation under the present conditions, unless we change those conditions radically. Therefore, we have lost the auto industry. Do you know how important the auto industry was? Do you know how important back in 2005 and so forth when we fought to save the auto industry? And I was playing a leading part in that fight. Do you realize what happened when the auto industry went down? Do you realize that we no longer are a nation capable of meeting our own needs? Look at the food supply. What's the food supply of the United States? How do parts of the farm area work? Nothing works! Especially since George W Bush became President. Since that point, there has been a disintegration throughout Europe and throughout the

United States and other parts of the world. We no longer have a sustainable economy. What we have is the possibility, with special efforts, to revive the economy. Now, what we're going to have to do – we've got some people in Detroit, for example. They're unemployed, essentially. There are few of them left in the other odd industries that they fled into as machine tool specialists and so forth. What we're going to do is create a new industry, based on the core of the skilled people who can play a key leading part in assembling a replacement for what used to be called the auto industry. The real name for the auto industry as it was since World War II, is the machine tool industry; that's its character. So, our job is, in the case of Detroit, you cannot solve this economic problem by sitting there or by following some politician's recipes. What we can do is seize control of the situation. Only through Glass-Steagall can we save the United States; otherwise the United States is doomed without Glass-Steagall. Because there is no agriculture, there is no machine tool system, there is no labor production of any significance; that's it. So therefore, unless we get Glass-Steagall in, we will not be able to make an immediate change from the kind of economy on which you're operating now, which is a hopeless failure. By changing quickly to bring agriculture back, to build up the water systems that we

need for feeding our people; all these things depend upon Glass-Steagall. Not just Glass-Steagall itself, but an expanded

version of Glass-Steagall.

Therefore, the issue is, unless we can seize the hands of power in the United States and organize the government to behave

like the government, not like it's been doing recently; and go in

there and put Glass-Steagall into effect quickly. Having done that, we're going to have to – in addition to Glass-Steagall – we're going to have to create a credit system to supplement Glass-Steagall in order to finance the things that have to be built up in terms of production which are needed to restore this

nation. Without those actions, there's no hope. You don't have

a chance; there is no other option. Grab the United States; put

it back to business as best you can, and use some innovation.

But above all, apply Glass-Steagall as I know how to do it; and

some other people also know. The very fact that we restore the

confidence of the people in their own nation – that is, the United States – by taking immediate action; which means large amounts of fundraising and fund contributions to get farming and

industry back going immediately. We have to have – just as Roosevelt did during the period of the onset of the Depression,

his first years. We had people; we put them to work. They weren't really producing anything; they were stuck in there with

shovels and picks and so forth out in the streets. They weren't

really producing things, but they were there; and they had a

job.

And they had the beginnings of a family income, and they had a future. That's what Roosevelt gave them, and that's what we now

have to give the people of the United States. We cannot give them much, because the friends of the Bush family have stolen so

much there's not much left for real people. But we can restart

the process of production; restart that; and that we can do.

And

that we {must} do. Without Glass-Steagall, we cannot do it.

So, the lives of the people of the United States depend upon Glass-Steagall. And Glass-Steagall can only be delivered by Glass-Steagall Plus. Glass-Steagall Plus means that we're going

to take the junk that is junk, and we're going to cancel it.

Most of this banking crap is worthless; there's no value in it.

So why are we continuing to bail it out in a hyperinflationary rate? We don't need it. Put the thing through processing, and

you will find that when you go through the paperwork, all these

banking systems, the Wall Street crowd, all of them; how much of

these things they claim they own are actually real? I don't know

if they could come out with a penny of it for a giant. So

therefore the point is, we have to restore the United States; get

rid of this crap, and do what Franklin Roosevelt did. It's going

to be more difficult than what Franklin Roosevelt faced in his time, but the principle is, we've got to do it. That's the answer; we've got to do it and get the message across to the people. That's the only thing; there is no other chance.

Forget

this Republican nonsense; they're just wolves trying to find a place to bark in. But that's the answer, and there is no other answer.

OGDEN: So, that was from 2013, but as you can see, that's the core of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws; that's the entirety of the program. That's the kind of voice of authority

that we have to come into the scene with, and speak with that kind of forcefulness, that kind of authority. That's exactly the

voice of Lyndon LaRouche that this constituency bloc can be formed around. As I said, what Trump tapped into – whether he knew it or not – is indeed the LaRouche constituency there in the heartland, in the industrial Midwest.

So, Bill, I just wanted to let you make some concluding points, but this is the theme. We can very rapidly take this so-called Rust Belt and bring it into the Belt and Road Initiative; and bring the New Paradigm of great projects into the

Midwest and awaken that kind of optimism. So, Bill, I invite you to just go ahead.

ROBERTS: Well, I think what Lyn said right there is absolutely key; that's it. People got brainwashed into thinking

that money is the key to wealth; that money is economy. And Lyn

said "No. Cancel a lot of that money. We don't need the money."

People said, "Cancel the money? How can we do that?" The point

is, you don't need it, and what you need is, you need the machine

tool capability, you need the advanced farming, and you need the things that go along with that. I wish we would have had a graphic in terms of where the funding goes in a national credit system, because that's really what he was addressing here. But the key is, you need the credit. We can build everything we need to. The people, the "toolies" in these areas as they call them, in these counties where people switched profile and voted for Trump; they understand this. They understand how what is central to an economy; what is essential to a productive workforce. The issue is credit. You don't need Wall Street trying to make 11%-12% off of any money that they loose from their hands. What you need is to organize the credit; then the people can build the economy. You don't need the straitjacket of this monetary system. In fact, if Trump doesn't move against this Wall Street financial bubble, this will bring the country down. It's a ticking time bomb right now, waiting to go off; as William White and others have said. This thing is ready to go. If this is not moved against with the Glass-Steagall policy, we're looking at a complete and utter disaster. But the good news is, we don't need it. It's simply that the American citizenry, the people watching this today, have to take it as a personal challenge that we have

to create among these constituencies of the country, the notion that there is a standard of competence for Federal office. That standard of competence is the comprehension of this principle; this non-monetarist credit system principle that we have been discussing today. I guarantee that if you do that, people will listen.

OGDEN: Well, let me put on the screen one more time "A Campaign for Victory: The Campaign to Win the Future". This is the electoral platform that LaRouche PAC has put out for 2018. And Bill, you're right in the middle of mobilizing the constituencies there in the Midwest. We need a national mobilization to endorse this platform; not only candidates for office, but Bill, as you said, the building trades, the labor unions, the productive workers, the agricultural organizations. These are the constituency bases that need to come to understand this as principle. The link is there on the screen: LPAC.CO/YT2018. This is the LaRouche PAC election platform for 2018.

We've got a lot of work to do, because it is our responsibility to communicate what you just said, Bill. This is a non-monetarist principle; it means that you have to raise your level of comprehension of what economics is really all about. This is not monetarism, this is not Wall Street; this is a question of what makes mankind a unique creative species, and how is that reflected in national economic policy. So, that's what is contained in the LaRouche PAC 2018 Campaign to Win the

Future.

We ask you to join our mobilization; endorse this, and become a part of what we're doing nationally. This is our strategy for victory.

So Bill, thank you very much for joining me here today.

It's good to hear from you; it's good to hear what's happening out there in the Midwest, and we look forward to being in touch a

lot more. I think we can look forward to a real mobilization.

So, thank you very much.

And thank you for tuning in to larouchepac.com. Please stay tuned; we have a lot of work to do, and we'll see you next week.

Thank you. Signing off, this is Matthew Ogden. Good night.

**»Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til
Vestasien
og Afrika« LaRouche PAC
Internationale
Webcast 19. jan., 2018, med
Hussein Askary og Jason Ross,
forfatterne
af Schiller Instituttets nye**

rapport

Vi har et helt særligt program i dag; med mig i studiet har jeg Jason Ross, og via video fra Sverige har jeg Hussein Askary. Jason og Hussein er begge medforfattere af en ny rapport, der netop er udgivet, med titlen, »Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika: En vision for en økonomisk renæssance«.

(OBS! Se [invitation til seminar i København 5. febr. med Hussein Askary](#))

[Bemærk: Der er mange billeder, der hver er separat nummererede af de forskellige talere; det er selvfølgelig bedst at se videoen, -red.]

Vært Matthew Ogden: Det er 19. januar, og dette er vores ugentlige fredags-webcast fra larouchepac.com.

Vi har et helt særligt program i dag; med mig i studiet har jeg Jason Ross, og via video fra Sverige har jeg Hussein Askary. Jason og Hussein er begge medforfattere af en ny rapport, der netop er udgivet, med titlen, »Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika: En vision for en økonomisk renæssance«.

