

**To systemer foreligger nu for verden: Hvad du skal vide om økonomi for at skabe en fremtid**

**for menneskeheden**

**LaRouchePAC undervisnings-serie 2018 i LaRouches økonomi**

**Introduktion og disposition**

*To systemer foreligger for verden. Det ene, det transatlantiske, City of London/Wall Street-finansimperium, har befundet sig i en tilstand af »frit fald« siden krakket i 2007-2008, et finanskrak, som Lyndon LaRouche forudsagde i et webcast, 25. juli, 2007:*

*»Det, der er optegnet som aktieværdier og markedsværdier internationalt på finansmarkederne, er vrøvl! Dette er rent fiktive trosobjekter. Der er intet sandt i det; falskneriet er enormt. Der er ingen mulighed for et ikkekollaps af det nuværende finanssystem – ingen! Det er færdigt, nu! Det nuværende finanssystem kan ikke forsætte med at eksistere under nogen omstændigheder, under noget præsidentskab, under noget lederskab eller noget lederskab af nationer. Udelukkende kun en fundamental og pludselig ændring af det globale, monetære finanssystem vil forhindre et generelt, kædereaktionslignende kollaps. I hvilket tempo, ved vi ikke, men det vil fortsætte, og det vil være ustoppeligt! Og jo længere, det står på, før det stopper, desto værre bliver*

tingene.«

*Hvordan kunne LaRouche forudsige dette?*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Om LaRouches opdagelse. LaRouche's Economics Classes 2018; lektion 1, 23. juni, 2018. Engelsk udskrift**

*Introduction based on the original scientific discovery made by Lyndon LaRouche during the years 1948–52, refuting the concept of entropy advocated by Norbert Wiener and developing a concept of physical economy based on a study of Heraclitus, Plato, Riemann and Georg Cantor, which he later supplemented through a study of Nicolaus of Cusa. This study led LaRouche to oppose all monetarist theories associated with the British East India Company system of Free trade, globalization and post-industrial society and to embrace the physical economic approach of Gottfried Leibniz (Society and Economy) that later became the American System of Economics of Alexander Hamilton, from his more advanced scientific basis. This class will be given by Will Wertz.*

# **Meddelelse: Ny undervisningsserie fra LaRouchePAC: 8-ugers kursus i LaRouches økonomi**

Online-præsentationer lørdage, kl. 2 pm (kl. 20 dansk tid),  
fra 23. juni til 11. august.

[https://discover.larouchepac.com/?recruiter\\_id=264822](https://discover.larouchepac.com/?recruiter_id=264822)

Introduktion til de enkelte lektioner kan ses på ovenstående  
link, såvel som også foreløbigt forslag til læsning.

Kurset kan følges på LaRouchePAC-hjemmesiden.

---

## **Denne tid med epokegørende transformation skriger på Lyndon LaRouches ideer**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 10. juni, 2018* – For strategisk klarhed  
– og også for din fornøjelses skyld – så se lige på verden i

øjeblikket gennem Det britiske Imperiums øjne. I løbet af sidste uge fandt følgende begivenheder sted, som indikerede, at Det britiske Imperiums værste mareridt er ved at tage form:

- Præsident Trump – der tydeligvis føler sig stærk, med Robert Muellers Russiagate-operation, der hastigt går til bunds og i stedet forvandles til et »Spygate«, der afslører mange af Storbritanniens hovedaktiver på deres vej til fængsel – har annonceret, at han vil mødes med den russiske præsident Putin, muligvis i Wien.
- Præsident Trump væltede G7-skakbrættet og sagde, han ville have Putin tilbage i møderne, for »vi søger fred i verden. Vi søger ikke at spille spil«.
- Italiens nye premierminister Giuseppe Conte sekunderede Trumps krav om, at Rusland atter skulle være med i G8. Trump meddelte, at han snart ville mødes med Conte i Det Hvide Hus.
- Conte overlevede Det britiske Imperiums statskupforsøg i Italien og tiltrådte embedet med tale om bankopdeling, dvs., Glass-Steagall. Det sidste, Det britiske Imperium ønsker, er, at Conte skal diskutere dette med Trump.
- Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping organiserede hele topmødet med Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen (SCO) omkring Konfucius' universelle ideer[1], for at skabe en »verden, der har varig fred, universel tryghed og fælles fremgang«.
- Spændinger mellem Indien og Kina mindskes med deres diskussioner om fælles, økonomisk fremgang og sikkerhedsspørgsmål – på trods af, at Storbritannien gør alt, det kan, for at drive en kile ind mellem dem. Selv Indien og Pakistan vil deltage i fælles militærøvelser for første gang nogensinde, under SCO's sponsorkab.

