

**RADIO SCHILLER, 23. januar,
2017:**

**Til præsident Trump: Det er
ikke ”Amerika Først”,
men Menneskehedens Fælles
Fremskridt**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**»Indvielse af et Nyt
Paradigme:
En dialog mellem
civilisationer«
Helga Zepp-LaRouches
hovedtale på
Schiller Institutets
konference i New York City,**

14. januar, 2017

... med win-win-samarbejdet omkring den Nye Silkevej, så har man muligheden for at få en dialog mellem kulturer på højeste niveau. Dette er præcis, hvad Schiller Instituttet promoverer med konferencer som denne. Den grundlæggende idé er, at, hvis alle mennesker blot kendte de skønneste udtryk for den anden kulturs højkulturelle epoker, ville de elske denne anden kultur, fordi de ville føle sig så beriget og erkende, at det er en skønhed, at vi har så mange kulturer. Det ville være ekstremt kedeligt med kun én kultur; og især er den vestlige, liberale kultur ikke ligefrem attraktiv. Hvis man derfor ser på Konfucius-traditionen i Kina, på Mencius, på literatimaleri; eller man ser på de vediske skrifter, eller Gupta-periodens sanskrit-dramatradition i Indien. Den indiske renæssance med Tagore, Sri Aurobindo; eller man ser på den Italienske Renæssance, man ser på den Tyske Klassik inden for musik og litteratur – især med musik fra Bach til Beethoven og til Brahms. Dette er bidrag til universalhistorien, som, når alle nationer først kender de bedste udtryk for den anden kultur, jeg er helt sikker på, vil få alle konflikter til absolut at forsvinde; og vi vil få en rig, universel kultur, der består af mange, nationale udtryk og traditioner. Men som stadig er forenet af universelle principper for kunst og videnskab.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Lad dette blive Dag Ét –

indvielsesdag – for en ny æra for udviklingen af menneskeheden som helhed!

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 20. januar, 2017; Leder

Vi har et par emner, vi vil fremlægge her i dag, men vi lægger ud med en umiddelbar gennemgang fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche af de begivenheder, der fandt sted i dag, og vore marchordrer for de kommende par dage. Det er i dag naturligvis indsættelsesdag. Vi er nu officielt kommet til slutningen af 16 år med Bush/Obama-æraen. Vi står på tærsklen til noget nyt; vi har et nyt, officielt præsidentskab. Hvad dette nye præsidentskab vil blive, står endnu uklart; det er stadig udefineret, og det er Lyndon og Helga LaRouches vurdering, at vores job ikke har ændret sig. Det er stadig vores opgave at lægge Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love på bordet. Vi er, og må fortsætte med at være, dette lands intellektuelle lederskab, og det er vores ansvar nu at indvarsle et nyt, internationalt paradigme, som USA i høj grad må blive en del af – det, vi kan kalde for det »Nye Paradigme for Udvikling«.

Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er i dag 20. januar, 2017; indvielsesdag. Dette er vores special-webcast på indvielsesdagen fra LaRouchepac.com. Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg to kolleger – Benjamin Deniston her i studiet; og, via video, Michael Steger, som er med os i dag fra Houston, Texas, hvor han har tilbragt nogen tid sammen med Kesha Rogers.

Vi har et par emner, vi vil fremlægge her i dag, men vi lægger ud med en umiddelbar gennemgang fra både Lyndon og Helga

LaRouche af de begivenheder, der fandt sted i dag, og vores marchorder for de kommende par dage. Det er i dag naturligvis indsættelsesdag. Vi er nu officielt kommet til slutningen af 16 år med Bush/Obama-åraen. Vi står på tærsklen til noget nyt; vi har et nyt, officielt præsidentskab. Hvad dette nye præsidentskab vil blive, står endnu uklart; det er stadig udefineret, og det er Lyndon og Helga LaRouches vurdering, at vores job ikke har ændret sig. Det er stadig vores opgave at lægge Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love på bordet. Vi er, og må fortsætte med at være, dette lands intellektuelle lederskab, og det er vores ansvar nu at indvarsle et nyt, internationalt paradigme, som USA i høj grad må blive en del af – det, vi kan kalde for det »Nye Paradigme for Udvikling«.

Dette er nogle af de emner, vi vil diskutere i dybden senere i programmet, med vægt på to, store projekter, der er eksempler på, og paradigmatiske for, dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling: Kra-kanalprojektet i Thailand og Transaqua-projektet i Afrika – to projekter, som hr. og fr. LaRouche i årtiernes løb har været meget involveret i, og som blot eksemplificerer den form for store projekter for *menneskelig udvikling*, som må forfølges i de kommende måneder og uger, både internationalt, men også store projekter af den art, som vi må gennemføre herhjemme i USA.

Lad mig begynde med en næsten ordret gennemgang af nogle kommentarer, som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche kom med umiddelbart efter præsident Donald Trumps indsættelsestale her i eftermiddag, og vi vil så diskutere dette lidt mere i detaljer, før vi går videre med en gennemgang af disse store, internationale udviklingsprojekter.

LaRouche sagde omgående, at det er meget uklart, mht. principper, hvad præsident Donald Trump har i sinde ud fra det, han fremlagde i sin indsættelsestale i dag. Lyndon LaRouche sagde, »De er meget forvirret på overfladen, og vi må vente og se, hvad der ligger under denne overflade. På baggrund af det, der blev fremlagt i denne tale, er der ingen

klarhed over principper i det.«

Helga LaRouche sagde: »Det vigtigste på hjemmefronten er, hvordan Donald Trump vil honorere de løfter, han har afgivet. Hvilke handlinger vil han faktisk tage?« spurgte hun. Med hensyn til den internationale front, var Helga LaRouches vurdering, »Trump burde vide, at det ikke fungerer sådan; blot at sige 'Amerika først'. Spørgsmålet er: Hvordan finder man fælles interesser, som er fælles for mange nationer, og ikke kun 'Amerika først'? Hvad er de fælles mål for mange nationer, og hvordan handler man for at forfølge disse mål?«

Dernæst sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Problemet er, at princippet endnu ikke er klart. Det kunne gå i retning af et forenende princip; men, ud fra det, der blev fremlagt, står det endnu ikke klart, at det nødvendigvis vil blive det, eller præcis, hvad dette princip vil være.« Helga LaRouche gentog, »Generelt set var talen en meget blandet pose. Der er bestemt løfter om, at dette kunne gå i den rigtige retning, men vi må se konkrete planer for handling. Vi, LaRouche-bevægelsen, LaRouche Political Action Committee, må forstærke vores mobilisering for Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love. Det er godt, at Obama er ude. Vi vil få en frisk vind, en frisk brise, men der er brug for langt mere klarhed.«

Sluttelig sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Vi vil ikke gå for meget ind på deres argumenter. Lad dem selv forklare deres egne argumenter.« Helga LaRouche sagde: »Vi behøver ikke nødvendigvis støtte ethvert aspekt af, hvad præsident Trump siger. Vi behøver heller ikke være overdrevent kritiske, men vi bør fokusere på vore egne principper og vore egne mål.«

Først og fremmest: Hvad er disse mål?

Nummer 1 – og det er stadig dagsordenen – må Glass-Steagall omgående genindføres som landets lov. I løbet af de seneste 24 timer har vi atter set et udbrud, i vid udstrækning pga. den mobilisering, som I, dette webcasts seere, og medlemmer af

LaRouche-bevægelsen i USA har været engageret i; Glass-Steagall er nu tilbage i forreste front, tilbage på dagsordenen. Dette sås tydeligst af de spørgsmål, der blev stillet under høringen for godkendelsen af den udpegede finansminister, Steven Mnuchin, og som rejstes af senator Maria Cantwell. Hun har, som folk ved, længe været en støtte af en tilbagevenden til Glass-Steagall, i mange år. Hendes første, og eneste spørgsmål til Steven Mnuchin, var, »Støtter De Glass-Steagall?«

Steven Mnuchins svar – og dette er Helga LaRouches analyse – var, »ægte sofisteri«. »Lyndon LaRouche har været meget klar omkring, at dét, vi har brug for, er den *originale Glass-Steagall, uden ændringer*. Så kommer denne Mnuchin-fyr og taler om en *modifieret Glass-Steagall* og blander det med Volcker-reglen«, sagde hun. »Dette er ægte sofisteri. Det er virkelig godt, at Maria Cantwell har meldt klart ud om dette spørgsmål, og nu må vi lægge meget pres på hende og andre, inklusive på præsident Donald Trump, for at få den ægte Glass-Steagall vedtaget. Som Maria Cantwell sagde, så kræver det en klar, skarp linje mellem investeringsbankaktivitet og kommercial bankaktivitet sådan, som Glass-Steagall oprindeligt blev udarbejdet af Franklin Roosevelt.«

Men Glass-Steagall er blot det første skridt til det fulde program for de Fire Love; og jeg mener, vi vil diskutere dette, ikke nødvendigvis stykke for stykke, men som en generel gennemgang, det princip, der forener Lyndon LaRouches program. Og vi må, som Helga LaRouches analyse siger, tænke på det som blot Dag Ét af de første 100 dage.

Hvad vi omgående må få at se, fra dette øjeblik, er en omgående forbedring i de amerikansk-russiske relationer. Det er der allerede positive indikationer på. Der er en invitation til præsident Donald Trump til at deltage, eller sende en delegation til at deltage, i Astana Fredsforhandlingerne i Kasakhstan; fredsforhandlingerne om Syrien. Det kunne ikke være mere presserende, end det er nu, med nyhederne her til

morgen om, at ISIS på tragisk vis nu har ødelagt de storsslæde, romerske ruiner i Palmyra, det smukke amfiteater og de andre ruiner. Så det er presserende vigtigt.

Men samtidig må der blive et seriøst partnerskab mellem USA og Kina. Den store mulighed for dette – i kølvandet på præsident Xi Jinpings tale om en fremtid for en fælles og almen skæbne, som var temaet i hans tale for Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum under sit nylige besøg i Schweiz – er en konference, der kommer til maj i Kina, om Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, og som mange statsoverhoveder vil deltage i. En eksplisit invitation er blevet overgivet til Donald Trump personligt for hans personlige deltagelse i denne konference.

Det, der står klart, er, at vi befinner os midt i en global proces for dramatisk og radikal forandring. Der kommer et betydningsfuldt skifte i dynamikken, som allerede finder sted, men som vil fortsætte med at udkrystallisere sig i de kommende måneder. De franske valg er i horisonten. Ifølge nogle beregninger er 75 % af vælgerne nu for at reducere sanktionerne mod Rusland. Dernæst er der de tyske valg, der kommer lidt senere efter de franske. I løbet af disse måneder kunne vi få at se en meget anderledes verden komme til syne. Det står klart, at det ikke længere er »business as usual«. Bush/Obama-æraen er forbi, og vi står nu på tærsklen til noget helt nyt.

Jeg vil gerne invitere Michael [Steger] og Ben [Deniston] til at sige lidt mere om dette, før vi går over til disse projekter, men, lad mig blot sige, om denne nye æra, som Helga LaRouche refererer til som nødvendigheden af at definere fælles interesser blandt mange nationer, og dernæst at samarbejde om at opnå disse interesser, eller, som præsident Xi Jinping udtrykker det, en fremtid for en fælles skæbne.

To store projekter, som jeg nævnte det, og som eksemplificerer mulighederne for at engagere sig på et sådant niveau og indvarsle dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling, er Kra-kanalen i

Thailand, der nu er meget konkret tilbage på dagsordenen – jeg kommer med flere detaljer senere – og Transaqua-projektet i Afrika. Det, vi ser, er, at den Nye Silkevej, Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, går støt fremad og nu bærer frugt efter årtiers arbejde fra LaRouche-bevægelsens side internationalt. Senere i aftenens udsendelse vil vi vise et kort klip af en video, vi har lavet, og som belyser Kra-kanalens historie, og som i de kommende dage vil blive ledsaget af et interview med en af hovedarrangørerne af dette projekt, Pakdee Tanapura. Og så får vi en slags generel præsentation af dette Transaqua-projekt i Afrika.

Men dette er store projekter, der blot eksemplificerer det, der, kan man sige, må blive det »nye normale« i dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling, og for det, som USA som en presserende sag må deltage i.

Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet:

**LET'S MAKE THIS DAY ONE – INAUGURATION DAY –
OF A NEW ERA FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR MANKIND AS A WHOLE!**

LaRouche PAC International Webcast, January 20, 2017

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's January 20th, 2017. Today is Inauguration Day, and this is our Inauguration Day Special Webcast from Larouchepac.com. I'm pleased to be joined today by two of my colleagues – Benjamin Deniston, here in the studio; and, via video, Michael Steger, who is joining us today from Houston, Texas, where he's been spending some time with Kesha Rogers.

We have a few items that we're going to present to you today, but we're going to begin with an immediate overview from both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche of the events that occurred today,

and our marching orders for the days to come. Obviously, today is

Inauguration Day. We've come now, officially, to the end of 16 years of the Bush/Obama era. We're on the verge of something new;

we have a new Presidency, officially. What that new Presidency will be, is unclear; it is very much still undefined, and Lyndon

and Helga LaRouche's assessment is, our job has not changed.

We

still have the task of putting Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws on the

table. We are, and must continue to be, the intellectual leadership in this country, and we are having the responsibility

now of ushering in a new international paradigm of which the United States must very much indeed be a part – what we can call

the "New Development Paradigm."

That will be some of what we will discuss in substance later

in this broadcast with an emphasis on two major projects which are exemplary and paradigmatic of that New Development Paradigm:

the Kra Canal Project in Thailand, and the Transqua Project in

Africa – two projects with which the LaRouches have been very much involved over decades and which are merely exemplary of the

kinds of great projects for {human} development that must be pursued in the coming months, in the coming weeks, both internationally, but also great projects of that type which we must carry out here at home in the United States.

Let me begin with an almost verbatim overview of some comments that both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche had, immediately following President Donald Trump's inaugural speech this afternoon, and then we will discuss that in a little bit more

detail before we get to the overview of these great international development projects.

What Mr. LaRouche said, right off the bat, is that it's very unclear, in terms of principle, what President Donald Trump has in mind, just based on what he presented in his inaugural speech today. Lyndon LaRouche said, "It's very confused on the surface, and we will have to wait and see what is underneath that surface. On the basis of what was presented in that speech, there is no clarity of principle there."

Helga LaRouche said, "The most important thing on the domestic front is how Donald Trump will deliver on the promises that he's made. What are the actions that he will actually take?" she asked. Regarding the international front, Helga LaRouche's assessment was, "Trump should know it doesn't work that way; merely saying 'America First.' The issue is: how do you find {common} interests, shared among {many} nations, not just 'America First'? What are the common objectives of multiple nations, and how do you act in pursuit of those objectives?"

Lyndon LaRouche then said, "The problem is that the principle is not clear yet. It could go in the direction of a unifying principle; but from what was presented, it's not yet clear that it necessarily will, or exactly what that principle will be." Helga LaRouche's reiterating remarks were: "Overall, the address was a very mixed bag. There are certainly promises that this could go in the right direction, but we need to see concrete plans of action. We, the LaRouche Movement, the LaRouche Political Action Committee, must increase our mobilization on Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws program. It is good," she said,

"that
Obama is out. We will get a fresh wind, a fresh breeze, but a lot
more clarity is still needed."

And then, finally, Lyndon LaRouche said, "We don't want to get too close to their arguments. Let them clarify their own arguments." And Helga LaRouche said, "We don't necessarily need to support every aspect of what President Trump says. We also don't need to be overly critical either, but we should be focusing on our own principles and our own objectives."