Det bliver emnet for aftenens udsendelse; men før vi kommer til det, vil jeg gerne lægge ud med at sige, at LaRouche Political Action Committee har indledt en national kampagne for at sætte betingelserne for valgene 2018. Som I ser her, er titlen for vores kampagne »Kampagnen for at vinde fremtiden«, og det er titlen på en erklæring, der nu cirkuleres i hele landet. Erklæringens indhold fremlægger de politiske prioriteter, der vil bestemme udfaldet af valgene her i USA i år, med hensyn til dette lands overlevelse. Vi er i det indledende stadie for at indsamle underskrifter på denne erklæring, og vi opfordrer seerne, især her i USA, til at underskrive denne kampagne. URL ses her på skærmen, og I kan

også få organisationer i valgkredsene, medlemmer af delstatskongresserne, siddende medlemmer af USA's Kongres og i særdeleshed kandidater til offentligt (føderalt) embede, til at underskrive denne kampagne.

Indholdet af denne programerklæring er meget signifikant. Den kræver, at USA vedtager Lyndon LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love, dvs.: Vedtag Glass-Steagall for at rejse en brandmur mellem kommerciel, produktiv bankaktivitet og spekulativ bankaktivitet på Wall Street; for det andet, at indføre et nationalbanksystem (statsligt banksystem) i Alexander Hamiltons tradition; for det tredje, brug billioner af dollar i føderal (statslig) kredit til at løfte det amerikanske folk og for at skabe produktiv beskæftigelse på det højeste og mest avancerede teknologiske niveau; og for det fjerde, sæt et forceret program i gang, der går i retning af udvikling af fusionskraft og udvidelsen af bemanded rumfart.

Det er meget, meget vigtigt, at vi har indledt denne kampagne nu, for vi går nu ind i de sidste 11-dages nedtælling fra nu og frem til præsident Trumps State of the Union-tale den 30. jan. Indholdet af dette politiske programforslag må være bestemmende for præsidentskabets politiske program her i USA. Som I ser, er vore to punkter på dagsordenen 1) Vedtag Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, og 2) Gå med i den Nye Silkevej.

Det bliver emnet for vores diskussion i dag. For de seere, der evt. ikke ved det, så blev ideen om den Nye Silkevej først udarbejdet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i 1980'erne. Det var den daværende Eurasiske Landbro for at udvikle det eurasiske kontinents indlandsområder, som forbinder Øst og Vest. Det blev til den Nye Silkevej og blev kaldt således af præsident Xi Jinping i Kina, da han i 2013 vedtog dette. Det udviklede sig så til Bælte & Vej Initiativet, som var en forbindelse mellem den landbaserede Silkevej og udviklingen af en Maritim Silkevej.

Gennem LaRouche-bevægelsens lederskab udvides dette nu til

ikke blot en eurasisk Ny Silkevej, men en Verdenslandbro, der omfatter alle Jordens kontinenter, inklusive Vesteuropa, Central- og Sydamerika, Nordamerika og for vores udsendelse her i dag i særdeleshed, Afrika.

Udviklingen af Afrika har ligesom været en slags lakmusprøve for menneskeheden i dag: Kina har taget denne udfordring op og har bestået prøven og sat standarden, som resten af verden må følge. Vi har set dette inspirere andre nationer, og for nylig har vi haft et meget signifikant gennembrud med den franske præsident Emmanuel Macrons besøg i Kina, hvor han mødtes med præsident Xi Jinping og erklærede, at Frankrig favner billedet af udvikling af verden gennem den Nye Silkevej, inklusive, at Frankrig ønsker at arbejde sammen med Kina om Afrikas udvikling. Dette er måske en bodsgang for Frankrigs kolonialistiske imperiefortid, men det, præsident Macron havde at sige, var meget signifikant.

Som I ser, så holdt han en meget signifikant tale i Xi'an, og i denne tale diskuterede han, hvad Kina har gjort for at udvikle Afrika og for at løfte 700 millioner af sin egen befolkning ud af fattigdom, og at Frankrig nu må imødekomme opfordringen til at deltage i denne udvikling, især udviklingen i Afrika, i partnerskab med Kina. Her følger et par citater af, hvad præsident Macron havde at sige:

»Det er lykkedes Kina i de seneste par årtier at løfte 700 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom ... Men jeg tænker også på Afrika. Kina har i de seneste par år investeret stort i infrastruktur og råmaterialer med en finansiell styrke, som europæiske lande ikke har. Samtidig har Frankrig historisk og kulturel viden om Afrika, som giver det mange aktiver for fremtiden.

Vi må ikke gentage fortidens fejltagelser, med at skabe politisk og finansiell afhængighed under påskud af udvikling ... det turde være nødvendigt at sige, at denne udvikling kun vil ske i fællesskab ... Frankrig har erfaringen med en ensidig

imperialisme i Afrika, der undertiden har ført til det værste, og i dag, med disse nye Silkeveje, der åbner op ... Jeg mener, at partnerskabet mellem Frankrig og Kina kan gøre det muligt at undgå en gentagelse af disse fejltagelser ... Det er en moralsk udfordring, og jeg håber oprigtigt, at vi kan imødekomme den sammen ... Det enorme arbejde, der gøres med infrastruktur og økonomisk udvikling, vil give et nyt ansigt til disse nye Silkeveje på det afrikanske kontinent.«

Som præsident Macron sagde, »det er en moralsk udfordring«; og nu får Afrika, der har været et af de mest underudviklede, fejlerenærede, forarmede og tilbagestående steder på planeten, muligheden for en renæssance og for at blive et knudepunkt for udvikling for hele dette område af planeten.

Som jeg sagde, så er titlen på aftenens udsendelse »Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika«, og jeg vil lade Jason Ross introducere jer til Hussein Askary, og vi kan diskutere indholdet af denne specialrapport, der netop er udgivet.

Jason Ross: Jeg tror, vi skal gå direkte til Hussein nu. Hussein Askary har arbejdet i området i mange år. Han er den, der oversatte *EIR's* Specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen« til arabisk og lancerede denne oversættelse i Kairo på et møde med den egyptiske transportminister.

Hussein har arbejdet meget på dette. Sammen har vi skrevet denne 274-siders rapport, I ser her. I kan få en kopi af denne rapport på Amazon og direkte gennem vores site også, [LPAC.CO/ExtendedSilkRoad], I ser linket her for neden, for at få en kopi.

Og hermed, lad os høre fra Hussein.

(Her følger et engelsk udskrift af resten af udsendelsen).

HUSSEIN ASKARY: Thank you, Jason and Matt. I'm very happy to be on this show. The writing of this report, actually, which took us several months last year, together with you, Jason, and a great team of collaborators in the Schiller Institute, it was a bit of a paradox, because we were writing this report from the standpoint of the future, and therefore the tone is optimism in the report. But at the same time, when you look at the news from Southwest Asia, which people wrongly call the "Middle East," and Africa, the news that these regions are, you know, hell-holes and people are fleeing from there by tens of thousands, there's famines, there's wars, and all kinds of things. But, if you keep digging your feet into that so-called "reality," which is artificially created by geopolitics, you will never come out and you will never be able to think clearly to solve the problem. And therefore, as Lyndon LaRouche always says, it's the future that determines the present. It's our vision of the future which gives us the inspiration and the means of thinking to change our behavior today. And this is something which we hope that with this report, too, and all the other campaigns we are having, to change the minds of people, and of leadership, whether it's in the United States or Europe, or Southwest Asia, or Africa – anywhere. At the same time, we are not naïve, we are not in the ivory tower, sitting and drawing nice baths, but this is a very

scientific study, based on LaRouche's idea of physical economy, but also they are philosophical and humanist principles throughout this whole report and the project we are designing, which goes both humanist Christian tradition and also the Confucian humanist Chinese tradition. We have provided for the readers of this report, a complete picture of what are the tools needed, whether physically, or intellectually, scientifically and morally, to be able to reach this future we are outlining in the report.

And we are not simply just reporting on "great things" that have already happened, that China is doing, but we are drawing a map towards the future: A future which Lyndon LaRouche already, more than 30 years ago, when the African Union published the Lagos Plan of Action for the development of Africa, he criticized the reaction to that policy by saying that you cannot adhere to the existing financial and economic and moral policies of the existing order, and at the same time achieve the development goals of Africa. You have to have a complete shift. And that shift is what Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the president of the Schiller Institute now says is the New Paradigm, the New Paradigm which has been launched by China and its partners in the BRICS, Russia and other nations, and many more nations are joining. Now, if we look at the first slide, the Silk Road, this is what Matt said in terms of our development of the idea – the LaRouches' development of the idea of the World Land-Bridge, to

bring all the continents together. Now, the New Silk Road is already reaching West Asia and Africa. Egypt has been building

the new Suez Canal to adapt to the Maritime Silk Road, and the other nations, like Ethiopia, Kenya, and others are already in collaboration and new railway systems have been built. So already on the ground, that's taking place.

But what is needed is a larger vision which we provide.

Now, also we have to reverse many of the old policies which have

been followed, which have kept Africa impoverished, such as, for

more than 200 years, Africa has been considered by the European

colonialists and their partners across the Atlantic, as a looting

ground – whether it is slavery, whether it is raw materials, plantations, and so on. And unfortunately, after World War II,

the vision of Franklin Roosevelt was not implemented, because he

died before the end of the war, and a wholly new type of creatures took over in the United States. And the United States

also, with the “special relationship” with the British Empire became a partner in the looting of Africa. And companies we have,

like Anglo American, which is a corporation called Anglo American, very active in mining in Africa – I mean, the name tells you all about it.