Set gennem Det britiske Imperiums øjne, er summen af alt dette virkelig deres værste mareridt. Firemagts-aftalen mellem Kina, Rusland, Indien og USA, som Lyndon LaRouche længe har stillet krav om som den nødvendige, hovedstrategiske alliance for at

lukke Det britiske Imperium ned én gang for alle, er hastigt ved at tage form.

Schiller Instituttets præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche trak i sin hovedtale til Schiller Instituttets konference »Dona Nobis Pacem – Giv os fred, gennem økonomisk udvikling«, som blev afholdt i New York City 9. juni, betydningen af det nuværende øjeblikks epokegørende transformation frem:

»Jeg er faktisk meget optimistisk med hensyn til situationen. Jeg mener, der absolut er en mulighed for, at vi i den nærmeste fremtid vil se fremkomsten af et fuldstændig Nyt Paradigme for civilisation. For allerede på nuværende tidspunkt samles flertallet af nationer omkring ideen om, at der findes én menneskehed, som tilhører en højere orden end nationale interesser og end selv geopolitisk konfrontation. Aldrig før har modsigelsen mellem og åbenheden i kampen mellem det Nye Paradigme og det gamle paradigme været mere åbenlys end netop nu. ...

Man har en ny model for win-win-samarbejde, for at agere i den andens interesse, med respekt for det andets lands suverænitet, ikkeindblanding, respekt for det andet lands anderledes samfundssystem og for ideen om at blive forenet omkring ideen om den ene menneskeheds højere formål. Det er den politik, der er et resultat af Kinas Nye Silkevejspolitik, som nu har ligget på bordet i næsten fem år, og som har udviklet den mest utrolige dynamik nogensinde. Det er historiens største infrastrukturprojekt, og det står allerede klart, at dette vil definere de nye regler i verden. ...

Dette er faktisk min mands, Lyndon LaRouches, vision; han krævede allerede i 2007, at de tre lande – Rusland, Kina og Indien – absolut må arbejde sammen for at imødegå den onde indflydelse fra Det britiske Imperium, som det fandtes på det tidspunkt. I 2009 krævede han, på Rhodos-forummet for Dialog mellem Civilisationer, at den eneste måde, hvorpå verden ville komme ud af denne nuværende tilstand, ville være en

firemagtsaftale mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien. ...

Den Nye Silkevej må opbygges på basis af alle traditioners mest fundamentale ontologiske, epistemologiske og metafysiske begreber. For Kina betyder det, det konfucianske princip om selvfuldkommengørelse og livslang læring og karakterens forædling, og om harmoni midt i forskelligheder. For Indien betyder dette, det vediske begreb om, hvordan den kosmiske orden må angive reglerne for det politiske liv på Jorden. ...

Den europæiske civilisation, af hvilken Amerika er en del, har meget at bidrage med mht. sine egne, humanistiske traditioner. Et af de mest betydningsfulde begreber om dette er den nye tankegang, der blev introduceret af Nicolaus Cusanus (Nikolaus von Kues) i det 15. århundrede – *coincidentia oppositorum*; modsætningernes sammenfald, hvilket betyder, at menneskelig skabevne og det menneskelige intellekt er i stand til at skabe en højere orden, i hvilken alle forskelligheder forsvinder. ...

Men en tid med en sådan epokegørende transformation er også den bedste tid for ideernes betydning.

Jeg kan blot sige, at de ideer, som kommer fra min mand, Lyndon LaRouche, der har arbejdet for denne form for koncepter for en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden i mere end et halvt århundrede, ja, nok nærmere i 75 år, eller endda længere endnu; men disse ideer har nu vundet indflydelse ... De mange, mange videnskabelige ideer, han genoplivede, mht. 2.500 års europæisk civilisation: Mange af disse ting bliver nu til virkelighed, fordi vi har nogle magtfulde lande, der rent faktisk virkeliggør dem og arbejder i denne retning.