Now, first and foremost, what are those objectives?

No. 1 – and the agenda still stands – Glass-Steagall must be immediately reinstated as the law of the land. We saw, over the last 24 hours, an eruption again, largely due to the mobilization that you, the viewers of this webcast and members of the LaRouche Movement in the United States have been engaged in; Glass-Steagall is now back in the forefront, back on the agenda. This could be seen most clearly by questions that were raised during the confirmation hearing of Treasury designate-Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, that were raised by Senator Maria Cantwell. Maria Cantwell, as people know, has been a long-standing supporter of a return to Glass-Steagall for many years now. Her very first question and her {only} question of Steven Mnuchin was, "Do you support Glass-Steagall?"

Steven Mnuchin's answer – and this is Helga LaRouche's analysis

– was "real sophistry." "Lyndon LaRouche has been very clear that what we need is the {original Glass-Steagall, without modification}. And here comes this Mnuchin guy, going on about a

{modified} Glass-Steagall, mixing it in with the Volcker Rule,"

she said. "This is real sophistry. It is very good that Maria Cantwell has now put herself on the spot on this issue, and now

{we} have to put real pressure on her and on others, including on

President Donald Trump, to get the real Glass-Steagall in place.

As Maria Cantwell said, that requires a clear bright line between

investment banking and commercial banking in the way that Glass-Steagall was originally designed by Franklin Roosevelt."

But Glass-Steagall is merely the first step in the full Four

Laws program; and I think we're going to discuss that, not necessarily piecemeal, but in terms of the broad overview, the principle which unifies Lyndon LaRouche's program. And the way to

think about that is what Helga LaRouche's analysis was, that this

is merely Day One out of what must be the First 100 Days.

What we have to see, immediately, from this moment on, is an

immediate improvement in U.S.-Russian relations. There are already positive indications of that. You have the official invitation of now-President Donald Trump to attend, or to send a

delegation to attend, the Astana Peace Talks in Astana, Kazakhstan; the peace talks for Syria. This could not be more urgent than it is right now, with the news that we received this

morning, that ISIS has, tragically, now destroyed the grand

Roman
ruins of Palmyra, the beautiful amphitheater, and the other
ruins
there. So, this is of urgent importance.
But, simultaneously, there must be a serious
partnership
between the United States and China. The grand opportunity for
that, following President Xi Jinping's keynote speech on the
future of shared and common destiny – that was his theme at
the
Davos World Economic Forum during his recent trip to
Switzerland.
[<http://america.cgtn.com/2017/01/17/full-text-of-xi-jinping-keynote-at-the-world-economic-forum>] The most immediate
opportunity is a conference that's coming up in May, in China,
on
the subject of the Belt and Road Initiative, which many head
of
state will be attending. There has been an explicit invitation
extended, for Donald Trump, himself, to attend this
conference.

What is clear, is that we are in the midst of a global
process of dramatic and radical change. There will be a major
shift of dynamic which is already ongoing, but which will
continue to crystallize in the coming months. The French
elections are on the horizon. According to some calculations,
75%
of the electorate are now in favor of rolling back the
sanctions
against Russia. Then you have the German elections coming
later
after that. Over the course of these months, we could see a
very
different world emerging. What is very clear is that this is
no
longer "business as usual." The Bush/Obama era is over, and
now

we're on the verge of something completely new.

Now, I would like to invite Michael and Ben to say a little

bit more about this, before we get into these projects, but let

me just say, this new era, what Helga LaRouche is referring to as

the necessity of defining common interests among multiple nations, and then working together to achieve those interests, or, as President Xi Jinping put it, a future of shared destiny.

Two great projects, as I mentioned, which exemplify the

opportunities to engage on that kind of level and to usher in this New Development Paradigm, are the Kra Canal in Thailand, which is now back on the agenda in a very real way – and I'll get into some of the details on that later – and the Transqua Project in Africa. What we see is that the New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative, is steadily moving forward, and it's coming to fruition after decades of work by the LaRouche Movement

internationally. Later in this show, we will be playing a brief

clip of a video that we made highlighting the history of the Kra

Canal, which also will be accompanied in the coming days by an interview with one of the key organizers of that project, Pakdee

Tanapura. And then we will have sort of an overview presentation

of this Transqua Project in Africa.

But what these are, are great projects which are merely

exemplary of what must become, you could say, the "new normal" in

this New Development Paradigm, and what the United States must {urgently} become a participant in.

Let me leave it at that. We can have a little bit more discussion and then get into some of the bulk of those projects.

MICHAEL STEGER: Well, I think everyone's fairly happy watching this broadcast, given the fact that especially the last eight years under Obama were a kind of psychological terror. There's definitely a relief. The one thing that's clear, is that it's a

moment of action. Perhaps President Trump understands that. As,

Matt, you indicated, as Lyn said, himself, we have to see what this actually means. But we, the LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche Association internationally know very well what this means. It's

largely determined by the actions that both Russia and China have

taken over the last three years around the New Silk Road initiative and a real collaboration, as Vladimir Putin himself called for in the 2015 United Nations General Assembly – an anti-Nazi coalition, like you saw in World War II – has to be brought together, a collaboration of nations.

And what that means – I think President Putin understands

this – and I think it's very important that the American people

grasp this. The eradication of this kind of terrorism, is the elimination of the British Empire, in the essence of a construction orientation; that you're actually building up the civilizations again, you're building up the populations. You're

taking the areas of Southwest Asia, North Africa; the project of

the Transqua is in a key area to begin to develop many parts of

Africa that are right now threatened by this terrorist scourge.

The same is true from India through Pakistan, the Kra Canal. The areas of Myanmar and Thailand and into Malaysia are also threatened. The Philippines.

So these questions of development are really the means by which an international coalition eradicates the terrorism; eradicates the drug trade; and begins to collaborate on mankind's true destiny, which is really much greater than simply solving some of these basic problems.

I'll say that for now. I think Ben might have more to say.

BEN DENISTON: That's exactly the issue. Maybe we can get it to it a little bit more, but you look at the United States, you look at the issue of Mexico and our relation to Mexico, for example, which has been a big subject of discussion. But what hasn't been put on the table, is, again, the kind of campaign and the programs that the LaRouche Movement has led up for major development projects. Mr. LaRouche, again, has a very rich and high-level history of relations with top Mexican officials, including one-time President José López Portillo of Mexico, with whom he had a direct personal relationship around this idea of common development.

This can be directly taken to one of the key issues we'll get into – the issue of water development, as we'll discuss in the case of Africa; but that can serve as a model for the kind of projects that we could bring back to the United States. What Michael is saying here is critical: development is the key; development is the future; development is what's needed to

actually {solve} these problems, not just address immediate crises, not just deal with catastrophes as they occur. But actually how do you move the world in many of these regions that

have been plunged into years if not decades of horrific activities led by the Saudis, Obama, Bush – all of these factions? How do you actually bring that into some real solutions

and resolutions that will create a long-term substantial change?

I think what Mrs. LaRouche said was very right on, in terms

of her response to the inauguration speech; is that it's a new world. We can no longer be thinking about individual nations alone; that's just part of the natural state that mankind is at,

at this point. Mankind has developed to the point where we're a

global force; the level of development and growth needed is something that goes beyond individual national boundaries.

You

have to do it with respect to nations and their interests and their boundaries and their cultures; but it's also undeniable that we're at a point where we have to think as a global species

– and really, an interplanetary species.

That's the basis for the future of mankind now. Where do

you define these common areas of mutual benefit, mutual interest

that nations can participate in; which creates a net higher amount of wealth and growth for all participants involved?

There's a principle! Mr. LaRouche was raising the issue of where's the principle; that's an actual scientific principle rooted in the scientific nature of mankind as a creative species,

and rooted in the very historical view of the point of human

development that we're currently at. That is a principle; that is something which you can continue to come to as the defining point for policy and what's needed now.

OGDEN: Absolutely! There is obviously a sense of dramatic change which is sweeping the country; and I think that President Trump addressed what is a reality. That there is a desperation among the American people; and that is obviously what rendered this election. The forgotten men, the forgotten women who feel a desperation and a despair as they look at these old abandoned factories, as he said, standing like tombstones scattered across the territory of this country. People who feel like they have no voice; and the sense that they now have the opportunity to participate once again in the policies of the United States. But participating in the policies of this country means a necessity for a deeply held education and profound understanding of principle, not just policies but a principle around which those actions can be taken. The sentiment of saying we're going to look at ourselves as standing on the threshold of a new millennium and unlocking the mysteries of space; and using American labor to build infrastructure across the United States, and roads and railroads and tunnels and bridges, is a positive one. But the understanding of where mankind is at in our history as a species right now, and what are the true scientific challenges that are facing us that require our creativity [in

order] to be solved. That is where the real questions lie in terms of clarity of principle. And great leaders of the United

States always had an understanding of what the principles were that mankind as a whole must resolve; the principled questions which are there to be solved.

So, we're going to take a look at these two case studies

which we're selecting because of, first of all, their magnitude

in terms of the importance of their role in this interconnection

of a World Land-Bridge or a new land-based and maritime Silk Road, as it's being called with the initiative from Xi Jinping;

but also because of the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have

played in these two projects over a number of decades, and the fact that their progress at this point does actually represent a

milestone in terms of the coming to fruition of a campaign of inaugurating this new era of development for mankind.

So, we're going to start with a short excerpt from a video

that LaRouche PAC made a number of years ago on the Kra Canal; the Thailand canal which has a long history going back over a century in terms of people looking at the different possible routes of cutting a canal through the isthmus of Thailand. But

it's also something that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche personally was involved in, in the 1980s. There are a lot of new developments

and hopeful developments around this, including a new book that

just was published called {Kra Canal: The Strategic History of Thailand}, which Pakdee Tanapura, who is an associate of the LaRouche Movement in Thailand and who was one of the prime

organizers in the 1980s, is a contributor to this book; but also a number of generals and admirals and other high-ranking and leading figures inside Thailand. This book is now being printed in 10,000 copies and is being circulated among some of the leading government institutions. With the passage of the previous king and the new king coming to power in Thailand, there is a strong openness; not to mention that there is a strategic shift now underway in Asia as a whole. The abandonment of the Obama Asia Pivot, the crumbling of the TPP; there's a strong potential in terms of the possibility of this project moving forward.

So, I'll have a little bit more to say about this after we play this clip; but again, this project – taken together with the other project we're going to talk about today – are merely exemplary of the type of new era of development that we must inaugurate today.

VIDEO voice [begins mid-sentence]: century, the concept of the preferred location for the canal route generally shifted towards southern Thailand, as compared to the earliest proposed routes.

We can compare the dimensions of a proposed Kra Canal with other well-known canals. The width of the Kra isthmus at its narrowest point is around 27 miles. Compare this to the width of the Panama Canal – about 48 miles. The length of the various Kra Canal proposals range from between 30 and 60 miles. The Suez Canal, for comparison, has a length of 119 miles. The height of

the interior mountain chain where the Kra Canal would be constructed is about 246 feet. Compare this to the height of the

Gaillard Cut of the Panama Canal, which is slightly lower at 210 feet.

The Straits of Malacca are not sufficiently deep for many large ships to pass through; the straits are 620 miles long, but very narrow – less than 1.6 miles at the narrowest, and only 82 feet deep at the shallowest point. Currently, large ships are required to travel much further south to the Lombok Straits near Java; which have a depth of 820 feet.

OGDEN: This is the beginning of the clip that we're going to play for you. We're going to explore a little bit more of the advantages of cutting this Kra Canal through the Thailand isthmus. What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that you're linking together two very crucial oceans in the world – the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean; this is a key connection in terms of this new Maritime Silk Road, and will completely transform the potential relationships between the countries in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. So, we'll continue playing this clip for you right now.

VIDEO voice: Clearly, a Kra Canal poses a more reasonable option than travelling so much further south for larger ships; or for any ship taking the 620-mile detour through the congested

and
pirate-infested Straits of Malacca.

The 600-plus-mile Malacca Straits are by far the most heavily travelled of the world's canals, with more than twice the traffic of the Suez and Panama Canals combined. By a recent estimate, one-fifth of world trade goes through the Malacca Straits; congestion or obstruction of the straits would dramatically increase the cost of trade. The maximum capacity of the Singapore-Malacca Straits being 200,000 ships annually. A more recent assessment estimates that the traffic of the straits

has been increasing at an annual rate of 20%.

In 1973, Tams Engineering had conducted a study of choices of Kra Canal routes, and suggested that route 5-A was the most suitable for the construction of a Kra Canal. At either end of the canal would be located industrial zones estimated to span collectively about 100,000 acres. A decade later, in 1983-84, the Fusion Energy Foundation and {Executive Intelligence Review}, together with the Thai Ministry of Communication, held two successful conferences on the Kra Canal project. FEF updated the earlier feasibility study done by Tams, and developed further on the project's economic and industrial benefits. The Fall 1984 conference entitled "Industrialization of Thailand and the Kra Canal" took place in Bangkok, Thailand. The conference brought together businessmen, engineers, and government officials from all of the ASEAN countries, to hash out the feasibility of building the canal.

PAKDEE TANAPURA: The idea of building the canal, of course,

was picked up again in 1983 when Lyndon LaRouche travelled to Thailand and organized an international conference on the Kra Canal. The participation was very good; we had representatives from India, representatives from Indonesia, representatives from Malaysia, representatives from Japan. In 1983, we didn't have a representative from China, but the Chinese are very observant about what we were doing. We had participation of the Ministry of Transport and Communications of Thailand, the Minister, Mr. Samatzu Tamaraif [ph] himself came to deliver a speech at the conference along with Lyndon LaRouche. Also, we had the participation of the GIF, the Global Infrastructure Fund group; from Japan, we had Dr. Yamamoto from the GIF group, as well as participation from Japan; a very prominent figure, Mr. Nakajima of the Mitsubishi Research Institute – a very prominent figure from the Mitsubishi Group. We had Mr. Saito also from the Toshiba Group, and we had lots of participation from [inaud; 28:55]. So, that was back in 1983.

VIDEO voice: The four panels covered all aspects, including a presentation by EIR/FEF researchers on the use of PNEs – or peaceful nuclear explosions – as the fastest, most efficient and cost effective method of construction.

OGDEN: So, the full video that that was just an excerpt from, is available on YouTube – "The Kra Canal; The Development of Southeast Asia"; and the link to that video is available in the description of this YouTube video. But as you heard Mr. Pakdee Tanapura mention, Lyndon LaRouche was a keynote speaker

at

both the 1983 conference and the 1984 conference that were organized there in Bangkok, Thailand with very high-level representation from almost every Asian country and from the Thai government itself.

What Lyndon LaRouche said in a recent interview, and he continues to emphasize, is the absolute critical nature of the Kra Canal. But he delivered an interview in 2014 to the {Fortune Times} of Singapore, on the Kra Canal project. I'm just going to read a short excerpt of what Mr. LaRouche said, which will clarify, I think, why this is such a key project in the overall global development perspective that we're talking about. Mr. LaRouche said the following:

"Divide the maritime region of East and South Asia into three principal categories: China – a giant; India – a giant; and the maritime connection throughout Southeast Asia's maritime regions. Add the impact of such a triadic maritime and related connection to the physical economic relations to the Americas to the east, and the Middle East's underbelly and Africa. Then, the potency of a Kra Canal development appears not only as an eminently feasible feature, but as a strategic, political, economic force for the planet." He went on to say, "The sheer volume of maritime trade between the two great nations of Asia – China and India – and their connections through the South Asia maritime regions make the canal probably the most potentially beneficial and also efficient project for the entire region of

the Pacific and Indian Oceans regions; and the co-development of the major regions of planet Earth as a whole."