But we just take a look at what has been happening in Africa in at least the last 10-15 years, the attitude, – that's what is fascinating with the New Paradigm – the attitude of Europe and the United States toward Africa has always been that “Africa

is a problem,” while the Chinese see Africa as an “opportunity.”

Therefore, the focus by Europe and the United States, while they were looting the continent, were just pushing aid programs. Now, the slide we have, number 2, here, is the "Foreign Direct Investments in Africa," where we see the United States is the blue line on the top, and China is the red line, which is increasing steadily. The United States, something funny happened in 2008 – there was the financial/economic crisis – then you have a dip in investments in Africa, but also what happens in the United States is that the first African-American President is elected. And you see, from 2009, U.S. investments in Africa completely collapsed and came down to zero by 2015, while the Chinese investments increased. Now, there's a flip side to this argument, is because most of the U.S. investments in Africa are in the oil and mining sector. And with the collapse of the oil and mining prices, there was no more interest; and Mr. Obama also launched the largest fracking operation on Earth in the United States, to make the United States the biggest producers of fossil fuels in the world. But China's investments continued all the same. In the next slide, number 3, we see the level of investments by the Export Import Banks of the United States on the one hand, which is the blue line which is completely dead, on the bottom; the United States does not issue credit for exports any more to Africa. But then we have the China Exim Bank increasing its investments, and more interestingly, is that the World Bank, which is the top, and you see where the failure of Western policy in Africa has been: The World Bank has been investing more

than

China in Africa, but it's a completely misdirected investment. It's on tiny, tiny, small programs, there is no financing of large-scale infrastructure as China does; there are no transformative projects, and no new technology.

In the next slide, we can see we have a lot of hypocrisy, saying that the Chinese want to come into Africa to loot African

natural resources, and this image, number 4, shows a very clear

picture that it is actually the United States and the Western countries, but with the United States, the investments in Africa

have been mostly in the mining sector and the Chinese investments

have been very diversified, in construction, manufacturing, mining, and others, such as agriculture, for example.

We can see also, the next slide, is Britain. Now, China is the largest, and people think, is not the largest investor in Africa, yet. It's the United States and Britain which have been

the biggest investors in Africa. But as we showed the United States is mostly interested in mining, energy, and metals; and here we have Britain, you can see the last 10 years of investments. ["U.K. Foreign Direct Investment Positions in Africa, 2005-2014"] And the last two columns in the breakdown into types of investments: The red one is mining, and the light

blue is in the financial sector, which is also looting Africa's financial resources.

So that's really the picture. And in the final slide in this group, number 5, we have where the investments of the Import Export Banks have gone: The United States has 71% of all loans

from the Exim Bank, although it has been very, very little, but

70% of it is in the mining sector; while China, the greatest chunk of the Exim Bank investments has been in the transportation sector. And of course, there's mining and energy, communications, water, and other – very, very important sectors for Africa's development.

Now, what we have, in addition to this looting of Africa, we have the hypocrisy which is very rampant in the West, like in Europe and the United States, that "we have to help Africa."

Now,

when they talk about "helping Africa" is simply very small relief

projects to keep things as they are. And they usually talk about

"sustainable development." Now, "sustainable development" does

not mean that you build modern technology, technologies that we

have in the United States or in Europe, whether it's in transport

or power generation; it is absolutely forbidden to support roads,

railways, nuclear power, hydropower – there is nothing like that. What they are proposing is simply, as President Obama, as

we show in one of the slides, when he went to Africa, his idea,

he had projects called "Power Africa," for power generation in Africa, and we looked at the numbers and you know, the goal of Obama's Power Africa is to keep Africa exactly as it is, with very, very slight changes here and there. And also what was being proposed was this idea of using solar energy, which everybody knows is not efficient to have a modern, industrialized economy.

So this has been a real problem in dealing with Africa. And

as we have seen, that China has completely different idea about Africa –

ROSS: Hussein, why don't we switch over to a clip we have of President Obama explaining what he thinks about African energy development?

PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA: It's going to be your generation that suffers the most. Ultimately, if you think about all the youth that everybody's mentioned here in Africa, if everybody's raising living standards to the point where everybody's got a car, and everybody's got air conditioning and everybody's got a big house, well, the planet will boil over. [end video]

ROSS: That was President Obama in South Africa.

ASKARY: And in fact, that's really revealing, because that's his soul speaking, because they consider human beings as a burden. Now, the United Nations statistics say that by 2050, the bulk of the world's population growth will take place in Africa.

And of the additional 2.5 billion new people, projected to be born between 2015 and 2050, 1.3 billion will be added in Africa,

which means Africa's population will reach about 3 billion people. Now, for Obama and the Malthusians this is a huge problem. But for China, this is a great opportunity!

And if we look, in 2015, which is very interesting, a complete contrast with what Obama's saying, when President Xi Jinping went to South Africa, the same place where Obama was speaking, in December 2015 at the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC), this is slide number 10, President Xi

Jinping said something very interesting, which is really the spirit of the New Paradigm: What he told the African leaders is, I quote, "Industrialization is an inevitable path to a country's economic success. Within a short span of several decades, China has accomplished what took developed countries hundreds of years to accomplish and put in place a complete industrial system with an enormous productive capacity." And then he continues and says, "It is entirely possible for Africa, as the world's most promising region in terms of development potential, to bring into play its advantages and achieve great success. The achievement of inclusive and sustainable development within Africa, hinges on industrialization, which holds the key to creating jobs, eradicating poverty, and improving people's living standards." Now, wow! What a contrast! President Xi Jinping said that by using modern technology as scientific development, we have achieved miracles in China and this really applies to Africa, too, as developing nations. And he means it. So the Chinese now have turned the whole idea of "sustainable development" upside down. What people think in Europe and the United States about sustainable development means, pumps for water, the small solar panels – no! China's talking about [industrialization] and it's also the latest, the state-of-the-art technology available. Because this is also interesting from a economic-scientific standpoint, because what China experienced that instead of going

back to square one, going back to the industrialization process

where the United States and Europe started, with the steam engine

– no, you start not with that, you start with the best technology available today, and that's high-speed railway for example. The same thing applies to Africa.

ROSS: You know, Hussein, you and I were both at a conference in November in Germany, in Bad Soden, and one of the

speakers there was a Chinese professor He Wenping, who gave some

talks about Chinese approach towards Africa. And since you're bringing up what China's policy is, why don't run a short clip of

what she had to say, to hear it from a Chinese person directly?

DR. HE WINPING: But now, I think One Belt, One Road is entering 2.0 version—that is, now facing all the countries in the world. As President Xi Jinping mentioned to the Latin American countries, “you are all welcome to join the Belt and Road.” In the Chinese “40 Minutes,” Xi said, all the African continent is now on the map of the One Belt, One Road, the whole

African continent, especially after the May Belt and Road Summit

in Beijing had taken place. ...

China's One Belt, One Road initiative is relevant to countries, their own development strategy. For example, Ethiopia.

Ethiopia has now been named as the “next China” on the African continent. It's not my invention, these words—many scholars have

been published talking about which country in Africa is going to

be the China in Africa, which means, developing faster! Faster and leading other countries forward. Most of them refer to Ethiopia.

Ethiopia has now reached an GDP growth rate, last year, as high as 8%...

So very quickly, let's move to Africa. In Africa, we have commitment, that is the FOCAC, the full name is the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation. This forum was established in 2000, and

every three years there is a FOCAC meeting. The FOCAC meeting in

2015 took place in Johannesburg, South Africa. In that meeting,

President Xi Jinping joined the meeting, put forward ten cooperation plans, and pledged the money—as high as \$60 billion—to cover all ten areas: industrialization, agriculture,

infrastructure, finance, environmental protection, and more.

The Belt and Road is very good for Africa's job creation. A lot of money has been earmarked to use for the industrialization

of Africa. Let me just highlight in my last two minutes, the two

areas, like two engines—like in an airplane, if you want to take

off, you need two engines: One is industrialization, another is

infrastructure. Without good infrastructure, there's no basis for

industrialization—short of electricity, short of power, short of

roads, and then it's very hard to make industry take off.

We have done a lot. Africa now is rising. Before, Africa was regarded as a hopeless continent, more than 15 years ago. But now, with kite flying over, now it's Africa's rising time...

Just to show you another infrastructure map: the Mombasa to Nairobi railway that was just finished at the end of May. We

are

going to build the second phase, from Nairobi all the way to Malaba in Uganda, and then that's an East African Community network. When this railway was finished—this is President Uhuru

Kenyatta, saying this laid the foundation for industrialization.

This shows people celebrating this railway connection, and this

shows a man holding a paper saying “Comfortable, convenient, very

soft, safe, and very beautiful.” And here, very beautiful at 100

years old, a grandmother. [applause] [end video]

ASKARY: Yes, that's the spirit, that's the spirit of things that are happening in Africa, which is fantastic. But it's also

a certain projection of the happiness of the Chinese people and

their leadership in what they have achieved in their own country.