Så ideernes magt er absolut afgørende, og vi har den store lykke, at, alt imens jeg ikke vil bagatellisere de farer, der stadig eksisterer; ligeledes er den mulige fare for en stor krig slet ikke fjernet; men jeg vil gerne have, at folk har en optimistisk følelse af, at vi, ikke alene i vores levetid, men

i en meget nær fremtid, kan opleve en fuldstændig anden verden, *hvis vi bliver aktive og vi kæmper for det.*«

*Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump taler med sine lederkolleger, Canadas premierminister Justin Trudeau, Frankrigs præsident Emmanuel Macron, Japans premierminister Shinzo Abe og U.K.'s premierminister Theresa May, under arbejdsfrokosten på G7-topmødet i Canada.*

[1] Se: »[Harmonien mellem konfuciansk og vestlig filosofi.](#)« Af EIR's Kina- og Konfucius-ekspert, Mike Billington.

---

# **De Fire Magter: Et Nyt Paradigme for fred og udvikling.**

## **BILAG: Lyndon LaRouche: Draft Memorandum of Agreement between The United States and U.S.S.R. (1984)**

*Lyndon LaRouche: Opgaven, som jeg har defineret den, er: Hvis Rusland og USA, og Kina og Indien, som en gruppe af lande aftaler at initiere og gennemtvinge en reorganisering af det globale finans- og kreditsystem, under disse betingelser med langfristede aftaler af samme type, som Franklin Roosevelt havde ytret før sin død i 1944, indgået mellem hovednationer, kunne Roosevelts plan være blevet realiseret alle disse år senere, og vi kan gøre det i dag. Det er vores chance. Enten*

*gør vi dette, eller også går vi under. Jeg kan forsikre jer for, at, hvis I tror, der findes nogen mulighed for, at det nuværende system kunne fortsætte ind i det forestående år, som et system, man kan arbejde med, og at der ikke vil være en fortsat generel krise, der forværres, på nuværende tidspunkt, vil der ikke komme nogen økonomisk genrejsning i nogen del af planeten, under de nuværende betingelser.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Lyndon LaRouche: En Firemagtsaftale kan skabe et nyt, globalt kreditsystem**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 2. maj, 2018* – Det britiske Imperium og dets allierede kræfter har lanceret en række koordinerede angreb på globalt plan, som er udtænkt at skulle sikre, at ingen holdbar koalition for udvikling og fred skabes omkring planetens fire, ledende magter – Rusland, Kina, Indien og USA. Disse angreb inkluderer eskalerende provokationer, der har til formål at udløse surrogatkrig i Mellemøsten (Iran og Syrien);



i Ukraine; og på Koreahalvøen – og som alle igen har til formål sluttelig at eskalere til en global krig, med USA imod Rusland og Kina.

Samtidig, og med en omhyggeligt koreograferet timing, har samme britiske kræfter optrappet deres heksejagt mod præsident Donald Trump og tyer til at fiske efter potentiel skadelig information – en aktivitet, der er lige så ekstrem, som den er farlig. Den seneste af disse er den *lækkede* trussel, at den særlige anklager Robert Mueller måske vil indstævne præsident Trump til at besvare Muellers *ligeledes lækkede* 40 spørgsmål, ifald præsidenten nægter at besvare dem »frivilligt«.

Præsident Trump svarede selv skarpt i et tweet her til morgen: »Der er ikke tale om nogen forhindring af rettens gang (det er et set-up & en fælde). Det, der er tale om, er pågående forhandlinger med Nordkorea om atomkrig ...«

For nu at sætte sagen på spidsen: Det britiske fremstød for krig, og det britiske fremstød for at afsætte USA's præsident, er parallelle operationer, der har et enkeltstående formål. Der kan ikke være noget heldigt forsvar af præsidentskabet imod Muellers beskidte operationer uden samtidig at stoppe fremstødet for at bruge Iran, Syrien, Korea og Ukraine til at udløse krig mod Rusland og Kina. Og modsat; det britiske fremstød for krig og for at kuldkaste hele det westfalske system ved at rive gyldig, international lov, folkeretten, i stumper og stykker med militærangreb og krige, kan ikke stoppes uden at besejre Mueller-FBI-kuppet imod præsident Trump.

Både Demokrater, Republikanere og Uafhængige – såvel som også folk i andre nationer – må vågne op til denne kendsgerning, før det er for sent. I kan ikke vælge, hvilken del af denne forenede, britiske operation, I ønsker at gå imod, og hvilken del, I ønsker at støtte, baseret på de ideologiske fordomme, I inderligt holder fast ved.

Tiden er inde til moral, anført af videnskab, sådan, som det eksemplificeres af Lyndon LaRouches forslag om en Firemagtsaftale.