Then, later, the following year, in 2015, some comments in

an informal discussion, but here's quote from those comments: "With the completion of the Kra Canal, on top of the Suez Canal

expansion which is ongoing in Egypt, there will be no longer a separation between the Atlantic and Pacific economies. China and

India will greatly benefit from those two canal projects, along

with the smaller nations along the Southeast Asian Rim. This must be pushed, hard. This will end the British geo-political games in the Eurasian region; it will change the economic character of the entire world."

So, I think that's the key here. What we're looking at;

{this} is what Helga LaRouche was referring to when you identify

a vision of common destiny or principles which are shared for the

mutual benefit of many nations, of an entire region, or potentially even, the entire globe; and then work together to achieve those benefits. That's the era of development; that's the new era of development which we have to inaugurate here.

And

I think that's exemplary – as Mr. LaRouche was just saying – of

these kinds of global visions of how we can bring mankind to the

next platform in terms of our development of the planet for the

mutual benefit of all nations.

So, let's take that as one project; and then, shift over to

Africa and look at what is now progressing around this really unprecedented project in terms of water transfer in terms of the magnitude and the potential benefits for that continent also.

DENISTON: Regular viewers of our website might have seen this,

but it was just this past December that there was a new Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Lake Chad Basin Commission, the Nigerian government, and also a major company out

of China, called China Power. This is now a new, formal, serious

step towards a feasibility study, a detailed engineering study of

what it would take to actualize this Transaqua project, as it has

been called in its earlier designs. As it now stands, as the designs stand and even a slightly smaller version which was cited

in this new Memorandum of Understanding would be the single largest water transfer project ever created on the planet Earth;

being brought right into Central Africa to address some of major

needs of that region. This has been on the table for decades

-

we'll get into that in a second – but what stands out now, again? We're in a new global paradigm, and what appears to be the key change that's now bringing this out of design and discussion and general acknowledgement of it being important; but

into actual realization? Again, we have China's role. China Power is the company that led the construction of the Three Gorges Dam in China.

So again, we're seeing China playing a key role in bringing

these much-needed, much-discussed mega-projects of development into fruition. While it might not technically be included as part of the whole New Silk Road or what they are now calling the

Belt and Road initiative; it is intimately part of that entire perspective, that entire program. This design to bring water from the Congo River Basin, not necessarily the end of the Congo

River where all the tributaries become the Congo River itself, but many of the upper tributaries that are at higher elevations

further inland; to bring a fraction – 5%, 8% of this water flow

– divert it to the north and to the west into Lake Chad to begin

refilling Lake Chad. This was designed in the early 1980s by certain Italian engineers; in particular, Dr. Marcello Vichi, who

has worked with the Bonifica Engineering Consulting Firm, who has

been very happy to collaborate with the Schiller Institute and Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the past and recently in his promotion of this project.

But again, this would be an incredibly amazing contribution

to this entire region. Just compare it to the level of discussion you still get in the West around poverty in Africa; you still just get disgusting discussions of how we need to provide them with gravity-powered light bulbs because they don't

have electricity, so you can create a mechanism to provide light

by a certain gravity-powered mechanism. And that's some kind of amazing contribution to the people of Africa who need electricity. That's just such a disgusting low level of thought

from this whole anti-development, Green perspective. And you look what China is saying: Let's bring the most modern, the most advanced, the largest water infrastructure project ever built on the planet Earth; and let's engage Africa in building it there.

Just to clarify, despite some of the lies that are put out, this would not be China coming in and building the entire project with their own people and their own labor force. That's often stated, but it's not the case, and it's being demonstrated that it's not the case. Just look at what's already happened and what's ongoing with the rail projects that China is working with various

African nations in developing. New standard rail lines in Kenya,

for example; just look at the figures on that. About 3000 Chinese are employed on that project there; 30,000 Kenyans are employed, and Kenyans are being trained to run these rail systems

in addition to the skill sets being developed to construct these

things. It's similar with other rail lines in other African nations. So, just to clarify that, this is not China coming in

and employing their own people and exploiting these African nations. This is coming in with this "win-win" perspective of an

investment; engaging with the populations there and developing the region for the benefit of all parties involved.

Just to emphasize, we have a first slide here [Fig. 1] just to show a couple of examples; but this is a project and a

general

idea that Mr. LaRouche and his associates have been advocating for decades. Prior to the design of the Transaqua itself, which

is the name given by this Italian engineer who did a more detailed initial engineering study for this project, the general

idea was recognized as feasible and made sense if you just look

at the region – which we'll look at in a second – you can see where there's an abundance of water; you can see where there might regions where you can transfer it. It was recognized, going back to Mr. LaRouche's famous 1975 International Development Bank, that these kinds of investments into large-scale water transfer is exactly typical of the kinds of projects we need for Africa, for example; for nations in Africa.

Similar ideas were featured in the Fusion Energy Foundation report, "The Industrialization of Africa", just to cite another

example. This has been often discussed and developed and proposed in various other publications by {Executive Intelligence

Review}, by LaRouche PAC, by the Schiller Institute.

But it's probably also worth just highlighting that in March

2016, {Executive Intelligence Review} held a seminar in Frankfurt, Germany to discuss the development perspective needed

to solve the refugee crisis in northern Africa and stretching into the Middle East; which has been something that Mrs. LaRouche

has campaigned on for well over year now. That the solution to

this refugee crisis is to reverse the destruction that's been caused by Bush's wars, Obama's wars in that region, the support

of terrorism through support of Saudi Arabia and more directly.

But do the complete opposite and engage in large-scale development of this region to ensure that there's a future for people; especially for the younger generation. That's the only

way you're going to fundamentally get rid of terrorism; the exact

opposite of Obama's drone strike policy, where every wedding party he drones, he creates ten times more future terrorists – because their lives have been destroyed – than he killed with his drone strikes. So, this was a very high-level seminar on that topic; and one of major projects that was featured, was this

Transaqua project. It featured two of the leading engineers; again this Dr. Marcello Vichi – and one of his associates who's

also involved and is an expert on the project – as well as a representative of the Lake Chad Basin Commission. This is the level of promotion and discussion that our organization {Executive Intelligence Review}, Mrs. LaRouche, also our friend

over in France, Jacques Cheminade who's currently running a campaign for the Presidency in France, has been a major supporter

of this project. So, we have a very close history with this entire thing. Now again, with China actually taking the lead, this is becoming a reality.

Just to put that in a little bit of context, I want to briefly look at this map; because it's well known that water is a

major issue for many parts of the world. And it's expected to become a growing issue for many regions as water use increases,

population grows; and under the assumption that we're not going

to have the level of water infrastructure that we need. If

you

just look at this map, put out by a United Nations report on global water issues, you can see in the lighter blues, you see regions where there is water scarcity due to the physical availability of water; and that's probably not a surprise in the

regions you see. In the west and southwestern United States, we

see physical water scarcity. But you see much of Africa is not

light blue, it's dark blue, which indicates economic water scarcity; meaning the water is there, but the infrastructure hasn't been developed to utilize the water supplies that are there. So, I think that's an immediate reference point that's worth making. You have major water supplies available throughout

the African continent; what's been lacking is the ability to facilitate the kind of projects needed to develop and take advantage of those.

Here [Fig. 2] is just a global depiction of river runoff

globally for all the major coastal watersheds combined that run

into different oceans and basins. Here, you can see where I'm indicating, the Congo Basin has a very large and significant water flow out into the South Atlantic Ocean there. So, it's a

major – maybe not the largest – but a major region of water flow that's available; the vast majority of which is not being used for any economic purposes. The Congo River itself, if people don't know, is the second largest river on the planet in

terms of discharge into the ocean. It's kind of hard to compete

with the Amazon itself, but the Congo is the second globally largest river; running at 1300 cubic kilometers per year of outflow. For a comparative reference for Americans, the

Mississippi is 500 [cubic km]. So this is over 2.5 times the size of the Mississippi River. The Nile River, another major river in Africa, that obviously supports a very large population

and development, is more in the range of 80-90 cubic km per year.

So, we're talking about an order of magnitude plus larger than the Nile River.

Here [Fig. 3] we have a quick breakdown of the different water basins in Africa. This graphic is actually labelled in German,

so my German-speaking friends can read this just fine. But the entire Congo River Basin, as I'm indicating here, so you can get

a sense of the size; all funneling down into the Congo River out

into the Atlantic again. Then, just bordering it to the north and to the west, is the Lake Chad Basin. So this entire region,

all water deposited in here filters into Lake Chad itself.

Currently, this basin and the water in this basin, the water in

the Lake Chad system supports somewhere in the range of 30-40 million people. Over the past 40-45 years, Lake Chad – in terms

of total surface area – is now only one-tenth of its former size. So, if you compare 1972 to today, it's one-tenth of the size it was then. There have also been issues of rainfall decreasing in the past 20 years or so on the order of 15% to 20%.

So, none of these figures are new or a surprise; this has

been known since our organization has been campaigning for the development of this project. But it is a very real and developing crisis in the region, and it can be alleviated. Here's

a depiction [Fig. 4] of the actual change in the size of the lake; it's rather dramatic. The total outlying area here is the 1972 level; it had a low record in 1987, and it's recovered just a little bit. But it's still a tenth of its original, expected size.

So this rather brilliant, beautiful proposal is to create a canal – again, that would not connect all the way down to the headwaters of the Congo River itself; but it would feed off many of the tributaries up in the highland regions and collect the water through a series of dams and reservoirs and canals in that region in the Democratic Republic of Congo and in the Central African Republic. You can see here an indication of the Congo River Basin as a whole, and the catchment region, and this is the canal that would be developed. Once it captures the water in that region, it could then be funneled into canals and existing rivers crossing the Congo River divide into the Lake Chad Basin, and then funneled directly into Lake Chad. What is being proposed here is something in the range of 50-100 cubic kilometers per year for the diversion. The original designs by the Italian leaders who originally did the engineering studies on this project, were looking at 100 cubic kilometers per year. Again, that's something on the order of 8% of the total water flow of the basin.

It's also worth noting that this would also provide flood control for the Congo Basin itself; so you could alleviate

some
of the periodic flooding which itself can be very problematic
with the lack of infrastructure in the region.

So, the original designs are looking on the order of
100
cubic kilometers a year; this new Memorandum of Understanding
threw out the figure of half of that – 50 cubic kilometers per
year. Both of which are massive figures. You're talking
about
on the order of a Nile River of flow, created by man,
refilling
Lake Chad over some number of years. Again, just to help to
get
a sense of some of these figures and what they mean, if you
take
all of the western water projects in the United States: the
Central Valley Project; the Franklin Roosevelt projects of the
'30s; the Pat Brown projects of the '60s; the projects to
divert
from the Colorado River into various regions. You combine all
of
that, and you look at what is the total functional capacity of
all these projects; you're talking about a maximum of 20 cubic
kilometers per year. So, this is already 2.5 if not 5 times
larger than all of California's water projects combined.

You take China's beautiful brand new South Water North
project; they've completed two of the three routes for that
project; the so-called eastern route, and the so-called
central
route. Those combined are going to be transferring about 30
cubic kilometers a year. When the western route is added on,
that'll be closer to 45. But again, even the lower estimate
of
the Lake Chad Transqua diversion project is 50 – is larger
than
the South Water North project in its entirety; and it could be
even twice that if the full extent is developed.

Hydropower will be developed along this region to provide much-needed electricity; and obviously the water will be used not just for refilling the lake, but an entire development of this region. If the full design is developed in its entirety, you can have a navigable canal that will be part of that; along with which, you can have inland ports, new industrial development, all kinds of economic activity along the canal itself. The level of land irrigation for farming that's being discussed – even with the current proposal of 50 cubic km per year – is equivalent to the entire California Central Valley.

If you know what the California Central Valley means for food production for the United States, this should tell you something. You're going to have a California Central Valley potential of food production right in the central heart of Africa. So this is an amazing project that will not just benefit the immediate nations touching the project; it will have spreading effects throughout [Africa], and is typical of the type of principle of development that is needed in this current period. You look for these large-scale actions that can benefit all the partners involved. China is making an investment; they're going to benefit from the project by being able to participate in its construction, but also getting new markets to work with as these African nations are able to grow and develop. All these African nations are going to get power, water, skilled

training to construct and operate these projects, the related industry that can go along with these development corridors.

This is exemplary of the type of programs that are needed

today. I think it deserves a very high level of support and praise for the potential of this thing becoming a reality. Again,

it should serve as a reference point for the level of discussion

needed for the United States. Much could be said – we've already taken up a fair amount of time with this, but the United

States' relation to Mexico; you have the entire NAWAPA design in

principle of managing the entire – and then potentials to add in

southern contributions from Mexico itself. So, you have similar

ideas of joint development that can not only alleviate current drought conditions that are ravaging California, the southwest United States, and much of northern Mexico; you can actually create a qualitatively higher level of ability to support completely new levels of agriculture development. You turn entire territories that are now uninhabitable into potentially some of the best land that you're going to want to get your hands

on.

It's this future-oriented level of development on this scale, rooted in these types of principles, that I think is only

reference point and the only standard that we should really be holding ourselves to at this point. So, you take, this is exemplary; what we just discussed with the Kra Canal. These are

just a few keystone projects that really signify a new era for mankind, and define the level of discussion that we need to rise

to in the United States.

OGDEN: So again, this is the paradigm which we wish to inaugurate today. This is something that the United States must

be a part of, when we talk about a vision of common destiny for

mankind; which was the way that Xi Jinping put it in his speech

at Davos. When we talk about the mutual benefit among nations,

it's defining these sorts of principles of the future and scientific challenges that can be overcome; and doing that together among nations, which is the paradigm of the 21st Century. We cannot retreat from that.

I think it's very clear, as President Trump said in his

inaugural address, the time for empty talk is over; now is the hour of action. True! But the question is, what form will that

action take? And according to what principle will that action be

conceived? We go back to the Four Laws document of Lyndon LaRouche. The principle is very clear in that document; this is

not just a policy paper. This is document which is formed around

the principle that makes mankind different from animals; that we

can master nature and improve it for the benefit of all mankind.

Increasing the productive powers of the labor force through new

technologies and new principles that are discovered; that's the

core principle of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws document. But I think

that's what defines this hour of action which must be taken.

I'd like to put up on the screen right now the link to our petition – which we are still circulating – this is lpac.co/trumpsotu. Again, this is a petition demanding that Trump act on his words promising Glass-Steagall, which he said in his campaign; and it must be a strict Glass-Steagall as LaRouche has defined it. This is between now and the State of the Union address. So again, if you haven't signed that petition, this is still the active, leading campaign from LaRouche PAC here in the United States.

But let me let Michael say a little bit – if you wish to.

MICHAEL STEGER: I think what Ben indicated is that what are possible today are platform-like projects; and that's sort of the question for this new administration. Are we going to take actions which don't simply address the problems which we currently face? But as President Trump said, are we going to move into the future? That's not characterized by some linear notions of time; that requires a physical leap in mankind's sense of productivity and mankind himself as a species. The kind of projects that need to be taken up in the United States, being here in Houston with Kesha Rogers, we had a chance to meet with about 25 former rocket scientists from NASA. Leading figures, some of whom worked their entire careers in the manned space program. They are ready to move forward; they see the potential,

but I think what defines the Apollo-like project today is to conquer the fusion energy program. That's something mankind has yet to do; we've clearly got a capability internationally with robotics, and combined with the manned space program to begin to really advance our abilities of exploration on the Moon and Mars.