So China's saying, we have done this ourselves, you can do it, and we are committed to offering you everything we have achieved,

so you can also achieve yours. It's a win-win policy: It's good

for you, it's good for us.

It's completely different from what we have seen in the Western policy, which hopefully will change – what we mentioned

about President Macron, what he had said is really shocking for

me, too. And you see that the New Paradigm, it changes people's

souls. And this is very, very important that we are becoming more human than before, with these great achievements

So in any case, what we do in this report is, we took for example, if you look at slide 12, this is a map which the African

Union put together in the Lagos Plan of Action in 1982. But nothing has been done. This is for highways. Now, we don't prefer to have trucks travelling 10,000km from north to south; we

prefer more high-speed railway, standard gauge railways, and so

on. But this is the kind of vision which existed, but it was never implemented.

Our vision of connecting the whole African continent, and also with the so-called Middle East, that this could be done now.

We also believe that the Chinese intention is the same: To integrate all of the African nations, the populations and the natural resources of these nations, and utilize them for the development of Africa itself. Now, in 2014, which is my next slide [slide 13], the Prime Minister of China, Li Keqiang, went

on a tour in Africa. This picture is his meeting with the leaders of the East African Community, which Professor He Wenping

just mentioned in her speech in the video you showed. He told the African leaders that China's intention is to help connect all

the African capitals with high-speed railway. One interesting thing which the Africans themselves say, is that when the Chinese

want to do something here economically, when they want to help,

they are not like the Europeans. The President of Uganda said,

they don't come here with lessons in democracy; they come here to

build things, they are not lecturing us. This is very interesting because China is not imposing anything on any

nation.

It's inviting others and offering its capabilities. This was in

May 2014, and in just three years, we have the first standard gauge railway which is in the next slide [slide 14]; Uhuru Kenyatta, very proud, inaugurating the railway from Mombasa to Kenya. There was a British line which was called the Lunatic train, which was very slow, but it was designed to loot African

wealth. And also the Djibouti to Addis Ababa railway was built,

also in three years in record time, and so on and so forth.

So,

China is winning African hearts and minds by doing these investments, but doing them in record time and with no conditionalities involved.

In addition of course, some of the mega-projects which we are demanding be built and encouraging being built in Africa with

China's help, for example we have in slide 15 the Transaqua Project, which is an Italian-designed project to both refill Lake

Chad, which is drying up and threatening 30 million people's lives with drought. To bring just 5% of the water of the tributaries of the Congo River to Lake Chad through an artificial

canal. But at the same time, connect East and West Africa with

railway and roads to open these countries, which are Rwanda, Burundi, and Eastern Congo, the Central African Republic, Chad,

and so on. These nations need outlets to world markets and also

to import useful machines and so on. So, we have been propagating, as the Schiller Institute, for many years and trying

to get the European Union and the United States to support

this project; but they rejected it. Now China is proposing to start looking at this project, and a Memorandum of Understanding was signed with the Lake Chad Commission to have a feasibility study of this project; which is a huge project, but it will transform large parts of Africa, not because of the water itself, but because of the old infrastructure involved in the central part of Africa. The next slide [slide 15] outlines the impact area of this whole project. It will create massive agro-industrial centers in that part of Africa which is suffering the most. The biggest migration from Africa is from these regions into Europe. But instead of having all those young people drowning in the Mediterranean, trying to flee to Europe looking for a decent life, they can stay in their countries now and build their countries by giving them the tools to do that. Of course, there are also other projects, but what's interesting about the Belt and Road is that it's also inspiring, not just helping countries, but inspiring countries to undertake plans which have been dormant for many years. But now the time has come; for example, the new Suez Canal project. There is also connecting to Europe from Morocco, which is the next slide [slide 16]; building a tunnel under the Strait of Gibraltar, connecting Morocco and Spain; and building a high-speed railway, the first high-speed railway in Africa is being built now in Morocco.

There are new ports being built, and also a scientific, industrial city being built in cooperation with China. We have another connection between Africa and Europe; we have still not given up on Europe. We want Europe to its and technological potential to contribute to this project and help itself by contributing to Africa's development. We have the Sicily to Tunis tunnel and bridge connection to connect North Africa also to Europe; this is a mega-project, and so on and so forth. We have also the Grand Inga Dam which China is now interested in building on the Congo River, which will produce a huge amount of hydropower – 40,000MW of power – which is twice as big as the biggest dam in the world which the Chinese built in China; the Three Gorges Dam. The Inga Dam, or series of dams, will be twice as big as the Chinese Three Gorges Dam, and a Chinese company has made an offer to the government of the Democratic Republic of Congo; and there's also a counterbid by a Spanish company. People should read the report; they should look at all the content and try to understand it with a completely new eye. The eye of the New Paradigm, which I think is very important. In conclusion, what I wanted to say initially, is that as we have in the last slide [slide 19] is this region which people call the Middle East; we call it Southwest Asia. It has been a horrific scene for the worst results of geopolitics and power politics. Regime change in Libya; regime change in Iraq; attempted regime change in Syria supporting terrorist groups. We have a horrible war in Yemen which should end immediately. It's the worst

humanitarian catastrophe in the world right now, taking place in Yemen. You look at this region and say "How could this region get out of this Hell?" This is what Helga Zepp-LaRouche said: This year we should kill geopolitics. We should end geopolitics.

The idea that nations have to undermine other nations; that nations are in competition with each other; that you have to weaken your adversaries; you have to undermine them, you have to kill them, you have to ruin their economy, destroy their infrastructure, so you can become a winner. That ideology is not really human. This has to end now and be replaced by the "win-win" idea, which is the more human kind of idea. The potential for enormous development exists in this region. It's the crossroads of the continents. Both the Belt and the Road pass through there. Forty percent of world trade passes through there. You have natural resources, you have human resources, you have rivers; you have every element necessary to have a massive development process in this region, which will be the basis for establishing peace among the nations of this region and also the big powers. If the United States joins Russia and China in developing this region, this would be the biggest test for mankind. Of course, Africa is very important, but we have things happening in Africa. But, we still have a horrible situation in Southwest Asia, which can lead into new and maybe bigger wars than before. Therefore, I think what Helga is saying that if we

use the Belt and Road idea, the idea of “win-win”, to crush geopolitics, this would be victory not only for the countries of this region; this will be a victory for all humankind.

ROSS: Absolutely! It’s a victory for a concept of mankind. One example that comes to mind is Yemen. Yemen is under constant Saudi bombardment; they’ve been victims of a war by the Saudis for some time now. Yemen has a very powerful movement within it for integration with the BRICS; a real sense of “Hey! Even though our conditions right now are what they are, this is our future; and we’ve got to have that future in mind. That’s what we’re going to make happen.”

You think about the economic potential of Africa, and as you said, it’s so clear, it’s so obvious the economic potential in West Asia and Africa. Geopolitics is what has prevented this development. It’s not that Africa didn’t get the help that it needed; China is showing that it’s an obvious thing to do. It was a deliberate decision to prevent development and to hold Africa back for the purposes – as you described – of looting. A couple of examples that you brought up, just to bring out the contrast a little bit more: You brought up the Grand Inga Dam which would be located in the Democratic Republic of Congo; one of the poorest, most energy-poor per capita, very low energy availability. It’s got the perfect site for a hydroelectric dam complex, making enough electricity for tens of millions of people. The World Bank pulls out funding on it, because it’s a big project which of course, they’re not going to touch because it would have a major development impact.

What I'd like to actually show is another voice from Africa. Professor He Wenping had mentioned that Ethiopia is sort of the
China of Africa, and other African diplomats will say this as well; that Addis Ababa is sort of the unofficial capital of Africa. I don't know if everyone in Africa agrees with that. But I'd like to hear from Dr. Alexander Demissie, who also spoke
at the Schiller Institute conference in November, and hear from
him from a direct African perspective, what the impact of Chinese
investment has been and what the future can be in Africa.