LaRouches første, betydningsfulde præsentation af denne idé til en politik, kom på et Forum for strategiske og sikkerhedsmæssige studier i New Delhi, Indien, 3. dec., 2008. Dernæst udvidede LaRouche denne strategi i en tale den 10. okt., 2009, han holdt på det Globale offentlige Forum for Dialog mellem Civilisationers syvende årlige forsamling. LaRouche opsummerede denne tale fra Rhodos under et privat frokostmøde for diplomater i Washington, 4. nov., 2009.

Bemærkningerne ved dette frokostmøde, som vi her bringer uddrag af, blev fremsat næsten fire år *før* den kinesiske præsident annoncerede sin Nye Silkevejspolitik, som i dag kendes som Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

»Det var min opgave [på Rhodos] klart at præsentere, hvad en Firemagtsaftale mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien, samt andre lande, der bringes ind i samme aftale, ville betyde for planeten. Det ville betyde, at vi kunne få en konvention, en aftale, om skabelse af et nyt system, der skrotter det nuværende, monetære system, som kan skrottes, fordi det allerede er bankerot ...

»Rusland og Kina stod på randen af en aftale, i denne periode, i hvilken Kina har for en billion dollar i amerikanske statsobligationer, som USA skylder Kina ... Det, der grundlæggende set skete i forhandlingerne mellem Rusland og Kina, var et arrangement om at anvende den legitime gæld, som skyldes til Kina mod en forpligtelse fra USA's side, og til at bruge dette; monetisere det, ved at investere det i noget, der er produktivt, som ville være gavnligt for Asien. Og Rusland og Kina aftalte et storskala-projekt for transport og relaterede systemer.

Planen var, ikke at stoppe dér: Planen er at udvide denne form

for aftale til Sydøstasien generelt, og til at inkludere Indien. Nogle af os har en plan for at bringe USA ind i samme arrangement. For, den kombinerede magt af USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og nationer, som ønsker at være tilknyttet dem i denne form for venture, er den største, økonomiske magt på planeten. Hvis denne planetære magt beslutter at gøre det, der må gøres, kan vi reorganisere og genopbygge verden og hurtigt skifte over fra en nedadgående udvikling og til en opadgående udvikling. Det er den valgmulighed, vi har.

Omdrejningspunktet er: USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien. Uden en aftale mellem disse fire nationer vil en sådan økonomisk genrejsning af verden ikke være mulig. Med disse fire nationer, samt andre nationer – såsom, umiddelbart, Sydøstasien, Korea, Japan og så fremdeles – andre nationer kommer med ind, og nu taler vi om muligheden for et generelt program, om skabelse af et nyt fastkurssystem, som et kreditsystem, ikke et monetært system, men derimod et kreditsystem baseret på fastkurstaftaler, til langfristet samarbejde om infrastrukturinvesteringer, som vil være drivkraft for udviklingen af produktive investeringer.

Med infrastruktur mener vi først og fremmest storskala-transport: moderne jernbaner, og overlegne jernbanesystemer [maglev], til transport over land. Formålet er at kunne rejse over land igennem Eurasien, gennem Beringstrædet og ind i landene på det amerikanske kontinent; og gennem Melleømøsten og ind i hele Afrika. Vi kan således skabe forbindelser med denne form for massetransit, som er mere effektive end transport over vand, og som vil udgøre en drivkraft for udvikling i alle de områder, igennem hvilke et sådant jernbanesystem og relaterede systemer rejser.«

---

# En spirituel faktor

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 29. april, 2018* – Den betagende proces, der er blevet mest synlig i Korea i løbet af de seneste dage – og hvor mange mennesker forventede for blot et par uger siden, at dette ville ske? – er stadig langt fra den totale sejr, som vi kæmper for. Foreløbig er det stadig en forpost, der kæmpes om. Det britiskledede angreb mod Syrien for to uger siden tilsigtede at forhindre dette fremskridt; det påførte det alvorlig skade, og næste gang, hvis vi tillader en 'næste gang', kan blive langt mere skadelig.