But the real question for mankind on Earth, and for mankind throughout the Solar System, is going to be this fusion platform. That's the kind of clear and distinct action that, if this administration takes, we will certainly move into the future in an unparalleled way.

OGDEN: We do see some references in this inaugural speech. As President Trump said, we're standing on the verge of a new millennium; and it's one in which we can unlock the mysteries of space, free Earth from the miseries of disease, and harness the energies, industries, and technologies of tomorrow. Fusion power as my example of what that could be. But, it's not enough to say those words; there has to be a clear pathway to achieve that, and the clear intention from the leadership of the United States to make that happen. But it requires an entirely new paradigm of thinking among the American people and among the nations of the planet generally.

We must maintain a sense of common destiny, a shared

future of common benefit; and I think if we take this as an Inauguration Day, but in a much broader sense of the word. Not just the inauguration of a new President in the United States; but potentially the inauguration of a new era of development for the planet. One which is already in motion; that paradigm is already underway, but it's waiting for the United States to become an active and willing participant in that new economic and strategic paradigm.

So, let me go back to the remarks that Lyndon and Helga

LaRouche made earlier today which I cited in the beginning. Helga

LaRouche was very clear; we must be focussed on our own principles and our own objectives, and proceed as we have been proceeding. We are very clear in terms of the fact that yes, the

Bush and Obama era is over; a fresh breeze could be blowing through. A lot can change; this could potentially be the end of

business as usual, but more clarity is still needed. And that clarity can only come from the leadership exemplified by the LaRouche Movement, defined and informed by clear scientific principle.

So, let's take these two great projects that we discussed

here today – the Kra Canal and the Transqua project in Africa – as paradigmatic of what the new era of development can be. Let's make the decision that this is not just Day One of the First 100 Days of new Presidency of the United States. It's not

just Day One of a new administration, but let's make this Day One, Inauguration Day, of a new era for development for

mankind
as a whole.

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Please be sure to watch the video of the Kra Canal project in full; the link is available in the description. And watch out for an interview with Pakdee Tanapura that will be coming very soon. And also hopefully, we will have more elaboration of the great and optimistic vision that Ben laid out in terms of this potential to develop the African continent as a whole.

Thank you very much for joining us here today, and please stay tuned. We're in for, I think, a wild ride; and we have a lot of work to do. Sign up to our email list if you haven't yet; subscribe to the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Det næste stadium i menneskets evolution

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 19. januar, 2017 – De næste dage vil se mange revolutionære udviklinger, kvalitativt nye udviklinger, der ikke ligner noget som helst andet, som tidligere er set i menneskehedens historie. Men én ting ved vi, som allerede er uundgåelig og ubestridelig. Deres system er færdigt. Det er forbi, og kommer aldrig tilbage. Jo, de kan lave ballade, som de netop gør. De kan lave et blodigt rod, hvis de får lov – men de vil aldrig være i stand til at bringe dette system

tilbage fra graven. Gud ske tak og lov, at vi er færdige med det, for altid.

Så snart, vi kendte resultatet af præsidentvalget, sagde Lyndon LaRouche, at det ikke var USA, der havde afvist Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama og alt, hvad de stod for – det var hele verden, der havde afvist dem. Det var et globalt fænomen. Uanset, hvad Angela Merkel måtte mene, så havde verden fået nok af deres myrderi og uplyndring – af Det britiske Imperiums uforskammethed og hybris igennem tre århundreder. Verden havde besluttet at lade dem tilbage i mudderet, og gå videre. Videre til det næste stadium i menneskehedens evolution, som allerede er begyndt.

Det næste stadie i evolutionen er et helt, indbyrdes forbundet kompleks – moralsk, fysisk, psykologisk og videnskabeligt – alle disse aspekter tæt sammenvævet, som det altid har været i Lyndon LaRouches tankegang. Ét ord for dette nye stadium af vor arts evolution er det »Nye Paradigme«. Det Nye Paradigme, hvor, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche så mindeværdigt har sagt det, »vi bliver virkelig menneskelige«. Dets nye »platform« for økonomisk udvikling inkluderer Verdenslandbroen, som hr. og fr. LaRouche for første gang lancerede som en idé for omkring tredive år siden, og som nu er i færd med at blive virkelig gjort under lederskab af Kina og Putins Rusland.

Med seneste nyt-udviklinger, der vælter frem for hver dag, der går, er projektet for Kra-kanalen igennem Thailand, som Lyndon LaRouche har kæmpet for siden 1980'erne, pludselig kommet tilbage på toppen af dagsordenen. Det forestående nummer af *EIR*, dateret den 27. januar, vil citere ham fra et interview i Singapore-avisen *Fortune Times* fra 2014, om Kra-kanalen:

»Opdel Øst- og Sydasiens maritime område i tre hovedkategorier: Kina, en gigant; Indien, en gigant; og så den maritime forbindelse, i hele Sydøstasiens maritime områder. Tilføj indvirkningen af sådanne tre-i-én maritime og relaterede forbindelser, til de fysisk-økonomiske relationer

til de amerikanske kontinenter mod øst, og til Mellemøstens underside og Afrika. Så kommer udviklingen af Kra-kanalens potens til syne som ikke alene et eminent muligt træk, men som en strategisk, politisk-økonomisk kraft for hele planeten.«

LaRouche bemærkede også, at den primære opposition til Kra-kanalen internt i Asien er Singapore, og at hovedkilden til modstand fra Singapore er helt igennem globale, britisk-imperiale, militærstrategiske interesser. Men, tilføjede han:

»Den blotte volumen af maritim handel mellem Asiens to store nationer [Kina og Indien], samt deres forbindelser gennem Sydasiens maritime områder, gør Kanalen til sandsynligvis at være det potentielt set mest fordelagtige, og også mest effektive, projekt for hele Stillehavsområdet og Det indiske Oceans område, samt for den samtidige udvikling af de store områder af planeten som helhed.«

Kina og Japan har lagt projektet for Kra-kanalen[1], der er en hovedforbindelse i den Maritime Silkevej, frem på bordet igen. Samtidig, som en del af Silkevejen for Afrika, har Kina engageret sig i Transaqua-projektet, det største infrastrukturprojekt, Afrika nogensinde har overvejet, som det rapporteres i *EIR*-magasinet fra 6. januar. Som Claudio Celani her skrev, så handler denne idé om »en vandvej, der vil være i stand til at genopfylde Tchad-søen og samtidig skabe en gigantinfrastruktur for transport, energi og landbrug i Centralafrika. Byggeriet af et sådant infrastrukturprojekt ville tilbyde jobs til millioner af afrikanere og lægge fundamentet for fremtidig udvikling.«[2]

Vidtrækkende, som det er, så er Verdenslandbroen blot en del af dette Nye Paradigme. Til dette hører også den nye, »økonomiske platform«, som udgøres udviklingen af det umiddelbare rum (dvs., Solsystemet). Det er fuldt ud opnåeligt, at, i den umiddelbare fremtid, vil nationer gå sammen om et rumprogram, hvis amerikanske komponent alene vil blive langt større end Kennedys Måneprogram. Og vi kan og må

have et succesfuldt, internationalt program for at producere stort set gratis energi til menneskeheden, på basis af kernefusion. Disse programmers nødvendige grundlag er et statsligt banksystem og en statslig kreditpolitik, der er målrettet herpå, og som må begynde med en genoplivelse af Franklin Rooseveltts beskyttelse gennem Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven.

Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Nye Love« (til USA's, og verdens, omgående redning) er således den ene, enkeltsående forudsætning for USA's tilslutning til det Nye Paradigme.

Hele det overordnede design har ligeledes integrerede moralske og kulturelle dimensioner. Snarere end blot et forsøg på at beskrive dem, kan vi henvise læserne til Lyndon LaRouches »Manhattan-projekt«, som er disse dimensioners førende organisation i nutidens verden. Manhattan-projektets fejring af Martin Luther King sidste weekend legemliggør dette på den meste intense måde.

Der er ingen garanti for succes – meget langt fra. Kreativ, fri vilje – din skabende, frie vilje – kræves, hvis menneskeheden skal bevæge sig opad til dette næste trin, der vinker forude.

Vi slutter med Krafft Ehrickes ord fra 1966, som vi tidligere har citeret her i lederartiklen:

»Fødselstimen, det være sig for et nyt liv eller en ny æra, er sandhedens time, hvor vi udfordres af smerte, tvivl og frygt, og intensiteten af deres angreb forårsager de kompenserende kræfter af styrke, tillid og mod at rejse sig til sjældne toppunkter af intensitet og kraft. Verden synes at bryde sønder under smerten fra denne nådesløse konfrontation af det gamle og det nye.«

Vi kan vinde dette her.

Foto: USA's præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt, der i 1933 satte

Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven i kraft, som indledte USA's udtræden af 'Den store Depression' og en udvikling, der ved slutningen af hans præsidentskab, ved hans død i 1945, havde gjort USA til den største fysisk-økonomiske magt, verden havde set.

[1] Se også: 'Major Breakthrough on Kra Canal Project' inkl. video:

<https://larouchepac.com/20170117/major-breakthrough-kra-canals-potential>

[2]

http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/private/2017/2017_01-09/2017-01/pdf/28-32_4401.pdf

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19. januar 2017: Dagen før Trumps indsættelse

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

Kom til koncerten:

En Musikalsk Dialog Mellem Kulturer

Fredag den 17. februar 2017, kl. 19,

Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur

Vester Voldgade 11, København.

Gratis adgang.

Kontakt os!: +45 35 43 00 33; 53 57 00 51

RADIO SCHILLER den 16. januar 2017:

**1. del: Briterne forsøger at
bremse Trump med LaRouche-
behandling//**

**2. del om at bygge Kra-
kanalen i Thailand og
Transqua-projektet omkring
Tchadsøen i Afrika**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

1. del:

2. del:

Kina og Rusland advarer Seoul og Washington om deployering af THAAD

13. jan., 2017 – I kølvandet på et møde i går i den Sjette Russisk-kinesiske konsultation om sikkerheden i Sydøstasien, advarede Rusland og Kina om, at de har til hensigt at tage »modforholdsregler« som respons til den foreslæde deployering af Terminal High Altitude Defense System (THAAD) i Sydkorea.

Disse modforholdsregler er designet til at beskytte Kinas og Ruslands interesser og den strategiske balance i området, som de anser for truet af THAAD-deployeringen. Begge nationer har, gennem deres Udenrigsministerier, opfordret USA og Sydkorea til at adressere disse sikkerhedsspørgsmål og standse den planlagte deployering. Ifølge TASS advarede Ruslands Udenrigsministerium om, at, ved at forfølge THAAD-deployeringen, vil Washington og Seoul »forhøje spændingerne og styrke våbenkapløbet i området, såvel som også udvide militære øvelser« og »skade den regionale stabilitet og sikkerhed«. I betragtning af det »høje konfliktpotentiale« og den »komplekse og følsomme« situation på Halvøen, understregede Ministeriet, er det afgørende at søge »fælles bestræbelser, der har til formål at finde en meningsfuld strategi, der ville vise vejen ud af det nuværende dødvande og være med til at afgøre spørgsmålet om atomvåben og andre problemer, som Korea-halvøen konfronteres med.«

Xinhua understregede, at de to nationer insisterede på målet med at »fjerne atomvåben fra Korea-halvøen for at sikre fred og stabilitet«.

NYHEDSORIENTERING JANUAR 2017: Farvel til krigens paradigme?

Hvad vi skal gøre – nu!

I USA, i lighed med Danmark og andre lande, er der nogle helt afgørende ting, der må gennemføres, som Lyndon LaRouche har fremført som fire nødvendige love, der må implementeres omgående.

1) *Der skal indføres en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, men under den overskrift er der mange andre ting, der må ske. Man må gå igennem bankernes og finansverdenens aktiviteter i lighed med det, man gjorde i USA, da Roosevelt blev indsat som præsident, så man får renset op og får adskilt tingene i legitime finansielle aktiviteter, der er vigtige for realøkonomien, og så spekulation, som skal helt ud af de normale banker. Man vil så få nogle mindre almindelige banker, som man kan hjælpe, hvis de får problemer, mens alle de andre spekulative aktiviteter ikke får lov til at belaste staten og skatteyderne, når de får problemer pga. fejlslagne spekulationer. Derefter skal der*

2) *skabes kredit til investeringer. Staten må gå ind og regulere det ovenfra og i den udstrækning, det er nødvendigt, med statslige kreditter sikre, at der bliver foretaget de nødvendige investeringer i samfundet og dets produktive aktiviteter. Det skal bl.a. udmønte sig i*

3) *store infrastrukturprojekter, der kan opgradere hele økonomien. Man kan bare skele til de enorme investeringer, Kina har foretaget siden 2008, hvor Kina har brugt over 1000 mia. dollars om året på infrastruktur og i dag har verdens*

største og bedste netværk af højhastighedstog. Programmet for Den Nye Silkevej er da også centreret om opbygning af grundlæggende infrastruktur, ikke blot i Kina, men i stadig større dele af verden. Når det gælder Danmark, har vi et forældet jernbanenet, der skal fornyes i form af et nationalt magnettognet eller højhastighedstognet i forbindelse med bygningen af en Kattegatbro. Vi skal så hurtigt som muligt have bygget den faste forbindelse over Femern Bælt og en Helsingør/Helsingborg-forbindelse. Der er masser af motorveje og andre projekter, der bare venter på at blive bygget. Der er så meget, der skal bygges, at vi kommer til at planlægge, hvordan vi kan få nok kvalificeret arbejdskraft og byggekapacitet for at kunne få alle de mange projekter realiseret. Alle disse projekter er nødvendige som en del af at løfte den danske økonomi op på et højere produktivitetsniveau, og samtidig skal vi have langt mere gang i forskning og udvikling.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

RADIO SCHILLER den 9. januar 2017: USA efterretningsrapport har ingen beviser om russisk

hacking af valget// Obamas militære provokationer

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Korrupte efterretningsfolk bag Obama afsløret som løgnere; USA må alliere sig med Rusland og Kina

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 8. januar, 2017 – Én dag efter den nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump mødtes med direktør for den Nationale Efterretningsstjeneste James Clapper, chef for CIA John Brennan og chef for NSA Michael Rogers, der intenderede at overbevise ham om, at Rusland, og Putin personligt, er ude på at ødelægge det amerikanske, demokratiske system, udstedte nyvalgte præsident Trump en erklæring, der sandfærdigt identificerede Amerika og den amerikanske befolkning og frembød et konkret skridt hen imod løsningen:

»At have gode relationer med Rusland er en god ting, ikke en dårlig ting. Kun 'dumme' mennesker, eller tåber, ville tænke, at det er dårligt! Vi har problemer nok i verden uden endnu ét. Når jeg bliver præsident, vil Rusland have meget mere respekt for os, end de nu har, og begge lande vil, måske, arbejde sammen for at løse nogle af de mange store og presserende problemer og spørgsmål i VERDEN.«

Denne sandhed kom til udtryk gennem LaRouches Schiller Institut i lørdags, i en smuk demonstration af det sande venskab mellem det amerikanske og russiske folk, som kan og må genetableres omgående. En mindebegivenhed blev afholdt ved Tåredråbemindesmærket i Bayonne, New Jersey – det mindesmærke, som blev skænket af den russiske regering for at ære de mennesker, der blev dræbt i terrorangrebene mod USA. (se: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/To_the_Struggle_Against_World_Terrorism)

Ved begivenheden fremførte Schiller Institutets Kor både Ruslands nationalhymne (på russisk) og USA's nationalhymne (på engelsk), og der var også indlæg af New Yorks Politikorps' Ceremonienhed; af den Russiske Föderations første, permanente vicerepræsentant til FN; forkvinde for 11/9-Familier Forenede for Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Terror; Bayonne Brandmandskorps; og Schiller Institutet. Begivenheden fandt sted for at ære dem, der mistede livet i det russiske Tu-154 flystyrt juledag, og især de 64 medlemmer af Alexandrov Ensemble (kendt som Den røde Armés Kor), som omkom på vej til Syrien for at dele deres musik og dedikation til kultur med det syriske folk. Se en 24 minutters video af begivenheden på <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fchk5m8HJe0&feature=youtu.be>

Dræbermaskinen under Obama bruger også sine sidste dage i embedet til at underminere Trumps forpligtende engagement til at afslutte de kriminelle »regimeskiftkrige«, der har forvandlet de seneste 16 år under Bush og Obama til en æra med ondskab og blodsudgydelser uden fortilfælde i amerikansk historie, samtidig med et forsøg på at styre den nye administration gennem militære konfrontationer med både Rusland og Kina. Samtidig med, at Obama deployerede et enormt antal tanks, helikoptere og andet militærudstyr til den russiske grænse i Europa i løbet af weekenden, har han også deployeret atomhangarskibsgruppen *U.S.S. Carl Vinson* til Stillehavet, der er timet til at ankomme til asiatiske farvande i nærheden af Kina samme dag, som Trumps indsættelse

finder sted. I Sydkorea har Obama fået autorisation fra præsident Park Geun-hyes regering – som selv konfronteres med en rigsretssag, der kunne gøre en ende på dens administration i løbet af få dage – der giver USA tilladelse til at etablere et 1000 til 2000 mand stort »drabsteam«, der har »opgaven at eliminere Pyongyangs krigskommando, inklusive Kim Jong-un, og paralyse dens funktioner«, ifølge Sydkoreas største nyhedstjeneste, Yonhap. En sådan provokation må både afsløres og afsluttes omgående.