DR. ALEXANDER DEMISSIE: So today, what I'm trying to discuss with you, or to present to you, is what is actually this
Belt and Road Initiative and how is that connected to Africa? What kind of long-term impacts when we talk about the Belt and Road Initiative and Africa?
So, this is a map [Fig. 1] I always present when I do presentations, and I ask people, "What do you see here?" It's a
very simple question. But what do you see here? Yes, you should
see something. So, it's a rhetorical question; I'm not expecting
you to answer me. But it takes usually several minutes until people realize what they see here. You see the absence of the American continent; that's what you see here. The absence of the
American continent. By saying this, you see that the Belt and Road Initiative, the Chinese version of the Belt and Road Initiative, is absolutely Eurasian-oriented; meaning that starting in China, it is primarily Eurasian-oriented. The idea
of the Belt and Road Initiative – probably even your idea back in the '70s – is the Land-Bridge that we have been discussing

yesterday and today. Within this picture or map, you will see also Africa. Africa is prominent, Africa is not entirely in the center, but on the left side; and it should be part of the Belt and Road idea. It's primarily an infrastructural undertaking, so the Belt and Road Initiative we don't have yet political institutionalization. We have infrastructural ideas, we have corridors; but we don't have yet political institutions. If we talk about the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank or the Silk Road Bank, these are just connected to infrastructure; they are not political ideas. And interestingly, this idea fits perfectly into the current African needs. What are the current African needs? The current Africa need is infrastructure development. Africa wants infrastructure and the aspiration – I'm going back here to the Agenda 2063, that has also coincidentally been coming up 2013 together with the Belt and Road Initiative. Africa wants a good infrastructure connection, a good internal interconnectivity. So, the idea coming from China is perfectly fitting into the idea actually happening or discussed within the Africa continent. We see now an actor coming in. China is an actor coming in and literally taking or doing part of those needed works. This is a huge – at least from the African perspective – this is a huge plus for many African countries. The idea of the Belt and Road Initiative, which is actually coming only in 2013; we see

that it is helping what has been taking place on the continent between China and African countries since the year 2000. We see this that China has clearly declared that they would like to see Chinese-African cooperation moving into development of highways, regional aviation networks, or industrialization. Also we see that China has been given a lot of clarity to the African Union's infrastructure development for Africa. This program has approximately 51 different programs, and this is translated into 400 different physical projects. I speak about ports, and streets, and telecommunication lines, whatever you require for a nation to function, or for a continent to function. What we see in Africa now is that since at least two years, there is a growing corridorization in the China-Africa relationship. As corridorization, I mean that not single countries are any more important, but entire regions are becoming more important for China. This is a huge departure from a single, bilateral country-based approach towards corridor development. If you look at Africa corridors, the map on the right [Fig. 2], we see right now as we speak today, there are around 33 different corridors that have either been developed, or are under development, or are thought out and need to be developed. Corridors do nothing else than combine two different areas, and by doing so also creating a development initiative, a development paradigm. Let's go to East Africa. So now, this is Africa; I'm aware that the plans for these things have been in the drawer for a long time. We know also that a lot of American research

institutes played a very good role in creating those plans in the '50s and '60s, especially in Ethiopia. The Grand Renaissance Dam that is being built in Ethiopia, goes back to American scientists that have been creating those ideas in the '60s. It's being built already now. So, a lot of ideas in East Africa have been already on the table for decades, but no one was able or willing to pay for it. But now a lot of money is coming out of China, so these infrastructure – and how this can change the life of the people is easily described. The transportation of cargo from the Djibouti port to Addis Ababa used to take three days. Now, with the train, it's already 10 hours. So now we can imagine what kind of economic activity will happen to this one corridor development, or one infrastructure within this community. [end video]

ROSS: I just wanted to read another short excerpt from Alexander Demissie. Towards the end of his presentation, he said, "The problem as I see it, is that the traditional partners are still in the old paradigm of thinking. They still think with traditional assumptions. Africa is seen as an aid-dependent continent; not a continent full of opportunities. It is still seen with the wrong mindset. This is one of the biggest problems, and it has to change." So, I think our report does a very thorough job of addressing the whole gamut of issues here. What the historical errors have been, or not errors, but cruelties or injustices

that
have occurred towards Africa, towards Southwest Asia with the
use
of geopolitics, with the use of looting rather than
development.

As well as what some of the ideas are today that hold back the
potential for development. The ways that environmentalism is
used; the ways that there shouldn't be any net growth of the
human species are used. This is the basis, for example, for
the

World Bank refusing any loans to coal or to large hydro
plants.

But you're not going to develop a continent with solar panels,
as

much as Obama might have wanted to have done that.

The other issues are in regards to economics. That there is
this prevailing and totally wrong view about economics that
looks

for financial returns as being the metric; as opposed to going
beyond GDP and saying how are we changing life expectancies?

How

are we changing productive potential? What's the long-term
value

of helping a nation to develop in a partnership? This is the
sort of thing. So, the report goes through all of this; it
goes

through what the specific projects are that are needed. It
goes

through something that's very important for policymakers – how
to finance it. How the hopes of trying to get investment, of
trying to get loans from private banks for these big projects;
it's simply not going to fly. The use of national banking, as
China has done both domestically as well as with its ExIm Bank
with these two large rail projects in Africa in particular in
Kenya and the Addis Ababa to Djibouti railroad.

So, I think we've heard from China, we've heard from
Southwest Asia, we've heard from Africa. Let me ask you,

Hussein, if you have any words that you would like to direct towards our American viewers. What would you tell Americans? What should we be doing?

ASKARY: Exactly! I had also in mind to say that, because we need to hear from Americans. I don't think it's a good idea that the United States is not on the map of the Belt and Road; but I think a different United States should be involved. I'm very sure that if President Franklin Roosevelt, President Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King must be very happy now for what is now already starting to happen in Africa. They might feel sorry for the lost time, but I'm sure they are happy. Americans should look back at that best of American tradition and work with ideas of Lyndon LaRouche and the LaRouche PAC and LaRouche's associates, because the United States will not become great again with the team that President Trump has. America will be great again with the ideas that the LaRouche PAC, the ideas of Franklin Roosevelt, the Hamiltonian idea of a national credit system, rather than depending on Wall Street. These things will make America great again, but it also will help the United States to have a completely different policy in the world; which will make the people around the world see the United States with completely different eyes. Right now, the United States is not so liked around the world; not because of Trump, but because of previous administrations' war policies, their hypocrisy. As you showed in Obama's case, their policies would lead to genocide. So, the

United States is not really a popular country around the world,
but this can shift. In order for that shift to happen, there should be a shift inside the United States in the mind and the soul of the American people. I'm sure the kind of work you are doing in LaRouche PAC would help greatly.

OGDEN: And that's exactly what we are doing with this campaign to win the future statement. As I said in the beginning of the show, we're initiating a national mobilization to bring together all of the constituent layers – regardless of party, political orientation – around a vision of economic development for the United States and for the world. If you just imagine the kind of way that the world could be transformed in the next 15 or 20 years with what China has begun doing in Africa; something that people thought was impossible. They just disregarded Africa and said well, this is just where you're going to have impoverishment and backwardness. Now, this could seriously become a hub of development for the planet. But take that and extend it across the Bering Strait into the Americas; have a rail link between Eurasia and North America. Then imagine an entire development corridor down through the central part of North America, through the heartland, the farm country in the Midwest; down through Mexico, across the Darien Gap into Central and South America. Then also, extend the Maritime Silk Road to the Caribbean. That vision of what could happen in the Western Hemisphere is the extension of the sort of optimism that you

now

see China bringing to Africa.

So, as I said, I think it's the great moral test. Emmanuel Macron was absolutely right; he said it's a moral challenge what

the nations of the world do to collaborate to bring development

to the African continent. I think we can be very happy that it's

because of the leadership over decades of the LaRouche movement,

of you Hussein. What you've been doing; what you did to collaborate with Jason to put together this extraordinary Special

Report. I know that this is being listened to in the highest levels of power across the African continent and in Southwest Asia; we have evidence of that. The invitation that you received, Hussein, from the Egyptian Transportation Ministry, and

other examples. So, we have to proceed with that kind of confidence that we are, indeed, shaping the policy for the future.

So, let me put on the screen one more time; this is the vision of an economic renaissance – this is the Special Report that Jason and Hussein collaborated in authoring. That is available; you can find the link to that on the screen here – LPAC.CO/ExtendedSilkRoad. It's a very thorough, book-length Special Report. This is something that is not just important for

the African leaders and for China. This is something that is very important for the United States. This is something that we

should be considering when we talk about what is US foreign policy, and those disgraceful graphics about the plummeting of US

investment into Africa over the course of the last eight years during the Obama administration. That needs to be reversed;

and

it needs to be reversed by bringing the United States and China

into a "win-win" collaboration for the development of these areas.

We are going to proceed with this campaign to win the future. And we're asking you to endorse this, to join our mobilization, and to make sure that this becomes the policy parameter for the 2018 election. None of the melodrama, not the

soap operas, not all of the secondary and tertiary issues.

These

are the questions which will determine the future of the United

States and the survival of our country and what our role is in respect to this New Paradigm that we've just been discussing on

the show today.

So, again, we have 11 days between now and President Trump's State of the Union address. We are putting these two items on the agenda. The United States must adopt LaRouche's Four Economic Laws, and the United States must join the New Silk Road.

So, Hussein, is there anything that you want to say in conclusion before we end this show today? Any special messages

for our viewers, both in the United States and internationally?

ASKARY: I think it's a great opportunity for people now to get this report, take to themselves the scientific, even philosophical and other ideas that are in the report which are necessary. As you said, it's for everyone; it's not only for Africans. I think the main target of the report should be Europeans and Americans, because we need these kinds of ideas more than at any time before. We have problems here in Europe with the infrastructure, with unemployment. You have massive

problems in the United States. You need to have these ideas for your own sake, too; but there is enormous potential that exists in Europe and the United States that could be revived. But that has to be done in the right way; and the right way was outlined by Mr. LaRouche, but we put it in very clear terms in this report. I hope people will get the report and learn something and push the policymakers in the United States to also do the same.