Men, selv som en omstridt forpost, så har det håb, som Korea-forhandlingerne repræsenterer, ikke desto mindre fejlet hen over verden med sin inspiration. Det var fuldstændig naturligt, da tusinder af tilhængere ved præsident Trumps møde i Michigan den 28. april, begyndte at synge, »No-bel«, »No-bel!«, da han nævnte Korea. Uanset partitilhørsforhold eller politiske grupperinger, så, for enhver, der har en smule forståelse og moral, kan det ikke slå fejl at finde nogen grad af inspiration fra Korea i dag. Husk, at den erklærede tilstand af fjendtligheder på Koreahalvøen har eksisteret lige siden 1950, hvor verdens befolkningstal blot var 2,5 mia., i sammenligning med nutidens 7,6 mia. mennesker. Kun omkring 7 % af dem, der lever i dag, var overhovedet blevet født, da denne aldrig afsluttede krig begyndte. Og denne Koreakrig indviede denne Kolde Krig, som dominerede resten af det rædselsfulde 20. århundrede. Og på lignende måde understøtter den frosne koreakonflikt stadig væk det britiske imperiesystem med at sætte alle op mod alle, for at opretholde dets verdensherredømme.

Det, der nu er ved at finde sted i Korea, er blevet muligt gennem det fælles og koordinerede arbejde udført af Kina, Japan, Rusland og USA, sammen med de to Korea'er. Det, der til syvende og sidst har gjort dette muligt, er, at Kina, Japan, Rusland og USA alle har gennemgået dybtgående forandringer i

løbet af de seneste årtier, som først nu, i dag, har gjort denne form for samarbejde muligt, hvor det tidligere aldrig havde været muligt. Hvad forårsagede disse ændringer? Præsidenterne Xis, Putins og Trumps, samt premierminister Abes nye politikker af? Jovist; men hvad var det, de alle havde til fælles?

Der foreligger en spirituel faktor. Som Douglas MacArthur så viseligt udtrykte det om bord på slagskibet *Missouri* i Tokyo Bay, »det må være af ånd, hvis vi skal redde kødet«. Lyndon LaRouche refererede til dette i sit banebrydende arbejde fra 2004, *The Coming Eurasian World* (Den kommende eurasiske verden), hvor han skrev, »Det, der sker, som jeg ofte, endda på nært hold, således i løbet af mit liv har set, er, at udviklingen af en hel kulturs kollektive bevidsthed drives af gnisten fra interventionerne, gennem tvetydighedens slør, fra relativt få genier og fra de unge mennesker, der gentager geniens oplevelse af opdagelse, i deres egen selvudvikling i den tidlige ungdom«. (*»Toward a Second Treaty of Westphalia: The Coming Eurasian World«*, EIR, Dec. 17 2004)

Den »kommende eurasiske verden«, den næste, store fase i menneskets udvikling, som Lyndon LaRouche her forudsagde, er nu ved at komme inden for vores synsfelt, drevet af de geniets gnister, som han har spredt igennem mange årtier. Koreaforhandlingerne tilstår os som muligt, at det kan gøres. Det skiller sig nu klart ud, ligesom den Nye Verden gjorde det for Schillers *Columbus*. Vil vi nu virkelig gøre det?

Foto: 27. april, 2018, underskrev præsident Moon Jae-in og formand Kim Jong-un *Panmunjom-erklæringen for Fred, Fremgang og Genforening* på Koreahalvøen som et resultat af topmødet, og de annoncerede erklæringen i fællesskab. (South Korea Gov. / koreasummit.kr)

---

# Huset Windsors forestående fald

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 22. april, 2018* – Næsten et kvart århundrede efter udgivelsen af Lyndon LaRouches artikel fra oktober 1994, »Huset Windsors forestående fald«, er den stadig den mest rungende opfordring til, at hele menneskeheden skal gribe til forsvar for at blive de sidste rester af Det britiske Imperiums oligarkismes svøbe kvit; en svøbe, der endnu i dag udgør en trussel om hellere at ødelægge hele verden snarere, end den vil løsne sit greb om planeten. LaRouche skrev denne artikel som en introduktion til en 60 sider lang *EIR*-Specialrapport med samme titel, som blev udarbejdet under LaRouches personlige supervision umiddelbart efter hans løsladelse fra fængsel i begyndelsen af 1994, efter fem års uretfærdig fængsling, på selvsamme Britiske Imperiums bud. I denne artikel taler LaRouche i sin egenskab af den ledende anklager på vegne af menneskeheden mod det folkemorderiske Britiske Imperium.

»Mine damer og herrer fra læserskarens internationale jury, vi har bragt jer til denne domstol for at høre anklager, der har deres oprindelse i en af de mest monstrøse forbrydelser, der nogen sinde er begået i menneskehedens kendte historie; en forbrydelse, der er begået på en enorm skala.