Verden har kun to muligheder – økonomisk kollaps og verdenskrig under den imperiale sammenhæng, der udgøres af London/Wall Street, og som kontrollerede både Bush og Obama, eller også et revolutionært skifte, der reflekterer Amerikas historiske rødder i Alexander Hamiltons principper, og som gør det muligt for USA at tilslutte sig Rusland og Kina og deres fælles bestræbelse på at knuse terrorisme og samtidig opbygge moderne nationalstater gennem udviklingen med den Nye Silkevej, som Kina har lanceret.

LaRouche-organisationen er helt fokuseret på den presserende opgave, der konfronterer den nye Kongres og den nye præsident: implementer Glass-Steagall nu og knus således Wall Streets hasardspilsbølle og genopliv Amerikas forpligtende engagement til videnskabens fremskudte grænser, og hæv således den produktive og kulturelle platform for alle amerikanere. En appell, der nu omdeles af LaRouchePAC, kræver, at Donald Trump lever op til sit kampagneløfte om at implementere Glass-Steagall og kræver, at han annoncerer dette i sin indsættelsestale og i sin Tale til Unionen (se <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17198>).

Vi befinner os i et af historiens enestående øjeblikke, hvor denne transformation er mulig, og nødvendig, for den menneskelige art som helhed.

Parlamentarikere fra Sydkorea til Kina for at drøfte deployering af THAAD-missiler

2. jan., 2017 – Otte parlamentarikere fra Sydkorea fra landets hovedoppositionsparti, Koreas Demokratiske Parti, inklusive Moon Jae-in, der er den førende præsident in spe, vil besøge Kina den 4. januar til et tredages besøg. Formålet med besøget er at forsøge at lette spændingerne med Beijing over den planlagte deployering af amerikanske missilforsvarssystemer i Sydkorea, sagde en af de delegerede til Sputnik i dag.

De sydkoreanske parlamentarikere forventes at afholde et møde med den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi under deres besøg.

»Vi vil sige til Beijing, at vore præsidentkandidater, inklusive Moon, kræver, at spørgsmålet om THAAD-missilerne skal genovervejes af den næste regering«, sagde partimedlem Song Young-gil til *South China Morning Post*. »Samt, vi vil også diskutere Kinas rolle i løsningen af de iskolde relationer mellem Sydkorea og Nordkorea.«

Formålet med THAAD (Terminal High Altitude Area Defense), som Sydkorea i 2016 gik med til kunne deployeres på dets territorium ved slutningen af 2017, skulle angiveligt være det, at imødegå trusler fra Nordkorea. Det er nu blevet til et hovedirritationsmoment i relationerne mellem Beijing og Seoul, rapporterer Sputnik. Kina og Rusland har gentagne gange udtalt deres modstand mod deployeringen af THAAD med det argument, at missilernes virkelige formål er at modvirke de strategiske våbensystemer, der befinner sig ikke alene i Nordkorea, men også i Kinas bagland og Ruslands fjernøstlige regioner.

Hvilken overraskelse: Vladimir Putin leder menneskehedens omorganisering af sig selv mod de nye missioner, som Lyndon LaRouche har fremsat

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 25. december, 2016 – Imellem Rusland, Tyrkiet og Iran er der dybe uoverensstemmelser; de støtter endda modstridende styrker i Syrien. Og alligevel er de tre kommet sammen for at afslutte kampene i Aleppo – et afgørende vendepunkt. Som det næste er det deres plan at mægle i forhandlinger mellem den syriske regering og oppositionens repræsentanter; forhandlinger, som en fjerde partner – Kasakhstan – skal være vært for.

Dette kom som en overraskelse for alle, med undtagelse af Vladimir Putin selv og Lyndon og Helga LaRouche – men denne form for overraskelser har i realiteten i mange år været markant for Vladimir Putins karriere. Vi har allerede set det i »Traktaten for godt venskab og samarbejde mellem naboer, mellem Folkerepublikken Kina og den Russiske Føderation«, fra 16. juli, 2001. Traktatens 25 punkter opstiller krav om »en fair og fornuftig, ny, international orden«, og om at »løfte relationerne mellem de to lande op til et helt nyt niveau« og

afgør, »at venskabet mellem vore to folk vil fortsætte i alle fremtidige generationer«. Hver af parterne har forpligtet sig til aldrig at gå med i en alliance, der truer den anden part; aldrig at rette deres missiler imod hinanden; og omgående at rådføre sig med hinanden, hvis en af parterne trues af aggression.

Dette var to lande, der havde kæmpet mod hinanden, med våben i hånd, i 1969.

Traktaten påtænker også en opgradering og udvidelse af systemet med kinesisk-russiske, interguvernementale kommissioner, som præsident Putin ivrigt har fremmet. Der er p.t. flere end et dusin sådanne kommissioner således, at en stor del af hver af de to regeringer uafbrudt rådslår med den anden regering for at glatte uoverensstemmelser, hvoraf mange er alvorlige. »Men vi finder altid en løsning«, sagde Putin.

Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen, SCO, var en udløber af denne traktat fra 2001 og de forhandlinger, der førte til traktaten. I løbet af de 40 år, hvor der har fundet forhandlinger sted om den russisk-kinesiske grænse og dennes demilitarisering, er der opstået tre nye, uafhængige, centralasiatiske stater på grænsen til Kina, og som afløser det forhenværende Sovjetunionen. Dette var med til at skabe betingelserne for dannelsen af SCO som, oprindeligt, en organisation bestående af Kina, Rusland og centralasiatiske stater, og som havde til formål at opretholde sikkerhed i og omkring Centralasien.

På lignende måde har Putins geni vist sig i skabelsen af BRIKS, endnu en grundpille i det nye, fremvoksende, globale arrangement sammen med de ovenfor anførte organisationer. Her ser man klarest påvirkningen fra Putins forgænger, nu afdøde Jevgenij Primakov. Men selve Putins rolle ville have været utænkelig uden Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange lederskab, udøvet gennem det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i 1977 og de efterfølgende år, og gennem initiativet med den

Eurasiske Landbro, som de udarbejdede i kølvandet på Berlinmurens fald, og som nu har udviklet sig til det verdensomspændende initiativ fra den kinesiske regerings side under præsident Xi Jinping, kaldet »Bælt-og-Vej«.

Foreningen af disse organisationer og initiativer, der er forbundet med Vladimir Putin og med Xi Jinpings »Bælt-og-Vej«, definerer det aktuelle, historiske øjeblik som værende fuldstændigt enestående og uden fortilfælde. Det fremgår klart, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche siger, at det nu er muligt at gøre det forbi med geopolitik. Vi har en klar opgave, og den er uerstattelig. Fuldstændig uerstattelig.

Foto: Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin og Kinas præsident Xi Jinping stiller op til fotografering i forbindelse med et af de seneste års mange møder for styrkelse af partnerskab og økonomisk udvikling i begge lande. Her fra 2015.

NYHEDSORIENTERING DECEMBER 2016: Helga Zepp-LaRouche i København: Donald Trump og Det Nye Internationale Paradigme

Den 12. december 2016 var Helga Zepp-LaRouche – Lyndon LaRouches hustru, Schiller Institutets grundlægger og en international nøgleperson i kampen for et nyt globalt udviklingsparadigme – særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller

Institut/EIR-seminar på Frederiksberg med titlen: »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Blandt deltagerne var diplomater, aktivister og repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet blev indledt med fremførelsen af en kendt traditionel kinesisk sang, Kāngdīng Qínggē (Kangding Kærlighedssang), af Feride Istogu Gillesberg (sopran) og Michelle Rasmussen (klaver). Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som på smukkeste og mest optimistiske vis førte publikken igennem en tour-de-force af den nuværende politiske situation med såvel befolkningens afvisning af det nuværende paradigme gennem Brexit, Hillary Clintons valgnederlag til Donald Trump og det italienske "Nej", som et forsøg på at skabe kaos (og krig) inden Donald Trumps indsættelse den 20. januar. Dertil kom en fremstilling af det nye globale paradigme, som allerede er ved at overtage verden, illustreret ved Kinas politik for Den Nye Silkevej – som den kommende amerikanske administration skal finde sin plads i – og den videre udvikling, der er nødvendig, hvis menneskeheden skal finde sin sande identitet. Hele talen og den efterfølgende diskussion kan ses, høres og læses på: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16773.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

»Donald Trump og det Nye,

Internationale Paradigme« (DANSK) Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale

ved Schiller Instituttet/EIR's seminar i København, 12. dec., 2016.

Jeg mener, at vi bør være meget glade, for hvis dette alt sammen går den rigtige vej; og det er for en stor del vores personlige forpligtelse at hjælpe, og jeg beder jer alle sammen om ikke at være passive tilskuere, men gå med i Schiller Instituttet for at være med til at implementere disse visioner og disse ideer, for så vil vi blive meget heldige med, at vi i vores levetid kan leve det nye paradigme. Og det nye paradigme vil blive første gang, menneskets værdighed vil blive virkelig gjort, og jeg mener, at det er en meget, meget vigtig mission, som vi alle bør vedtage.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

(Efterfølgende spørgsmål og svar, engelsk udskrift: [Klik her.](#))

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Institutets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Institututtet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Institututts stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appell til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på Schiller Institutts og EIR's seminar i København: Donald Trump og det nye internationale paradigme. ENGELSK udskrift af tale samt Spørgsmål og Svar

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Institutts medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Institutts stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet

i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appell til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale, der varer omkring 1 time og 20 minutter, kan høres ovenover eller her:

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

—

English: Introductory article

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on 'Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm'

COPENHAGEN, Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS) – Today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche

was the special guest speaker at a Schiller Institute/{EIR} seminar in Copenhagen entitled, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Eight diplomats from six countries attended, including two ambassadors. There were nations from Western Europe, Southwest Asia, Western and Eastern Asia, and Africa. In addition, there were around 30 Schiller Institute members and contacts, as well as a few representatives of various Danish and international institutions.

The event was opened by the presentation of a Chinese love song performed by Feride Istogu Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Afterwards, Tom Gillesberg, the chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark, introduced Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, describing her historical role in bringing about the New Silk Road policy.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's very inspiring, in-depth speech began with the revolution against globalization represented by the Brexit, the Trump election, and the Italian No vote. She gave an evaluation of the potential represented by some of the statements and appointments Trump has made so far, and then proceeded with a detailed discussion of the two conflicting paradigms in the world today. Zepp-LaRouche then uplifted the audience with the beautiful ideas of space scientist Krafft Ehricke and Renaissance philosopher Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. She concluded with an appeal to those present not to act as spectators on the stage of history, but engage in the battle for the new paradigm with us.

Her speech, about 80 minutes long, may be heard above, or at:
https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

Zepp-LaRouche's speech and discussion had a profound effect on all present.

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

Discussion:

(There is no video or audio of the discussion period, only this transcript.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

(To facilitate free discussion, the questioners are not identified, and the questions are summarized. The answers are complete.)

Question: Can we be optimistic about Trump's presidency, because he is skeptical about climate change, is for trade war with China and Mexico, opposes the free trade deals, and has called for tearing up the nuclear deal with Iran.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I said earlier that the potentialities for change are there, but it depends, to a very large extent, upon us – what we do. When Trump got elected, my first response was, this is what I call the 'dog pull-tail, let-go feeling.' What I mean by that is that when you pull the tail of a dog, which you should never do, naturally, and you let go, the pain stops. When you pull, there is pain, and when you stop pulling, the pain goes away.

So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWIII, and that was really the primary point, because if Hillary Clinton would have been elected – unfortunately, Hillary Clinton, when she was in the Obama administration, transformed from being a relatively OK person, she was never great, but in 2008, she was relatively decent, compared to what she became, because she capitulated to Obama, and when she made this terrible statement, for example, in Libya, about the murder of Gadaffi, "We came, we saw, and he died." This is

barbarism.

Her behavior in the Ben Ghazi case. There were so many things where she became worse than Obama, almost. So the immediate thing was that that big danger, that she would have continued the policies of Bush and Obama, in the confrontation with Russia and China, that that was stopped is, already, for the survival of civilization, the most important step.

Now, on these other points. Naturally, there is climate change. There is no question about it. But the question is, what is the cause of it? And the Schiller Institute had several conferences where we invited extremely important scientists who presented, beyond a doubt, that if you look at the last 500 million years in the history of the Earth, you have a continuous cycle of ice ages, of warming periods, of small ice ages, and the man-made component of climate change is absolutely negligible. It's a big fraud, for example, it's a big business. To sell CO₂ omission quotas, is like selling indulgences in the Middle Ages.

Obviously, there are climate changes, and some countries which have low coasts are very much affected, but then you have to adapt to these climate changes with modern technology, and you cannot solve the problem by going to electric cars, or going to decarbonization of the world economy. This is a big fraud, and I am not saying that Trump is saying this for all the right reasons, but the idea to impose measures implied with the "great transformation" Schellnhuber is talking about – I mean these people do not want development.

We have been on this case for the last – as a matter of fact, we, the LaRouche movement, had a conception about the development of the world really starting at the end of the sixties.

I joined Mr. LaRouche because I went to China, Africa, other Asian countries, and I saw the horrible, horrible underdevelopment. So I came back from this trip, and I said, 'I have to become political, because I want to change this.' I could give you a long, long story of the many observations, because I went with a cargo ship, and when you go to these

countries with a cargo ship, you get a quite different idea than if you go on a 5-star cruise, and hotels. You see how the poverty affects people in their real lives. And I came back, and I looked at all the political movements, and I saw that LaRouche was the only one who said, 'We have to have Third World development. We have to have technology transfer. We have to alleviate this poverty.'