OGDEN: Wonderful. Thank you very much, Hussein, for joining us. And thank you to Jason for joining me here. I think we have a lot more to come. So, a very exciting report here today. Help us circulate this video; send it out to everybody that you know; share it on social media. Let's get these ideas to permeate the United States. Thank you very much and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

**Frankrig omfavner den Nye
Silkevej:
Bliver USA den næste?
LaRouche PAC Internationale**

Webcast, 12. jan., 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: Som I ser, så er temaet for aftenens show, at vi fortsat befinder os i en nedtælling til præsident Trumps State of the Union-tale den 30. jan. i år. Der er nu 18 dage tilbage til denne tale; og vi holder fortsat fast i vores forpligtelse til, at det er vores job at sætte to punkter på dagsordenen: Nummer ét: præsident Trump må vedtage Lyndon LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love. Nummer to: præsident Trump må udtrykkeligt erklære, at USA går med i den Nye Silkevej.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

On that latter point, a very dramatic breakthrough has occurred this week, and the world has substantially changed. However, you most likely have not heard this news; unless, of course, you are watching larouchepac.com. But the western media is failing to report what is probably one of the most strategic changes in the alignment of the world in many years. That news comes out of a trip that French President Emmanuel Macron made to China in the beginning of this week. Now, this may come as a surprise to many people who might not have expected that this would occur. But we do have to say that the activities of the LaRouche movement yet again have now come to bear and really deserve significant credit for this strategic shift that has occurred in France. Of course, you remember that Jacques Cheminade, who is a collaborator of Lyndon LaRouche in France,

ran a very high-profile Presidential campaign just last year, in which he called for France to join the New Silk Road. Now, what has Emmanuel Macron done? He has announced that he intends for France, and also by consequence, Europe to collaborate with China on the New Silk Road. This is an extraordinary change. Emmanuel Macron was the first European leader to visit China in the aftermath of the 19th Party Congress. He had a very high-level, substantial state visit which lasted several days, with President Xi Jinping. What has he announced? France is now making the commitment that France will collaborate with China's Belt and Road Initiative of great infrastructure projects across Eurasia and notably in Africa. That's a very important point for France, due to its history in Africa. Emmanuel Macron and President Xi Jinping announced that they will particularly be focussing on French-Chinese cooperation in developing nuclear power technology. This is something that France is a leader in, in Europe; and China is also now an emerging leader in nuclear power. This will be what will power the world's economies, including the economies of all those nations along the New Silk Road. This makes France not the first European country to make this commitment and to announce their interest in joining the New Silk Road. Of course, the 16 countries of Eastern Europe have already made that announcement. We had the summit at the CEEC [Central and Eastern European Countries] conference in the fall of last year. These Eastern European countries have already announced that they are enthusiastic about joining the New

Silk

Road, and being the front door for the Silk Road into Europe. However, what this is, is the first *Western* European country to

announce unequivocally this intention to collaborate with China

on the New Silk Road. France is the number two economy in Europe; it's a leading world power. Obviously, a global power and a very longstanding civilization; and it is one of the permanent United Nations Security Council members. That topic was also part of the discussion between Macron and Xi Jinping.

So, I would assume that, unless you've been watching larouchepac.com, you do not know the significance of this news.

But what we're here to do today, is to communicate to you exactly

what occurred during this historic trip by Emmanuel Macron to China. And to ask the question: Now that France has taken this

step, whither the rest of Europe, and whither the United States

of America? The invitation is on the table for the United States

to join the Belt and Road Initiative. The door is wide open. President Trump has expressed his clear intention and interest in

working together with President Xi Jinping and developing a close

relationship and a new era in US-China relations. Now all he needs to do is take that step through that open door, and to do

exactly what President Macron on France has just done.

So, I would like to share with you some excerpts. First, of a speech that Emmanuel Macron made in Xi'an, which is one of the

historic cities at the terminus of the Silk Road in China.

This

is the city where they have the famous terra cotta warriors;
and
Emmanuel Macron did make a tour of that astounding museum.
When
you see this with your own eyes, you realize the power and the
depth of the ancient civilization that China represents.
Then,
subsequent to that, I will share with you some of the comments
that he made to the same effect during a joint press
conference
he had with President Xi at the conclusion of his trip.
So, here are a few quotes from President Macron's speech in
Xi'an. What President Macron said during this speech is, he
went
through the history of French-Chinese relationships and
stressed
how significant this shared history has already been. Then he
said the following: "I want you to understand something
today.
France is here; becoming transformed in depth and wants to be
that country of dialogues and construction of a new
partnership
for the 21st Century, with China. With it, Europe wants,
through
the building of its own power to build a balanced cooperation
with China in the coming century. When you build a
relationship
of friendship, it is a balanced cooperation that you seek.
"It is in the same spirit that I wish for us to advance
on the New Silk Road. Indeed, One Belt, One Road is the
perspective gave itself and that it has proposed to the world.
When a proposal is on the table, it is not my habit not to
discuss it. I understand the opportunities for China on the
economic level for finding new markets internationally; on the
political level in order to open up regions hit by
under-development; on the diplomatic level to stabilize trade
in

fragile regions where there are states in difficulty, and in developing regions; on the cultural level, since it is a matter of exerting leadership with the force of new ideas. I think that the initiative of the New Silk Roads can meet our interests – those of France and of Europe – if we give ourselves the means to really work together. After all, the Silk Roads were never purely Chinese, if I'm honest. When we talk about the Maritime Silk Roads, they were first Portuguese. On land, they went through Central Asia – Iran, Iraq, Tyre, and Antioch – and in so doing, they were Sino-European. The genius of the first Silk Roads was to have often re-invented European roads and made them Chinese roads. I am saying that in a consubstantial way, these roads are still shared. And if these are roads, they cannot be one way; they must be a two-way street. I am thus ready to work to the announced objectives. Road, railroad, airport, maritime and technological infrastructure programs along the Silk Roads can provide a response to the infrastructure deficit; particularly in Asia.

“The pooling of our financial resources, public and private, for cross-border projects, can strengthen the connectivity between Europe and Asia and beyond. To the Middle East and Africa, and allow better integration, structure, and opening up through the growth of trade. At the same time, it will do much more. And the city of Xi'an is a living example. Those first Silk Roads brought Buddhism and Islam and Christianity here. These New Silk Roads will inevitably lead to cultural and

educational exchanges and to profound transformations in the countries that they cross.

“Finally, it is a matter of giving ourselves a perspective at a moment when the shared grand narratives are so sorely lacking in the world. I must say, it is one of the great merits

of these Silk Roads proposed by Xi Jinping. These Silk Roads re-activate the imagination of a new civilization of fruitful exchanges, of shared wealth. And they show to all those who thought that we were in a tired, post-modern world where the great stories were forbidden, that those who decide to live great epics can make others dream as well. I believe profoundly in great stories.

“It is up to France, and with it to Europe, to contribute its share of imagination to this proposal, and to work at it in

the months and years to come. This will be the object of my exchanges with President Xi Jinping: To define the agenda of trust that I want, that we put together. I know that some will

say that this agenda of trust must be one to create an equilibrium between a developed country and a developing one. But China is no longer a developing country; it is a country which is bypassing that, largely. Therefore, we must reinvent here the terms of a new relationship; and the Silk Roads are the very expression of that new relationship of China to the world.

I propose to identify very concretely the political framework in

which we can build that partnership, that cooperation, and that

common strategy. I am convinced profoundly that if Europe and China know how to establish that goal together, this initiative

could be the occasion of relaunching very pragmatically the

multi-lateralism which is today lacking in concrete realizations.

“I am ready to play a key role in this direction, making sure that the European countries progress in unity. Because China needs to have a solid interlocutor to exchange and build on

its own initiative. I want the Silk Roads to not limit themselves to economic questions, but be enlightened in Europe by

a deep comprehension of China. All resources must be used to this end; from the publishing world to the world of theatre and

cinema; from the French Sinology school to the world of arts.

These are the roads of exchange that we must build.

“You have understood, ladies and gentlemen, that my will is, indeed, in this framework. That France and Europe take up their

full responsibility and meet the proposal offered by China.”

So, that was an excerpt of French President Emmanuel

Macron’s speech in Xi’an in China; just a short excerpt. It’s a

very elaborated speech in which he also discusses the importance

of not returning to imperialism. He talked about the need to create harmony between countries, and not to be competing for so-called limited geo-strategic interests. He said, if we equip

ourselves with the means to really cooperate, we can create a new

civilization. He praised China’s work in Africa, and he said China has invested heavily in infrastructure and in raw materials

in recent years, with a financial power that European countries

could not have done. He called for French-Chinese cooperation in

developing Africa; saying that to implement projects that are

really useful and financially sustainable for growth on that continent, because that's where the future lies. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past, he said, by creating political

and financial dependence under the pretext of development. He also said that the West must overcome the "one-sided imperialism"

that has been perpetrated by France and other European powers in

Africa and elsewhere. Then he commented that China's example of

lifting 700 million people out of poverty, is the example that must be taken everywhere.

Now, in the concluding joint press conference between French President Emmanuel Macron and President Xi Jinping, Emmanuel Macron elaborated and repeated and emphasized some of the points

that he made in that initial speech in Xi'an. So, here are a couple of quotes from that speech during the concluding press conference.