Vi fremlægger her for jer beviserne for, at, i de seneste fireogtredive år siden dens stiftelse i 1961, har en ond organisation, der kalder sig selv sådanne ting som Verdensnaturfonden, deltaget i overlagt folkemord mod nationerne og folkeslagene i subsahara-områderne i Øst-, Vest- og Sydafrika. Vi vil bevise for jer, at, i hele denne periode, har lederen af denne forbryderiske sammensværgelse

været prins Philip, også kendt som hertugen af Edinburgh og den regerende dronning af Det forenede Kongeriges gemal ...

Disse beviser vil vise, at han er personligt ansvarlig for dette igangværende og forsøgte folkemord imod befolkningen i Afrikas subsahara-område, såvel som også andre steder på planeten. Bevismaterialet viser, at denne royale gemal er skyldig i denne forbrydelse, ikke alene som person, men også i sin egenskab af den udpegede, prinselige leder ('kingpin') af dette rædselsfulde foretagende. Der er mange andre skyldige parter ...

Listen er, som den også bør være, lige som en opsummering af forbryderne under Nürnberg-domstolens kategori af forbrydere, under rubrikken, forbrydelser mod menneskeheden ...

Det er fuldt ud og rimeligt udregnet, at de politiske forholdsregler, som prinsen og hans medskyldige har vedtaget og i øjeblikket er i færd med at gennemføre i verden, ville, om dette fik lov at finde sted, reducere befolkningstallet på denne planet fra de nuværende omkring 5,3 mia. mennesker til langt under 1 mia. inden for omkring to generationer, hovedsageligt gennem den hyperbolske og selvaccelererende virkning af hungersnød og epidemiske sygdomme hos mennesker, dyr og planter. Under omstændigheder, fremkaldt som et biprodukt af et sådant koncentreret chok til alle højere livsformers immunsystem, er det på ingen måde garanteret, at der overhovedet ville eksistere mennesker ved slutningen af det forestående århundrede, hvis prinsen og hans medskyldige ikke stoppes og politikkerne omstødes, nu. Vi kan håbe på, at et sådant holocaust ikke er vist, men vi vover ikke at forlade os på dette ønske; under alle omstændigheder må prinsen, hans medskyldige og deres onde politikker stoppes nu ...

Den ondskab, der gennemsyrrer prinsens og hans medskyldiges forbryderiskhed, er meget gammel, lige så gammel som de svagt oplyste horisonter af den tidligste, kendte historie. Den ultimative fjende er ikke denne ulyksalige prins, men snarere

den særlige kriminelle tradition, der med rette beskrives som 'oligarkisme'. Denne oligarkisme er det særlige smitsomme stof, der er ansvarligt for den moral og mentale sygdom, som den anklagede prins og hans medskyldige lider af. Ved valget af en retfærdig og klog fremgangsmåde med hensyn til de igangværende forbryderiske handlinger, der her dokumenteres, må vi hæve os over de fleste nuværende, internationale juridiske og relaterede praksissers fremherskende dekadens for at helbrede problemet, snarere end, sådan, som sejrherrene perverterede Nürnberg-rettergangen, idet de søgte at skjule vor egen, tidligere forsømmelse bag iøjnefaldende lidelser, der blev påtvunget nogle anklagede syndebukke ...

Den udfordring, der udgøres af de beviser, der fremlægges for jer, er: Kan I, juryens medlemmer, provokeres af rædslen, der ligger i det faktum, at ingen løsning på kollapset af denne civilisation eksisterer under de nuværende, alment accepterede adfærdsregler, og til at opdage de nødvendige, radikale, aksiomatiske ændringer af de politiske beslutninger; sådanne ændringer, der kunne gøre det muligt for menneskeheden at genopbygge et ødelagt samfund umiddelbart fra ruinerne af det kollapsede dynasti, uden at gennemleve en 'Ny Mørks Tidsalders' mellemliggende mareridt?«

(Hele LaRouches artikel kan ses her: [https://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1994/eirv21n43-19941028/eirv21n43-19941028\\_012-the\\_coming\\_fall\\_of\\_the\\_house\\_of\\_lar.pdf](https://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1994/eirv21n43-19941028/eirv21n43-19941028_012-the_coming_fall_of_the_house_of_lar.pdf))