And we had a positive conception already in the seventies, and therefore, when the Club of Rome appeared, we immediately said, 'This is a fraud.' Because the Club of Rome said, 'There are limits to growth. We have reached equilibrium. Until the year 1972, you could develop, but now, we have reached equilibrium, and we have to have sustainable development. We have to have appropriate technology.' These notions did not exist before, because before, you had the idea of a UN Development Decade, where each decade, you would overcome the underdevelopment by qualitative jumps. And when we recognized this propaganda by the Club of Rome, we immediately said, 'This is a complete fraud,' and the people who wrote the book "Limits to Growth," Meadows and Forrester ...

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

A: I would like to give you written documentation afterwards of the studies that were made by these geologists, which are, without question, the explanation of climate change is not man-made. The anthropogenic aspect of it is so minuscule. Climate change has to do with the position of the solar system in the galaxy, which goes in cycles around a certain axis, and you can see that over 500 million years, the data confirms that you have these wide changes. Greenland is called Greenland, because it was green. There used to be vineyards. You had ice ages which completely covered the Earth, and the reason why I went into this longer history, is to show how the environmentalist movement was created with the attempt to keep development down, and climate change is just another expression of the same effort.

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO₂ emission trade, you

have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing, because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, "Against the Stream," is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

The question is, 'What is the source of wealth?' Is the source of wealth cheap labor, to buy cheap raw materials, produce cheaply, and sell expensive? Is that the cause of wealth? No. The only cause of wealth is the increase in the creativity of labor power. And a good government is, therefore, investing the maximum amount into education, into sponsoring the creativity of youth, of labor, and the more people in the labor force, by percentage, are engineers, scientists, the more productive the economy becomes.

And the free trade system, of which NAFTA is just one example, did exactly the opposite. China, which was part of this in the beginning – the reason why China today has so many environmental problems, like smog, like a large amount of groundwater being contaminated, is the result of the fact that China, in the beginning of its industrialization, accepted being a cheap labor production place for the U.S. and for Europe. When I was in China, even in 1971, I visited some factories which were horrible. They were absolutely horrible. The working conditions were terrible, the labor force, which produced electrical devices for radios, it was horrible. They worked for 18 hours. No health system. It was just terrible. And that is how China developed in the first phase.

But then China, with Deng Xiaoping, started to recognize that that is the wrong way. So China is now on a completely different track. They are putting the maximum emphasis on science and technology, the increase of excellence. Last year, they produced 1 million scientists. That's double of what the U.S. produced. Obviously China is a larger country, but still. What will finally be decisive is the number of people who are creative. And that is why China, right now, has the best education system, because they have understood that the source of wealth is not raw materials. Is not trade conditions. It is the creativity of their own people. And that it a good thing. If we go to a system where we have a certain amount of protectionism, to protect the development of the domestic market, it is a good thing.

There is no danger of cutting [countries off from one another], because all of these infrastructure projects are connectivity. The world will be more connected than ever before. But this whole myth of free trade is really a very bad thing. It has been coined by the people who profit from it. That's why the world is in the condition it is right now, where the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. The middle class is being destroyed all over the world. And I would really like to communicate with you so that we can deepen this dialogue.

On the Iran thing, I don't think he will break it, but that is my hope. I don't know.

So, I'm not saying he's a – as I said, Baron von Knigge would get a heart attack when he hears Trump's speeches, but the world was in such a grip of evil, satanic evil, that it is a good thing that there is a break, and the unfortunate thing, is that Europe is still in this grip.

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know

what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

So, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of the Europeans who react this way to the defeat of Hillary, are obeying another power in their head, and that power I call The British Empire, which is still in place, and it dominates Europe, and that is why they feel – I was asking myself, how come all of these politicians are so arrogant towards the new president of the U.S.? Because they were the boot-lickers of Washington until yesterday, and they would immediately do everything Washington would say and do, so I asked myself, 'Where is this sudden self-assertedness coming from?' And the only explanation I came up with, was to say, they must have an idea that there is another power which is more powerful than Trump, otherwise, they wouldn't have this sudden arrogance.

And it is the British, because you will see tomorrow, because tomorrow, there will be a federal press conference in Berlin, where a number of people will present their contribution to the German chairmanship of the G-20, which will take place in July in Hamburg. This will be Joachim Schellnhuber, the head of the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change), this is the scientific advisory organization advising the German government. He put out this paper about 'the great transformation,' which we wrote about. You can look in the archive. He is the head of the idea of a decarbonization of the world economy.

Now, if you decarbonize the world economy, without having fusion, that would be one thing, to have fusion power in place. Then you can talk about getting rid of fossil fuels, but without having fusion, and being against nuclear energy, fission, it means that you will reduce the world's population to 1 billion or less, because there is a direct correlation between the energy-flux-density, and the number of people you can maintain. Schellnhuber said that the carrying capacity of the Earth is maximum 1 billion people. He didn't say that he wants to do with the 6 billion who are already there. If he would be consequent, he should hop away from this planet.

And they will announce a sinister plan, to try to use the fact that many countries have environmental problems, to sneak in their anti-development programs. People should not be naïve, because not everybody thinks that population growth is a good thing. There are many people who think that each human being is a parasite, destroying nature. That is the image of man which many people have. The greenies, for example.

We look at it in a different way. We think that the more people you have, the greater longevity you can have, division of labor, and a modern scientific society needs many people with a long life span. Because if you are in the Third World, and you die, and you have an average life expectancy of 40 years, or less, you cannot have scientists, because the production of a scientist takes 30-35 years, and if people then die right away, then you can't have a modern society.

So the more creative people you have, the better. Each human being is an incredible addition, because we are creative.

Tom Gillesberg: Schellnhuber, for his services, was appointed Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE), and for him, he personally has said, that the highpoint of his existence was that the British Queen, personally, gave him the Order of the British Empire, for his efforts to reduce the possibility for mankind's survival, you could say, so it is connected with what you said.

Q: This is the best speech I have ever heard in my life.

Is this a second American Revolution, and will the Federal Reserve, which is privately owned, be closed down, and will money be created for the benefit of all people, and not just the private Fed?

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the Declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system

for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

It's the same idea that Friedrich Schiller had in *Wilhelm Tell*. This is a play he wrote, which takes place in Switzerland. There, the Hapsburg oligarch is also trampling on the rights of the Swiss people, then they unite with the Rütli Oath. There is this beautiful formulation which says, 'When the rights of people are trampled upon, they have the right to reach out to the stars, and take from the stars those rights which are eternally embedded in these stars. (I am not saying it as beautifully as Schiller does.)

If you compare these two texts, the Declaration of Independence, and the Rütli Oath from Schiller's play, they are almost identical, and it's very clear that Schiller was inspired by the American Revolution when he wrote that play, because in his plays, there are many ideas which resonate with the American Revolution, and he actually wanted to immigrate, at one point, to America.

So I think that if Trump turns out to be another fraudster, which we don't know yet, I think that this process of revolt will continue, because I only mentioned some elements.

I could mention that there are many countries now in realignment. for example, the Philippines, Duterte. This was supposed to be the playground for the conflict with China in the South China Sea. Now Duterte sent his Defense Secretary, Lorenzana, to Russia and China, to buy weapon systems from Russia and China, and to establish a friendship with China, and he said, 'The Philippines is no longer the colony of the U.S.'

Then you have Japan, which was the junior partner of the U.S. in the Pacific. Abe went to Sochi, meeting with Putin. In three days from now, Putin will go to Japan to have a state visit. They are talking about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan.

All of these are new alignments. There is a shift in the

strategic situation, and I don't think that that shift can be reversed.

Q: About Russia hacking the U.S. election. Why doesn't the U.S. have anti-hacking measures? Can you explain that?

A: I cannot explain that, for the same reason that I cannot explain why the NSA is surveilling everyone, all their phones, their communications, worldwide. They can observe all of these things, but they don't know about terrorism. They don't know about drug trafficking. They don't know about money laundering. Either their system is not so good, or they are looking in the wrong direction. I can't answer your question.

Q: Will the result of the Brexit be positive for Europe, to enable continental Europe to become stronger, and to improve cooperation with the eastern parts of Europe?

A: I think that the EU is not functioning, and I think it is not just the Brexit. The "No" in Italy is a reflection of the same dynamic. Now you have Gentiloni, the new prime minister, and they will probably go for new elections. Right now, in the polls, you have the 5 Star Party leading. If they win, and form the new government, they have already said that they would leave the EU, and leave the Euro, and, in a certain sense, it is not functioning.

The reason I was against the introduction of the Euro from the beginning, was because we said that it cannot function. You cannot have a European currency union in something which is not an optimal economic space. You cannot put advanced industry together with an agrarian country, with completely different tax laws, pension laws, and you don't want a political union, because Europe is not a people. You don't have a European people. I don't know what the Danes are saying. I don't know what is in the Danish newspapers. The people of Slovenia have no inkling of what is happening in Alsace-Lorraine, and so forth, and so on. You don't have a European people. Esperanto doesn't function. You have 28 nations, 28 histories, 28 cultures.

That doesn't mean that you can't work together. I think that the idea of Charles de Gaulle to work together as an alliance

between perfectly sovereign fatherlands, that is a correct idea. And all these fatherlands can adopt a joint mission, like to develop Africa, or other things.

I just think that this European Union is not going to stay forever.

Q: (followup) Will it be easier for Germany and France to promote this development, as the leading countries?

A: Everybody says that Germany is the biggest beneficiary of globalization, the EU, and the Euro, but that's not really true, because, if you look at it more closely, then you can say that since the introduction of the Euro, the domestic market of Germany has completely stagnated. And the number of people who became poorer has increased.

Q: (followup) What about regarding the dialogue with Russia.

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

I do not think that this EU bureaucracy is capable of reform, because by their self-understanding, they are the local pro-consuls of this empire, and I think that it would be much better if Germany, France, and other countries have individual relations. And I don't think that – this whole idea that you need a European Empire to compete with Russia and China and other emerging countries – The EU, by definition, is an empire. They have said it themselves. Robert Cooper, who has some kind of advisory function [currently serving as EU Special Advisor with regard to Myanmar], he said that the EU is the fastest expanding empire in history. It's a bad idea.

And the Russians for – I noticed this since the beginning of the year 2000, that the Russians did not make a difference anymore between the EU and NATO. They said that it's the same thing. And it is the same thing.

Q: You said that the One Belt, One Road was stripped of commercial interests from the Chinese side, as opposed to the IMF, World Bank. On what basis do you say that it is less interest-driven than the Bretton Woods institutions?

A: Well, because, the question is not that I'm saying that China is perfect. I'm not saying that. But when you look at anything, you have to look at the vector of development, is it

going upward, or is it going downward? And from that standpoint, I had the advantage that I was in China in 1971, which was in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. This was so different than China today.

The Cultural Revolution was horrible for the people. The Red Guards would take people out of their homes, put them in jail, send them to the countryside, and people were distraught.

And now, people in China are happy. If you talk to students, or to young people, they are optimistic. They say, 'Oh. I will do this in the future. I have these plans.' I talked to a group of students in Lanzhou two years ago, and they said, 'We will go to Africa. We will develop Africa.' I have never heard a German student say this. Yeah, when I was a student, but that's a long time ago.

I think that it is very worthwhile to read the speeches of Xi Jinping. There is a book, "The Governance of China," but that only has about 60 speeches, and there are many, many more. For example, you should read the speeches he gave when he went to France, to Germany, and to India.

For example, when he went to India, he made a speech which was really incredible, because he said that he loved Indian culture from his early youth, and then he gave so many examples of the high points of Indian culture, the Gupta period, the Upanishads, the Vedic writings, Rabindranath Tagore, many predicates which prove that he really knows what he is talking about. He is not just one of these politicians who have a PR advisor about how to make nice bubbles in your speeches, but you could really see that he means it. And the same for Germany. He came to Germany and he emphasized Schubert and Heine, things which I also appreciate about Germany, and he did the same thing in France.

And I don't think that the Chinese leadership would agree with me when I say this, but I think that they are less communist than Confucians. They probably would not admit that, because they are officially the Communist Party, and that's OK, but, I come from Trier, and Trier is the birthplace of Karl Marx, so I have studied Karl Marx, and I think that they are still

socialist, or communist, or whatever, but they always said that they are communist with Chinese characteristics, and these Chinese characteristics are Confucianism.

And the Confucian idea of man is lifelong learning, lifelong perfection, that everyone should be a Jinzi, a wise man, a noble man, and Confucius said, if the government is bad, then the Jinzi, these wise people, should replace the government. Also the idea that you have to have an harmonious development, starting with the family, continuing in the nation, and then, larger, among the nations.

China is the only country that has not made wars of aggression, colonial wars, in its 5,000 years of history. It was invaded many times, the Opium War, and things like that, but China is not an aggressive nation, at all.

And if you look at what they are doing in practice, the IMF and the World Bank have prevented Third World development, and China is going from one country to the next, building science cities, helping with space cooperation, bringing in developing countries in the most advanced areas of science, in order to not prevent their development. I think this is a completely different approach.

I think that the Chinese have come up with a new model of government, which I have not seen in any place in Europe, the U.S. ever, and it's a model which is overcoming geopolitics, which is, if you say, 'I have a win-win for cooperation. Everybody can join.' Then, if everyone joins, then you have overcome geopolitics.

And geopolitics is the one thing that caused two world wars, and in the age of thermonuclear weapons, we cannot have geopolitics anymore. So I think that these are very important differences.

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey

democracy,' and do nothing.

Q: Statement about Chinese infrastructure projects in Morocco. Both are winners, as opposed to projects 20 years ago run by other countries. The Chinese there have learned Arabic. The projects have greatly reduced the travel time. They have a different perspective than the French, and Europeans had.

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

A: I would just say that people should not just believe, or not believe, what I am saying, but take an active attitude to try to find out what the truth is, for themselves. Because the world is not helped by replacing one ideology by another. The only way you can be certain, is that you become a truth-seeking person yourself. Because the whole question about what went wrong, is that people forgot what it is to be an honest truth-seeking person, taking the truth not as something you reach finally, but something you always improve.

Schiller had this beautiful writing about universal history, where he said that the philosophical mind is the first one to take his own system apart, to put it together more perfectly again.

I think that that quality – and, also, we had two days ago in Berlin, a very important event, which was also about the dialogue of cultures, and every – we had a very important presentation, which you can soon see on our webpage, where we had a double bass player who spoke about the importance of Wilhelm Furtwängler as a conductor, and he gave some musical examples, and he compared the performances of Furtwängler with some modern conductors, and the difference is so unbelievable. The music of Furtwängler is transparent. It is beautiful. It is absolutely overwhelmingly uplifting, and many of the other conductors are just playing along, with no respect for what the composition is.

And he really described, with many quotes from Furtwängler, that what is needed is this inner quality of truthfulness. That you don't fake it, because if you're not truthful – for example, you cannot recite poetry, if you're not truthful. You cannot sing beautifully, if you're not truthful. Sure, you can

sing brilliantly, you can do all kinds of tricks, and it impresses people, but to really produce art, you have to be truthful. You have to try to understand the poetical idea, the musical idea. You have to step back with your ego behind what the composer or the poet wrote. And that's what is wrong with modern theater. In Regietheater, they just say, 'I don't care what Schiller wrote, or what Shakespeare wrote. I just make my modern interpretation. I put Harley Davidson's into Shakespeare, and it doesn't matter.' And that is not art.