President Macron said, "The last point in the global agenda is the New Silk Road; the Belt and Road Initiative. I'm convinced that this initiative will have a considerable impact and will provide elements that will stabilize in the regions crossed by the Silk Road. We have proposed to work together on

this. Historically, the Silk Road was shared; shared by the Europeans and the Chinese because it was a road for trade and exchanges. So, it's important that this New Silk Road in terms

of its philosophy and spirit, that it should revitalize the balanced exchanges and cooperation between us. I look for close

collaboration with President Xi Jinping. We will be working to

ensure that whenever and wherever we implement this initiative,

we fight against corruption and imbalanced forms of development;

to allow societies to benefit fully from the growth thereby generated.

“Finally, you mentioned culture. Culture is a powerful, historic element along with language. And again, this reflects

the quality of our bilateral relations. I would like us to strengthen – through multiple initiatives – our cultural cooperation. First of all, by organizing several exhibitions to

better understand the mutual influence of our cultures; to better

understand the China of yesterday and today; and also the history

of the Silk Road.”

So, this was an extraordinary strategic breakthrough, and it did take people by surprise. However, it should be viewed as a

consequence of the persistent effort by a handful of leaders such

as the leaders of the LaRouche movement and Lyndon and Helga LaRouche particularly; and Jacques Cheminade in France, and others, to put this agenda on the table. It proves that the

winds of change have come. The New Silk Road is indeed now the

prevailing dynamic worldwide. The leaders of European countries

who are not committed to being dinosaurs and being stuck in the

past in a failing trans-Atlantic geo-political world, are recognizing that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain

from reciprocating President Xi Jinping’s offer of mutual benefit

and “win-win” cooperation.

Now, apparently directly following Emmanuel Macron’s trip to

China, the European Union has announced that it is drafting its own “inter-connection blueprint” for the Eurasian continent. This “inter-connection blueprint for Eurasia” is intended to dovetail with the Belt and Road Initiative of China. This was stated by the EU Ambassador to China, Hans Dietmar Schweisgut, at a press conference that he gave this week, which was held literally within hours of French President Macron’s return from his state visit to China. The EU ambassador stated that this economic blueprint for the interconnection of the Eurasian continent is something that they are intending to pursue. Now, in what form is not clear, and the big question is, will the rest of the countries of Western Europe get on board – Germany most of all. Will Germany abandon some of the failed policies, the debt break and the anti-nuclear policies and others, that would hold Europe back from participating fully in this Belt and Road Initiative?

In response to a question on the announcement of this so-called EU blueprint for interconnectivity in Eurasia, the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, Lu Kang, said the following:

“The European side is welcome to participate in the Belt and Road Initiative. And we are ready to work with them for ‘win-win’ cooperation in interconnection and in other fields. Based on the principle of achieving shared growth through discussion and collaboration, China will join the EU in promoting prosperity and stability of the entire Eurasian continent, and building a community of shared future for mankind.” So, that was the

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman in response to this EU interconnection blueprint plan.

Now also in the wake of Macron's trip – and I think this really indicates that there's a seriousness among the French political and strategic policymaking elite that this is going to

be the directionality for France. It's been reported that the Sorbonne, which is the leading foreign policy university and institution in France, and really one of the leading foreign policy institutions in all of Europe, the Sorbonne has announced

that they will be hosting a series of 11 seminars on the New Silk

Road. The first one is going to be hosted and chaired by the former Prime Minister of France, Dominique De Villepin. So, we can see I think indications going all the way back to the attendance by Raffarin at the Belt and Road Forum in China in the

spring of last year, that there was this undercurrent in France.

But it has now taken a really dramatic form, with Macron's trip.

We see that there are other countries which have also begun moving very clearly in this direction. There was a major conference in Milan, Italy which was called "Belt and Road: Building a Concrete Roadmap with Italy's and China's Joint Growth". This was sponsored by the Italian Industries Ministry

and the Chinese Trade Ministry, and also the Lombardy Association

of Industry. It was organized by the Italy-China Business Forum.

The coverage of this conference indicates that there are very strong indications inside Italy also that they move in this direction. We do know that the Prime Minister of Italy, Gentiloni, and President Macron just had their own summit meeting on the sidelines of the Mediterranean European

countries

summit, where it is very much to be assumed that they discussed

Macron's trip to China and the necessity for all of southern Europe and the Mediterranean countries to join the New Silk Road;

exactly what has been the subject of a prolonged campaign by the

LaRouche movement in Europe.

So, this indicates that what France has done is setting the agenda which the rest of Europe and frankly the United States must follow. We even see that the Paris newspaper {Le Monde} is

beginning to understand exactly what time it is when it comes to

the role that China will play in the future of Europe. They published an extensive story under the title "China: The Innovation Dragon". They said, "The pace of China's transformation over the last four years is unprecedented. The country's GDP grew by nearly 10% per year on average, while reshaping global trade patterns and becoming the second-largest

economy in the world. That success lifted 800 million people out

of poverty. The mortality rate of children under five years old

was halved between 2006 and 2015. The question now is whether China, well-positioned to become the world's innovation leader,

will realize that opportunity in 2018 or soon after."

So, this is exactly the point. China has accomplished a miracle that no other country has accomplished on the entire planet. That model of what China has done is the standard which

all other countries now must measure themselves against, and must

become participants in; not in a competitive way, but in a

“win-win” way with this idea of a common destiny for the future of mankind. We also know that there was a very interesting conference that occurred, believe it or not, in Wall Street at the New York Stock Exchange just this week. With Chinese leaders discussing the necessity for a new measurement of economic prosperity. Not GDP, which can be a very fraudulent measure of so-called economic growth; but actually measuring the rate at which you are increasing the living standards of the population, the rate at which you are incorporating new technologies and innovations, and some very important measuring rods that you need to measure the true success of an economy – not just stock market bubbles. That is a lesson which must be taken to heart by the American people and by President Trump himself. Now what I would like to do is, share with you the remarks that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had during her international webcast from the Schiller Institute yesterday, where she responds directly to the significance of this trip by President Macron to China. This is Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s comments on Macron’s decision to bring France into the orbit of the New Silk Road.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, this is a real breakthrough, and I know that many people have different opinions about Macron, but I must say, if somebody goes in the right direction, one should be positive about it. What he did, is he went on a three-day visit to China. He was the first European leader after the 19th Party Congress of the Communist Party of China; and he went to Xi’an first, which is the place where the

ancient Silk Road started from the Chinese side, and he made a very remarkable speech. And I would urge all interested political people, people who are really trying to get to the truth of the matter, don't believe what you read in the media, just read the speech. It's a 1 hour and 15 minute speech, and the fact that he admits some of the most horrible mistakes of Western policy is a reason why I tend to believe that he really is making a change in French policy.

For example: He not only fully endorsed the New Silk Road of China, he called it a "treasure to civilization"; he said we must never repeat the mistakes of the past, like Iraq, Libya, and then he also said he wants to invite China to cooperate with France in projects in Africa, so that France would not make the same mistakes of the past of imperial unilateralism in Africa. He also said that one must make sure that one does not create new dependencies politically and economically under the pretext of development aid, but that therefore he invites China, because if China and France are working together on development of Africa, these mistakes can be avoided.

So I think there are a lot of other elements in his speech: He praised the Chinese policy of being a great epic, one of the great epics of history. He said, we in the West have become tired and epics have not been allowed any more, but that is exactly what is needed.

I think this is a very, very positive development, and on the plane on the way back to Europe, he was asked by reporters,

but what about the tension between the EU and China? And he said, this is not to be blamed on China, it's entirely the fault of the EU.

These kinds of statements really convince me that he means what he says, and I find it highly interesting that today, that

is just three days after his speech in Xi'an – or maybe yesterday already – the EU put out a statement saying that they

want to come forward with their own plan of connectivity which is

supposed to be linked up with the Belt and Road Initiative of China. This was welcomed by the Chinese Foreign Ministry, praising it, saying this means there will be a "win-win" cooperation to the benefit of both sides.

So, there is a lot going on, and I think this is very positive, because this can only be an inspiration for President

Trump, because if even the EU, which has been *really* against this initiative, they tried to block it out entirely for years,

if even they move now, one has to see obviously what they do about financing this, because the famous, or infamous "Juncker plan," which supposedly had EU350 billion never materialized because it was all based on the idea of private investments which

never came. Because obviously this kind of infrastructure cannot

be financed by private capital, but this is something which needs

a credit system. And that would mean the EU has to change.

They

would have to abandon their debt brake, which is now in the

constitutions of all member-states, and they would have in Germany, to, if they would ever join, to abandon the policy of the so-called "black zero." I mean Germany just had a budget surplus, I think of \$38 billion which is quite a bit. So they could already start investing some of this money in these projects, because the infrastructure in Germany is also in a very pitiful condition, let alone other European countries. This is a breakthrough and all the various opponents of the New Silk Road, I think they will realize that the Silk Road is there, it's coming, it's spreading, and it is a new paradigm. And I think it's the victorious one, as compared to the outdated neoliberal model.