Sammenlign denne strategiske vurdering af Lyndon LaRouche fra 1994 med den, som blev præsenteret af Maria Zakharova, talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, 19. april, 2018, i det afsnit, der bærer overskriften, »The Political Crimes of the U.K.«. I dette 17 sider lange dokument præsenterede Zakharova en udstrakt gennemgang af britisk folkemord over hele planeten i århundredernes løb. »Afrika har også fået sin andel af lidelser under britiske overgreb. Henved 13 millioner afrikanere blev udskibet fra kontinentet



som slaver. Antallet af afrikanere, der døde under denne periode, er tre til fire gange højere end det antal, der blev fjernet fra kontinentet. Med andre ord, så løber det totale antal ofre op i titals millioner af mennesker ... Historikere mener, at Storbritannien er verdensførende, når det drejer sig om folkemord, i betragtning af de millioner af uskyldige civile, der er blevet dræbt i britiske kolonier.«

Sammenlign nu begge disse tekster med den gentaget erklærede, britiske politik for at ødelægge Donald Trumps præsidentskab, hvor denne politiks mest skamløse trussel kom i en artikel af BBC-journalist Paul Wood, udgivet i londonavisen *Spectator* 21. januar, 2017 – dagen efter Donald Trumps indsættelse – under hovedoverskriften, »Vil Donald Trump blive myrdet, afsat ved et kup eller simpelt hen afsat gennem en rigsretssag?«

Med alt dette, der står fuldstændig klart for jeres indre øje – og som får yderligere kraft gennem bevidstheden om, at Kina og Rusland begge har handlet for at erstatte det bankerotte Britiske Imperium med et Nyt Paradigme – opfordrer vi jer, damer og herrer i læserskarens internationale jury, til at handle i overensstemmelse hermed.

*Foto: Dronningen af Englands gemal hertugen af Edinburgh.*

---

## **Harmonien mellem konfuciansk og vestlig filosofi: Mod økumenisk**

# enhed mellem Øst og Vest. Lektion 5 i LaRouchePAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, 31. marts, 2018

*Det er generelt tilfældet, at folk i både Østen og Vesten ofte har accepteret ideen om, at der findes en eller anden fundamental forskel mellem den kinesiske tankegang og den vestlige tankegang, og at dette er et uoverstigeligt svælg. Som Rudyard Kipling, den britiske imperialist, grundlæggende set sagde, »Øst er Øst, og Vest er Vest, og aldrig skal de tvende mødes«. Som jeg altid har sagt, så er dette ikke en konstatering af fakta, men er derimod en politik – dette er den britiske imperiepolitik, der sørger for, at der eksisterer en opdeling, for det er gennem at holde verden opdelt, at de kan fortsætte med at herske imperialt over de opdelte nationer.*

*Men vi har altså, både her i USA og i Vesten og i Kina, at folk accepterer denne idé om, at der skulle være en eller anden fundamentalt anderledes tankegang. Der er selvfølgelig forskellige karaktertræk i vestlig kultur og i kinesisk kultur – det er der ingen tvivl om. Men folk, der fremfører dette som et argument, er tilbøjelige til at sige, at deres side er den overlegne, og de andres side er underlegen; og dette ser man for øvrigt i Kina såvel som her.*

*Det, jeg vil gøre i dag, er grundlæggende set at tilbagevise denne opfattelse og forsøge at vise, at det, der er fundamentalt for mennesker overalt, er kampen mellem en*

*humanistisk opfattelse af mennesket og så den oligarkiske anskuelse af mennesket som i heldigste fald en eller anden slags avanceret dyr; og at dette er arten af hele den vestlige kulturs historie og af hele den kinesiske kulturs historie.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Lyndon LaRouche: Martin Luther Kings liv og mission**