And I think the question is, 'What do you do with your life?' That is really the question. Are you becoming a creative person, devoted to that with your life, you contribute to enable mankind to move on a little step further, and become better.

Or, are you just eating three tons of caviar, and have 3,000 Porsches. And then, when you die, they write on your gravestone, 'He/she ate three tons of caviar, and had 3,000 Porsches,' and that was it.

No, you should try to be an honest person, trying to make human society better with what you do. And, once you do that, you become happy. Then you are free. This inner freedom, is what you should try to find. And that is the only way that we will win that battle. It's not Trump. It is, can we get enough people to be innerly free.

And then we win.

End of discussion

**Filippinerne: USA må ikke
bruge vore baser**

til provokationer over 'Sejladsfriheden'

8. dec., 2016 – Den filippinske forsvarsminister Delfin Lorenzana, der netop er hjemvendt efter et besøg i Rusland for at diskutere militærsmarbejde, blev under en pressekonference i dag spurgt, om Filippinerne fortsat vil give amerikanske skibe og fly lov til at udføre deres provokationer over »Sejladsfriheden« i det Sydkinesiske Hav fra baser på Filippinerne, som de tidligere har gjort. Lorenzana sagde, at Duterte vil nægte dette, »for at undgå alle provokerende handlinger, der kan optrappe spændingerne i det Sydkinesiske Hav. Det er ikke sandsynligt«, rapporterer AP. »Desuden kan USA flyve derover ud fra andre baser«, med henvisning til Guam, Okinawa og amerikanske hangarskibe.

Antallet af fælles militærøvelser er blevet reduceret og vil fokusere på katastrofeindsatser og humanitære missioner, snarere end øvelser, der tilsigter konfrontation med Kina, annoncerede regeringen i sidste måned. AP jamrer, at »Dutertes handlinger er blevet en forhindring for de amerikanske bestræbelser på at genvinde sin betydning i Asien, selv om det amerikanske militær har aflagt løfte om at fortsætte med at afpatruljere en af verdens travleste, kommercielle vandveje.«

General Lorenzana sagde ligeledes til pressen, at både filippinske fiskerbåde og kystvagtskibe nu frit sejler i området ved Scarborough Shoal, som Kina havde blokeret siden en træfning fandt sted i 2012, og Kina blokerer heller ikke for genforsyninger til det skib, som filippinerne med vilje sejlede på grund ved nogle andre, omstridte sandbanke-øer.

Foto: Et amerikansk hangarskib i den amerikanske flådebasis, Subic Bay, i Filippinerne.

NYHEDSORIENTERING november 2016: Donald Trump og det nye paradigme

Etablissementet i både USA og Europa er rystet over Donald Trumps valgsejr, men rystelserne ender ikke der. I lighed med Reagan efter valget i 1980 vil han indtage Det Hvide Hus med sit helt eget team og egne nye rådgivere. Derfor er en helt ny politik mulig, hvor USA finder sin naturlige plads i et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina – og forhåbentlig dropper Bush/Cheneys og Obamas krigs- og konfrontationspolitik. Danmark og Europa skal dermed også finde en helt ny udenrigspolitik frem. Samtidig kommer Trump så til at skulle slås med et finanskrak større end i 2008, men hvis han lytter til Lyndon LaRouche, som Reagan delvist gjorde det i 1981, så er der med LaRouches Fire Love en vej ud af moradset. Dette er en redigeret udgave af en tale, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Institutets formand, holdt den 21. november 2016, og som kan høres på www.schillerinstitut.dk.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

RADIO SCHILLER den 7. november 2016: Det vigtigste efter valget i USA: kampagnen for LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Ny økonomisk verdensorden: Malaysias premierminister Najib i Kina – endnu et som i Obamas 'Omdrejningspunkt Asien'- ligkiste

Tirsdag, den 1. nov., 2016 – Den malaysiske premierminister Najib Razak har yderligere afsløret, at Obamas plan om at bruge sydøstasiatiske nationer som syndebukke for sin militære konfrontation med Kina er kollapset. På dag to af sit ugelange besøg i Kina underskrev Najib en toårig forsvars aftale med Kina og økonomiske aftaler til \$34,4 mia., inklusive byggeriet af en Øst-Vest jernbanelinje, og sandsynligvis også en

højhastigheds-jernbanelinje fra Kuala Lumpur til Singapore.

Forsvarsaftalen er især et slag i ansigtet på de neokonservative i Washington. Malaysia vil købe fire skibe, der kan medføre missiler og har en landingsplatform til helikoptere, til kystvagtmision. To vil blive bygget i Kina, og to i Malaysia, hvilket også muliggør en overførsel af teknologi. »Jeg kalder denne beslutning for en milepæl, for før dette, havde vi ikke købt sådanne skibe fra Kina«, sagde Najib ved en pressekonference efter sine bilaterale drøftelser med den kinesiske premierminister Li Keqiang. Han behøvede ikke at nævne, at det meste militærudstyr er kommet fra USA.

Øst-Vest jernbanelinjen vil løbe fra Port Klang, nær Kuala Lumpur ved Malaccastrædet, over halvøen og dernæst mod nord langs østkysten til nær ved den thailandske grænse. Dette vil være til enorm fordel for udviklingen af østkysten, der er fattigere og mindre udviklet end vestkysten. Najib sagde, Kina havde indvilget i at bevilge bløde lån til Malaysia til byggeriet af østkystens jernbanelinje, der skønnes at ville koste omkring \$13,2 mia.

Alt i alt blev 14 forståelsesmemoranda underskrevet i Folkets Store Hal, inkl. til byggeri af en ny havn ved Malaccastrædet.

»Lederne fra de to sider aftale at yderligere fremme den ordentlige bilæggelse af spørgsmålet om det Sydkinesiske Hav gennem dialog, gennem en bilateral kanal«, sagde den kinesiske viceudenrigsminister Liu Zhenmin til reportere. »Lanceringen af flådesamarbejde mellem de to sider er selvfølgelig signifikant for vores bilaterale bånd. Det er en afspejling af det meget høje niveau og den gensidige politiske tillid mellem vore to lande«, sagde Liu.

Det meste af den vestlige dækning af disse begivenheder siger, at Najib er i færd med at vende sig bort fra USA og hen imod Kina pga. FBI's undersøgelse af One Malaysia-skandalen, der omfattede en pengehvidvask ind i USA af mulige penge fra den

uafhængige rigdomsfond i en størrelsesorden af \$1 mia. Alt imens denne skandale er signifikant, så har Najib aldrig ændret sin kurs for stærke bånd til Kina (dette er hans tredje besøg under sin administration), og han responderer i en vis udstrækning til de samme spørgsmål, som præsident Duterte i Filippinerne – han ønsker ikke en krig, og han ønsker at samarbejde med Kina.

Foto: Malaysias premierminister Najib Razak, venstre, med Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, i Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, i 2013.

Journalister fra ASEAN fik et glimt af Kina og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej

29. okt., 2016 – Femten journalister fra ti ASEAN-lande deltog i ASEAN-Kina Centrets konference om det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej i den vestlige Yunnan-provins den 27. okt., og besøgte flere byer, der ligger langs den gamle Silkevej i provinsen Jiangsu; disse områder har fælles grænser med ASEAN-lande i sydvest. Journalisterne fik et glimt af det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej med besøg på flere industriparker; havne ved vandet og på land; industricentre, universiteter og lokaliteter for kinesisk kulturarv; såvel som de også lærte den lokale kultur og de lokale traditioner at kende, rapporterede Indonesiens Antara News Agency den 28. okt.

Antara rapporterede, at mediebesøget i 2016 til Kina er det andet år, hvor et sådant program er blevet arrangeret af ASEAN-Kinacentret. Sidste år var en gruppe ASEAN-journalister blevet inviteret til Kina, hvorefter flere end 50 artikler om

Kinas initiativ for Ét bælte, én vej (OBOR) blev udgivet, bemærkede artiklen.

I kølvandet på journalisternes besøg i år rapporterede Antara om reaktionerne hos flere af dem: Anas Bin Abu Hassan fra Malaysia sagde, at den mest interessante del af besøget var muligheden for at lære det kinesiske folks kultur at kende. »Vi fik mulighed for at lære historiske værdier, bortset fra Kinas storhed.« En anden journalist, Stephen Joel Paredes fra Filippinerne, sagde: »Vi er blevet overbevist om Kinas hastige udvikling. Selv om Kina har været et udviklet land, udvikles det stadig lige som andre ASEAN-lande.« Keuthuanchai Malychansy fra Laos håbede, at Bælt-og-vej-initiativet vil bringe fælles fordele til alle ASEAN-lande, og især til hans land. »Jeg håber, det vil styrke turismen og infrastruktursektorerne i Laos«, sagde han.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 26. oktober 2016: Obamas eftermæle er død, ødelæggelse og økonomisk ruin

Med formand Tom Gillesberg.

N.B.: Pga. en teknisk fejl er der ingen video denne gang.

Lyd:

Tidligeere topdiplomater for Korea mødes med nordkoreanske regeringsfolk i Malaysia

24. okt., 2016 – De relativt fornuftige, amerikanske embedsfolk fra diplomatiet, der forhandlede den generelle rammeaftale i 1994 under Bill Clinton (som endegyldigt kunne have afsluttet »Koreakrisen«, hvis ikke Dick Cheney havde taget over og lukket det ned), og som repræsenterede USA under sekspartsforhandlingerne under George W. Bush, holdt et todages møde under et 'sekundært spor' (dvs., uformelt og uofficielt) med nordkoreanske topregeringsfolk i Malaysia sidste fredag og lørdag. Robert Gallucci, der ledede 1994-forhandlingerne; Joseph R. DeTrani, som var stedfortræder under sekspartsforhandlingerne; og dr. Leon Sigal, en koreaekspert ved Social Science Research Council i New York, mødtes med Pyongyangs viceudenrigsminister, Hang Song Ryol, samt andre delegerede.

Sigal sagde til pressen i dag, at gruppen havde til hensigt at formulere et forslag til den næste amerikanske administration, der skulle erstatte den mislykkede Obama-politik med »strategisk tålmodighed« (som var vanvittig – at nægte at forhandle, før Nordkorea opgav sit atomprogram. Det var udtænkt med overlæg for at gøre det muligt for Nordkorea at udvikle atomvåben, der skulle retfærdiggøre en amerikansk militær opbygning rundt om Kina -red.).

Nordkoreas erklærede holdning var, iflg. Ryol, at en fredstraktat skulle underskrives, før man diskuterede atomprogrammet. Forslaget, som blev opkastet af det amerikanske hold under tidligere fora, går ud på, at en

fredstraktat (især et løfte om ikkeinvasion) skulle forhandles, mens en indefrysning af Nordkoreas atomprogram er på plads, som skulle føre til senere forhandlinger om at lukke atomprogrammet ned.

Prøveaffyring af missil fra Nordkorea, set fra Sydkorea.

Duterte vs. Obama: Bloomberg truer med militærkup, Danny Russel truer med økonomisk straf

24. okt., 2016 – Hysteriet i Washington stiger over den filippinske præsident Rodrigo Dutertes modige handlinger. Obama og Hillarys inddæmning af Kina – omdrejningspunktet for Asien – er tydeligvis blev udmanøvreret og grundlæggende set besejret af Dutertes totale afvisning af Obamas krigspolitik og imperiediktater til hans land, og af hans besøg i Kina, hvor han for fuld damp tilsluttede sig det nye, globale paradigme for udvikling og samarbejde om den Nye Silkevej.

Responsen er trusler og flere trusler fra Wall Street og fra Wall Streets marionetter i Washington. Den 23. oktober udgav Bloomberg News en »redaktionel lederartikel«, der, alt imens man foregav at ønske et fortsat venskab med Filippinerne, gjorde det klart, at dette krævede fjernelsen af præsidenten, død eller levende.

»På et bestemt tidspunkt i sidste uge«, begynder artiklen, »syntes den filippinske præsident Rodrigo Duterte at have orkestreret et af de mest dramatiske skift i Asien, siden

afslutningen af den Kolde Krig – ved at opgive USA, sit lands mangeårige allierede, til fordel for rivalen Kina.« Men, der er ingen grund til bekymring, mener de: Kinas løfter om infrastruktur og lempelige lån vil aldrig komme igennem, alt imens Duterte »vildt oppuster sit lands globale relevans« ved at tale om samarbejde med både Kina og Rusland.

Så kommer truslen: »Det filippinske militær har en historie med kup – og lidet interesse i at erstatte amerikanske våben, logistisk støtte og uddannelse med russisk og kinesisk teknologi ... Amerikanske øverstbefalende minder utvivlsomt allerede deres filippinske modparter om, at et radikalt brud i relationer ville få strategiske konsekvenser.«

I mellemtiden sagde Danny Russel, Obamas viceudenrigsminister for Asien, som tilbragte en weekend i Manila med at forsøge at finde ud af, hvad man skulle gøre mht. Duterte, til pressen, at Dutertes handlinger har »skabt forvirring i en række lande, ikke kun mit. Og ikke alene blandt regeringer, men også i andre samfund. Og også i selskabers bestyrelseslokaler.« (Hvilke selskaber? Dope, Inc., måske?)

Hverken truslen om et kup eller om økonomisk krigsførelse vil forstyrre Duterte. Han og hans kabinet har allerede erklæret, at USA næsten udelukkende investerer i minedrift og callcentre, alt imens Kina og andre ønsker at investere i at opbygge den filippinske realøkonomi. Alt imens truslen om mord (begået af den mytiske »enlige morder«) er meget virkelig, så er en gentagelse af det amerikanskørkestrerede kup imod Marcos i 1986 ikke andet end Obamas og hans neokonservatives fantasifoster.

Foto: Præsident Rodrigo Duterte.

Lyndon LaRouche om Filippinernes fremtid, nov. 2013.

Lyndon LaRouche: ... Først og fremmest er nøglen opbygning af økonomisk infrastruktur. Men hvordan skal dette forekomme? Vi er nu kommet til det punkt, hvor den største trussel mod menneskeheden er den umiddelbare trussel om en atomkrig, der stadig simrer derude. Atomkrig er det grundlæggende valg for krigsførelse blandt større nationer i dag, hvilket betyder, at hvis man tager de samlede våbensystemer og arten af våbensystemer, der står til rådighed til gennemførelse af generel krig, så har vi en situation, der har evnen til at udslette den menneskelige art, eller til at udrydde størstedelen af menneskeslægten. Derfor er tiden kommet, hvor målet må være at eliminere krigsførelse, fordi krigsførelse af enhver generel art er af en sådan natur.