OGDEN: â€¦ yesterday on her webcast about the breakthrough of Emmanuel Macron's trip to China. Now what I would also like to do is share with you a portion of a briefing that Paul Gallagher, who is the *EIR* Economics Editor, presented last night on the Fireside Chat – the national activist call. Paul very clearly puts this breakthrough which just occurred within the context of the decades-long fight by Helga and Lyndon LaRouche to conceptualize this idea of what was originally the Eurasian Land-Bridge and now has become known at the New Silk Road or the One Belt, One Road initiative; going all the way back to the collapse of the Soviet Union. What Paul also does is he gives some more details on what the agreements were, that were made between Emmanuel Macron and President Xi Jinping; most particularly around nuclear power. There are some very stunning developments on that question. Then Paul puts

directly

this development within the context of the urgency of immediately

implementing Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws here in the United States. So, here's a portion of Paul Gallagher's briefing from last night.

PAUL GALLAGHER: The Belt and Road Initiative

launched by China – and remember, this is a policy first thought

of as bridging the whole Eurasian continent with new rail lines

and communications corridors and lines of new cities going across

from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast; essentially from the Spanish coast over to the Chinese coast. These Belt and Road

Land-Bridges were initially the idea of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche; they were their idea in the late 1980s, when the Soviet

Union began to break up and when the Iron Curtain was being removed as the absolutely impassable barrier to this kind of transportation and communications development of the entire Eurasian continent. When that was finally being removed, they immediately came forth with this idea.

Now this is the policy of the Chinese government, as you know. In a pretty important development in the last few days, it's become the policy of the French government. This is the number two economy in Europe. The President there is a new president. He just made a trip to China for a summit meeting. Out of that came a commitment of France to join into the development of the Belt and Road initiative. Macron and the Chinese President spoke about the fact that this would create much more space for the economic and technological development of

France, to be part of these Eurasia-crossing great projects of infrastructure development. In particular, France is a leader

in

nuclear power; the two of them agreed that they had special responsibilities to cooperate in new fourth-generation reactor technologies for the nuclear fuel cycle in order to power all the

economies on the New Silk Road and on the Maritime Silk Road.

To

power all those economies increasingly with advanced third- and

fourth-generation nuclear power plants. France is in the lead in

that. They are simultaneously going to be building – in China – a European power reactor which is a new reactor design; it's called the EPR [European Power Reactor]. It's a new design for

which France is largely responsible. They're going to be building that as a model in China; they're going to be building a

fuel reprocessing facility in China. For the first time there,

in order to reprocess used nuclear fuel to make new nuclear fuel.

They're going to assist China in developing advanced breeder reactors at the same time, to make more fuel. And also a system

in the certification of the nuclear reactor which China has developed, which is called the Hwa Hwong 1000. This is the first

time that China has developed its own domestically built and sourced nuclear reactor, and they're trying to get it certified

by the international nuclear authorities like Euratom so that it

can be sold to other countries and this development can take place.

So, they made this partnership. They also talked about partnership in astrophysics, astronomy, and in space

exploration in which China right now has the most aggressive space exploration program of any of the space-faring nations at

this point. But France is in there, too. So, you have the number two economy, and also as the Chinese President noted, these two countries are permanent members of the Security Council

of the United Nations. Therefore, in cooperation, they have a certain power against the tendency of neo-cons and others in Britain and the United States and elsewhere to come in with these

crazy resolutions which demand that one or another regime be overthrown and so forth. They have a certain stabilizing authority also in the United Nations Security Council.

So, this is really an extremely important partnership which has suddenly been concretized between China and France. It means

that pressure is on Germany, which at present is in some disarray

and has only a caretaker government; the pressure is on Germany

– the number one economy [in Europe] – and it now means that it's not only the Eastern European countries like Serbia and Poland and Hungary and Austria and Greece. It's not only all those Eastern European and Balkan countries which have been enthusiastically jumping into collaboration on the Belt and Road

Initiative; but now you have the number two Western European economy and power, which has also jumped in.

Now this really means for the United States, here it is.

Already, China has made this major investment in West Virginia.

The governor yesterday gave a State of the State address in which

he talked about the Chinese investments in his state, which is the third-poorest state in the United States, as the 800-lb gorilla in the room. He had a lot to say about the importance

of
this for the prospect of pulling West Virginia out of what it
had
fallen into. Already this is obviously in front of the United
States, and the French move only makes it that much clearer an
offer to the United States. Everyone is looking for an
infrastructure initiative from the Congress and from the
President; it's supposed to be occurring in January. Well, it
is
occurring; it's the Belt and Road Initiative, and it's coming
right at us both in the now hundreds of freight trains every
week
that are crossing Eurasia and all the new lines that are being
opened up. But it's also coming at us in the development of
high-speed rail across the Bering Strait and the potential
that
this will come all the way down to Vancouver and into the
so-called Cascades rail corridor in the United States.
So, it's there. The infrastructure initiative is there.
Essentially what we talk about as the third one of LaRouche's
Four Laws, the third action that's necessary; the use of the
credit to develop new high-technology infrastructure. That's
coming to us; we have to join it as a nation. Those Four
Economic Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, those four actions that he
specified four years ago, need to be taken.

OGDEN: So, that's our campaign. We need to make the Four
Economic Laws of Lyndon LaRouche the policy of this Presidency
and the policy of the United States. That's the means by
which
we can join the New Silk Road dynamic. Now the pamphlet,
which
is "LaRouche's Four Laws: America's Future on the New Silk
Road",
has now been printed, it's in circulation. Ten thousand
copies
are in print form, and are being circulated both in the

streets
of cities across the country, in key constituent layers and
farm
and industry layers across the United States, including in the
Heartland. And notably this week, a very successful
distribution
of this pamphlet to all of the relevant offices in the United
States Congress. Volunteers with LaRouche PAC were on the
ground
in Washington, DC getting this pamphlet around into the hands
of
members of Congress and their key advisors, and having
impromptu
meetings right there on the spot. Including very relevant
questions that were being asked by these policymakers, such as
“Now, how do you turn debt into credit?” Well, that’s a
question
for Alexander Hamilton, isn’t it? But that’s the question
that
is answered in these Four Economic Laws pamphlet. Notably,
yesterday was the birthday of Alexander Hamilton. Perhaps
that’s
an appropriate way to celebrate Alexander Hamilton’s birthday.
We will continue our mobilization around these Four Economic
Laws, and expect that over the coming 18 days, things will
continue to very dramatically change. What we would like you
to
do is to immediately get the copy of this pamphlet; this is
the
link that you can see on your screen where you can get the
digital version of this pamphlet – LPAC.CO/4LYT. It has to be
circulated everywhere, and this has got to be the subject of
every political discussion in the United States. The contents
of
this pamphlet and “Hey! Did you know that the world changed
this
week? You might not have heard it on CNN; you might not have

heard it on Fox News. But France, the number two economy of Western Europe just indicated that they want to join the New Silk

Road. When will it be {our turn}?" That's the question that's on the table.

So, we ask you to tune in again on Monday, because first we'll have some very important updates to share with you as to what China has already been doing to bring various states in the

United States into this New Paradigm. The billions of dollars that are being invested around the country – Alaska, Iowa, other

states – and most notably, \$83.7 billion into the state of West

Virginia. You heard Paul Gallagher report that Governor Jim Justice gave his State of the State address this week. We'll have some excerpts of that address, and continue to follow the inspiration that is coming from China to this state in West Virginia. That State of the State really should be the template

for President Trump's State of the Union. We should be discussing the future is on the New Silk Road.

Then also on Monday, we will share with you an initiative which is being launched by LaRouche PAC. This is LaRouche PAC's

intervention into the 2018 Congressional elections. LaRouche PAC

has issued a statement; it is being prepared for mass circulation, but it's also an endorsement. It's a call to action. All leaders within the American population should endorse this statement of intent from LaRouche PAC, get on board

with the Four Economic Laws, get on board with the New Silk Road.

So, on Monday we will be launching that officially; and that will

be a campaign that you can immediately join, and you can immediately assist us in circulating all across the United States.

With that said, please tune in on Monday for some very special content, and thank you very much for watching today. Thank you and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Afslut kuppet; Stop den næste krig;

Byg Verdenslandbroen.

Taler af forfatter til EIR's Mueller-dossier

Barbara Boyd og VIPS-medlemmerne

William Binney og Ray McGovern.

Video og pdf.

Vi vil lægge ud med Barbara Boyd. Barbara er forfatter af den særlige undersøgelsesrapport, som nogle af jer måske har set; titlen er »Robert er en juridisk lejemor; Han vil gøre sit job, hvis I giver ham lov«. Hun vil være med her på skærmen. Efter hende har vi to talere; William Binney, der sidder her på min højre side, og dernæst Ray McGovern (begge medlemmer af

VIPS). Jeg vil introducere dem hver især, når de taler, selv om jeg ikke ved, om de faktisk behøver ret megen introduktion. Nu til vores første taler.

(Dansk udskrift af Barbara Boyds præsentation)

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)