(Uddrag af Specialrapport, der i sin helhed kan læses her:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=3508>)

Matthew Ogden: Før jeg stiller et sidste spørgsmål, som er vigtigt, vil jeg gerne understrege det, du netop sagde. For, hvis man ser på det oligarkiske princips historie, fra Zeus til Malthus, til Bertrand Russel og Prins Philip i dag, så er mantraet et satanisk mantra, bestående af krig, fattigdom, sult og sygdom. Og hvis man ser på alle de virkninger, som vi har fremlagt her i dag, så er *hver eneste af disse virkninger* forårsaget af denne sataniske tro på det oligarkiske system. Og som du gentagne gange har nævnt, som også her i aften, så var Den trojanske Krig det fremmeste eksempel på, hvordan dette folkemord har virket hele vejen ned gennem historien. Og der er en ting, som jeg mener, det er meget vigtigt, at folk indser, og det er, at dette er kendt! Som du sagde, at Cusa vidste det, men som enhver, der er bevidst om det oligarkiske

princips ondskab, vidste det, indbefattet, når man går helt tilbage til selveste Homer. Der er et episk digt, der blev forfattet som en slags »forløber« for Iliaden og Odysseen. Det hed Cypria og fortalte historien om de begivenheder, der førte til Ilion-krigene, der førte til Den trojanske Krig. Det beskriver, hvorfor Zeus besluttede at fremprovokere denne krig. Digtet siger:

»Der var en tid, hvor menneskenes utallige stammer, endskønt adspredte, undertrykte den storbarmede Jords overflade, og Zeus så det og forbarmede sig, og i hans vise hjerte besluttede han at befri Jorden, der nærer alt, for menneskene ved at forårsage en stor strid i Ilion-krigen, for at mængden af død måtte tømme verden. Og helten blev således dræbt i Troja, og Zeus' plan blev ført ud i livet.«

Så Zeus afsløres tillige her som en miljøforkæmper.[latter]

Lad mig stille det sidste spørgsmål: Dette kommer fra en prominent radiovært i Filippinerne, som også er en nær ven af vor organisation. Som man ved, så har der været en virkelig grusom tragedie i Filippinerne med virkningerne af Supertyfon Haiyan. Man skønner, at 10.000 mennesker er døde i kølvandet på denne storm; man har foreløbig fundet omkring 3-4.000 lig; ligposer ligger på rad og række i gaderne, og der er ikke tilstrækkelig med arbejdskraft til at begrave de døde. Så denne herre spørger, om Lyndon LaRouche vil kommentere den katastrofe, der er sket i denne nation i kølvandet på Supertyfon Haiyan, som afstedkommer massiv ødelæggelse, og hvis effekt blev meget værre pga. det drastiske underskud af national infrastruktur, der kunne håndtere sådanne naturkatastrofer. Han siger:

»Hr. LaRouche, De har haft et langvarigt og venskabeligt forhold til Filippinerne, men De har været meget kritisk over for manglen på lederskab der, siden Ferdinand Marcos blev væltet i 1986 af George Shultz og hans 'kammesjukker', og som har efterladt landet i en forarmet tilstand, ødelagt dets

atomkraftprogram, lukket dets industri ned og gjort en ende på dets program for selvforsyning med fødevarer med det resultat, at Filippinerne er udelukket fra den udvikling, der nu foregår i resten af Asien.«

Han spørger, hvordan du ser på vores forslag om et kreditsystem, store infrastrukturprojekter og en fusionsdrevet udvikling i Stillehavsområdet; hvordan disse forslag kan håndtere den aktuelle krise i Filippinerne og lignende kriser i fremtiden.

Lyndon LaRouche: Der er to aspekter til denne forudsætning. Først og fremmest er nøglen opbygning af økonomisk infrastruktur. Men hvordan skal dette forekomme? Vi er nu kommet til det punkt, hvor den største trussel mod menneskeheden er den umiddelbare trussel om en atomkrig, der stadig simrer derude. Atomkrig er det grundlæggende valg for krigsførelse blandt større nationer i dag, hvilket betyder, at hvis man tager de samlede våbensystemer og arten af våbensystemer, der står til rådighed til gennemførelse af generel krig, så har vi en situation, der har evnen til at udslette den menneskelige art, eller til at udrydde størstedelen af menneskeslægten. Derfor er tiden kommet, hvor målet må være at eliminere krigsførelse, fordi krigsførelse af enhver generel art er af en sådan natur. Det betyder to ting: Det betyder, at man måøre sig klart, at der er et element i verdenssamfundet, som skaber sådanne krige, som vi f.eks. ser det i Syrien. Vi har set det i andre forbindelser. Krige stimuleres af imperiemagter, som f.eks. det såkaldte Britiske Imperium eller Det anglo-hollandske Imperium. Dette har været menneskehedens historie, at krig var et redskab til at ødelægge befolkninger, der ville være uafhængige og frie. Derfor står vi nu igen over for dette, men nu er det med termonukleare våben. Og kvantiteten og virkningen af termonukleare våben er af en sådan karakter, at man kan skønne, at det vil udslette praktisk talt et helt område af verden inden for halvanden time pga. den kapacitet, som findes

derude. Så tiden er kommet, hvor vi må sætte spørgsmålstege ved selve spørgsmålet om krigsførelse, ikke, fordi vi er pacifister, men fordi vi er imod denne form for krigsførelse! Vi må derfor mobilisere os selv på denne baggrund. Vi må stoppe denne manipulation, hvor man opildner til mindre krige og udbreder dem, som vi så det i Irak-krigen, den seneste Irak-krig – som var fuldstændig unødvendig! Tony Blairs gave til hele regionen! Der var ingen grund, overhovedet ingen grund, til at starte den krig! Men på det tidspunkt havde vi en præsident Bush, og præsidenter fra Bush-ligaen er ikke noget godt at have om sig på sin egen grund, de bør anbringes et andet sted. Så vi er altså gået ind i en sådan fase. Obama – falske krige! Alle mulige slags falske krige, massedrab, alle den slags ting! Vi har ikke noget reelt behov for krig. Der kan være tilfælde, hvor tvang må gennemføres, men der er forskellige måder at håndtere det på. Men der er sket det, at disse befolkninger er blevet fordærvet af et instinkt for krig, hvor det ikke er nødvendigt. Det, der er nødvendigt, er den form for programmer, som forhindrer dette, og det, vi må gøre, er faktisk at benytte et af de store våben, som er til vor rådighed, det store, psykologiske våben, vi har til rådighed, og det er Mars og udviklingen af forsvarssystemer imod ubezagelige asteroider, der med et slag kunne udslette hele den menneskelige befolkning. Så vi har derfor masser af ting, som vi kan gøre. Men det væsentligste er, at vi må opdrage menneskeheden: Det, vi må gøre, er at tage førende nationer i verden i dag, eller dele af disse nationer, som erkender, hvad atomkrig er, i særdeleshed i det foreliggende tilfælde, hvor vi netop nu står på randen af den. Potentialet er til stede. Derfor må vi stoppe det, hvilket betyder, at vi må have nye mål, hvilket først og fremmest betyder højteknologi – meget høj teknologi. Fusionsforskning har, siden begyndelsen af 1970'erne, været det foretrukne valg som drivkraft for fremskridt i verden! Netop nu er dette, for vor egen del, hvad vi vil have! Vi behøver det i Stillehavsområdet, nu! For, med den forfærdelige tilstand i det transatlantiske område, som vi også ser i vort eget land,

der i vid udstrækning er ødelagt, har vi ødelagt en stor del af vor evne til at leve! Ikke blot til at leve, men evnen til at leve! Derfor er tiden kommet, hvor vi må skabe en ny alliance blandt nationer. Og jeg mener, at det kan gøres, hvis USA vil skaffe sig af med dette problem, som vi har i selve USA nu. Jeg mener, at vi kan få denne aftale på plads. Rusland har udtrykt interesse; andre nationer er kommet med lignende tilkendegivelser. Tiden er kommet til at gøre en ende på denne form for krigsførelse! Politiaktioner, som er nødvendige – fint, det er én ting. Men krig skal vi forhindre, for seriøs krig er atomkrig, og atomkrig har potentialet til at udslette den menneskelige art. Derfor er tiden kommet for menneskeslægten til at vågne op og tage chancen for at overleve. Der er nogle meget specifikke ting, som vi må gøre for at gennemføre dette, denne politik. Men jeg mener, at vi nu har – med de former for alliancer, der dukker op som forsvar, den form for afsky, der gennemtrænger hele verden på grund af det, som Obama er blevet repræsentant for, [så mener jeg,] at verden for en stor del er parat, pga. af tilstrækkelig indflydelse fra nationer i verden, til at gøre en ende på denne rædselsudvikling. Og hvis vi kan finde den rette måde at tænke på det, vil vi være i stand til at bringe suveræne nationer, som stadig er suveræne – for suverænitet er meget vigtigt; for man er nødt til at integrere folkets personlighed i arrangementerne. Man kan ikke have, at der kommer nogen, som er en konge eller sådan noget, og siger »nu er I mine undersåtter«. Det er ikke sådan, man opbygger nationer. Men hvis vi har nationerne, så vil nationernes ledere erkende, hvad deres interesse er, og finde deres fælles mål – det behøver ikke at være identiske mål, men det skal være fælles mål – hvis vi gør dette, kan vi redde civilisationen. Og så er der også den anden side af dette billede: Når vi først har fået fat i idéen, blandt tilstrækkeligt med mennesker blandt tilstrækkeligt med nationer, at tiden er kommet til at gøre præcis dette, og jeg tror nu, som vi ser det på gaden så at sige, at Obama er ved at gå ned; hvorvidt det bliver permanent og endegyldigt eller

ej, ved vi ikke endnu, men Obama er nu tilsyneladende dømt til politisk undergang. Og folk er i stigende grad parat til at smide ham ud af embedet og ikke vente på ceremonierne. Under disse betingelser har vi måske nået et punkt, hvor graden af lidelse i det transatlantiske område nu, såvel som i vor egen og i andre nationer, er af en sådan art, at vi sandsynligvis vil kunne nå frem til en sådan aftale. Rusland er parat til det, Kina er parat til det, Indien er sandsynligvis parat til det, og så fremdeles. Så villigheden til at gøre dette, hvis de kan forsikres om, at det er en sikker mulighed, der nu foreligger pga. omstændighederne. Vi må ændre de omstændigheder, der fremmer dette til at blive til den virkelige hensigt om at gøre dette. Og vi har nået det tidspunkt, hvor dette praktisk talt, i en praktisk betydning, er indlysende. Den store forhindring er den grønne politik. Den grønne politik er den trojanske politik, det er den oligarkiske politik. Det er en politik for at gøre folk dumme – og meget sultne og døende! Så vi må simpelthen forstå, blandt ledende personer i verden, at disse galninge, der oppisker til at denne blodsudgydelse og ballade og nonsens, at disse galninge bør dæmpes lidt ned! Og mentalt sunde mennesker i nationer, der er klar over, hvad problemet er, hvad faren består i; der findes ikke en nation på planeten, der ikke er truet i dag, truet hovedsageligt af denne form for overvejelser! Vi må få nogle seriøse mennesker til at indse, at vort mål ikke er krig med en eller anden nation. Vort projekt går ud på at redde os fra store genstande, der svæver rundt i rummet, og som med et slag, hvis de ramte vor planet, ville slå os alle ihjel. Det er vor fjende! Mars – jeg anbefaler slet ikke, at folk skal tage til Mars, jeg mener, at det er en fjallet idé. Det er en antikveret idé. Hvorfor skulle man gøre det? Vi kan, i en mere eller mindre nærfremtid, hvis vi gør dette, anbringe instrumenter på Mars; vi kan kontrollere, hvad der foregår på Mars' overflade. Vi kan udvikle de teknologier, som er inden for rækkevidde, til at gøre dette. Vi kan således bruge Mars som et af de steder, hvorfra vi kan kontrollere rummet inden for Solsystemet med

henblik på at beskytte os imod ankomsten af store objekter, som kan ødelægge vor planet. Forsvaret af vor planet er det, der står på spil. Og det betyder altså ikke, at vi skal ud og finde en anden planet at slå ihjel. Det betyder, at vi skal stoppe disse trusler, som allerede er indbygget i vor del af Solsystemet, og forberede et forsvar mod dem. Desuden skal mennesket udvide fremtiden, fra at leve på denne planet og til at håndtere en del af Solsystemet. Vi kommer i berøring med hele Solsystemet i vor levetid, dog ikke specifikt i min; men vi kan, lad os sige inden for Mars' rækkevidde, og så fremdeles, inden for denne rækkevidde af Solsystemets rum bør og kan vi udvikle systemer, som vi kontrollerer fra Jorden, som vil udgøre midler til at opnå et mål. Mennesket vil ikke længere tænke på sig selv som jordboere; de vil tænke på sig selv som folk, der lever på Jorden, er født på Jorden, men som håndterer en betydelig del af Solsystemets territorium. Og dette bør være vort mål.«

(Foto, dette indlæg: I Filippinerne anslås tyfonen Haiyan, der ramte landet den 2. november, 2013, at have påvirket mindst to millioner mennesker og dræbt op imod 10.000.)

Dutertes mediedirektør opslår EIR-artikel om Marcoskuppet og LaRouche-video om Filippinerne på Facebook

21. okt., 2016 – Præsident Rodrigo Dutertes direktør for de sociale medier under Dutertes succesrige valgkampagne 2016, Pompee La Vina, har opslået en EIR-artikel fra 2004 på

kampagnens Facebook, Pompee La Vina Duterte 2016. Artiklen, af Mike Billington, havde overskriften, »Shultz og 'hit men' ødelagde Filippinerne«. Foreløbig har flere end 2300 mennesker linket til artiklen via opslaget på Facebook, og en af de første responser inkluderede et link til Lyndon LaRouches webcast fra 15. november, 2013, der havde titlen, »The Philippino Future«.

Mike Billingtons artikel fra 24. december, 2004, var en del af en *EIR*-serie, der dokumenterede tilfælde efter tilfælde af de »økonomiske hit men«, der ødelagde nationer gennem kup, IMF's plyndring og andre midler. Artiklen leverede en meget detaljeret, skridt-for-skridt redegørelse for kuppet imod Ferdinand Marcos og den efterfølgende plyndring af Filippinerne gennem de metoder, som på tidspunktet for udgivelsen for nylig var blevet afsløret af John Perkins i hans *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (En økonomisk hitmans bekendelser).

Opslaget på Facebook havde overskriften, »The Secret Sin of US to Philippines – Disclosure Time« (USA's hemmelige synd over for Filippinerne – afsløringens time), og lød, »Ingen hemmeligheder forbliver for evigt skjulte. Disse dokumenter forklarer, hvordan de amerikanske IMF-'økonomiske hit men' (globale eliter) hjalp det 'Gule Oligarki' med at overtage vort land og vore resurser fra 1986 og frem til i dag. Er Onkel Sam vores sande allierede? Tænk igen. Her hjælper en PDF dig til at forstå, hvorfor præsident Duterte sagde, det er Kina, Rusland og Filippinerne 'imod verden'. Skynd dig at downloade filen, før den er væk.«

Det er ikke tilfældigt, at en nær medarbejder til præsident Duterte opslår dette *EIR*-materiale på et tidspunkt, hvor præsidenten netop har fuldført et historisk besøg til Kina, hvor han omlagde Filippinernes kurs mod det, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har kaldt det »nye paradigme« med win-win-samarbejde mellem nationer og områder i verden, for store projekter, rumforskning og andre fremskridt inden for pionervidenskab.

Den fornyede gennemgang af Wall Streets kup imod Marcos kommer betids, fordi Obama-administrationen fuldstændigt er flippet ud over Dutertes besøg i Kina og hans omhyggeligt udarbejdede brud med Washingtons dominans. Daniel Russel, Obamas tilbageværende top-asienspecialist, er nu på vej til Manila for at foretage et skøn over skaderne og vende tilbage med anbefalinger for, hvordan Washington bør respondere.

EIR-pdf:

http://www.larouchepub.com/other/2004/site_packages/econ_hitmen/3150philipp_coup.html

Webcast med LaRouche om Filippinerne:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CggYb4UhQEU>

Foto: Rodrigo Duterte i maj, 2016, under slutspurten til præsidentvalget.