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

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

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

»Vi har, mener jeg, to problemer, som bør være grundlag for at reflektere over Martins liv i dag. 1) Vi har en national krise. Jeg vil ikke lægge fingrene imellem eller tale ud fra det politiske partiapparat (Demokraterne); men kendsgerningerne skal frem: Denne nationaløkonomi er ved at kollapse. Situationen, med hensyn til USA's grundlæggende økonomiske infrastruktur i dag, er relativt set værre end i 1933, hvor Roosevelt i marts måned kom ind i Det Hvide Hus. Det vil sige, hvis man undersøger infrastruktur, energi osv., livsbetingelserne for vort folk og i hele verden – lad være med at se på de store byer, hvor de går rundt med en facade og siger, alt går godt; men se på lokalsamfundene; Detroit, f.eks., har nu halvdelen af det indbyggertal, byen plejede at have. En industriby er forsvundet. Se på Birmingham, man ser det samme rapporteret; det var aldrig rigt, men deres oplevelse af tab, tab, tab; det er situationen i USA. Og der er en ligegyldighed over for USA's problemer. Mindst 48 af de 50 stater er bankerot, håbløst bankerot; dvs., at staterne umuligt kan øge skatteindtægterne uden at sænke økonomien yderligere, for at imødekomme regeringens essentielle forpligtelser. Det er karakteristisk for mindst 48 stater, og det bliver værre. Hvis man ser på leveomkostningerne, stigningen i leveomkostningerne i forhold til det, der officielt rapporteres, se på priserne for mad hos købmanden hen over de seneste 6 måneder i USA. Se på det faktum, at den amerikanske dollar, som for ikke så længe siden kunne købe en euro for 83 cents; i dag koster det 1 dollar 26-28 cents at købe en euro. Den amerikanske dollar er ved at kollapse i værdi; det, der stiger, er den pengemængde, der associeres til hasardspil, og den mest omfangsrige form for hasardspil finder sted på Wall Street. Pengene går, for rent spekulative formål, til at drive separate hasardspilsindsatser på sidelinjen i økonomien i vejret, for at drive værdien at aktiepriserne op

for visse selskaber; og så snart et eller andet selskab bliver rigt, kommer lederne af selskaberne i fængsel, ligesom i Enron; for vi er gået fra 'stålindustrien' til 'stjæleindustrien'! Det er arten af nationaløkonomien.

Vi er i vanskeligheder. Vi er i vanskeligheder på global skala. Siden januar 2002, da den nuværende præsident holdt en uheldig tale, i sin 'State of the Union'-tale. Holdningen over for USA er faldet hastigt, til det laveste niveau, jeg nogensinde har set; fra nationer i hele verden. I hele Eurasien; i de amerikanske lande, er USA nu foragtet, hvor det i det mindste var respekteret, eller endda elsket, før. Vi er i vanskeligheder. Og se på verden. Verden konfronteres med en stor krise; USA konfronteres med en stor krise, med den måde, det behandler verden på. De største befolkningskoncentrationer i verden, i Kina, f.eks., 1,3 mia. eller mere; Indien, Pakistan, Bangladesh og landene i Sydøstasien; dette er den største befolkningskoncentration på planeten. Det er en fremvoksende del af verden; spørgsmålet er, hvad er USA's relation til disse asiatiske folkeslag, der i det store og hele repræsenterer forskellige kulturelle baggrunde i forhold til USA og Vesteuropa. Hvordan skal vi finde fred i en urolig verden; hvordan skal vi finde forsoning i en verden i vanskeligheder med lande, der har vendt sig mod os pga. Cheneys og et par andres krigspolitikker?

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

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

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

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

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

står overfor, tilfældet med Shakespeares Hamlet; især Hamlets monolog i 3. akt.

Hvad handlede det om? Martin var en sand Guds mand, på en måde, som meget få mennesker kan virkeliggøre i deres livstid. Det var ikke alene det, at han var en Guds mand, men at han voksede op til fuldstændigt at forstå, hvad det ville sige. Hans billede var selvfølgelig Kristus og Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Det var hans kilde til styrke. Han levede det. Han havde besteget bjergets top, på et tidspunkt, hvor han vidste, hans liv var truet af magtfulde kræfter internt i USA. Og han sagde, 'jeg vil ikke vige tilbage fra denne mission, om de så dræber mig'; præcis som Kristus sagde, og jeg er sikker på, Martin tænkte på dette, på dette tidspunkt. Kristi korsfæstelsespassion er det billede, der er essensen af kristendom. Det er et billede i f.eks. Tyskland og andre steder, hvor Bachs Mattæus-passion opføres, en ca. to timer lang forestilling. Og i disse to timer genlever publikum, menigheden, sangerne, musikerne på en kraftfuld måde Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Dette har altid været vigtigt, at genleve dette; at indfange essensen af, hvad Kristus betyder for alle kristne, og Martin viste dette.

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

fortjent til den plads, man ønsker at have i evigheden?

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

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

Lad os tage tilfældet Jeanne d'Arc, til sammenligning. Dette er den sande historie; hun var en så signifikant person i det 15. århundrede, historien blev grundigt dokumenteret dengang og er blevet krydstjekket osv. Hun var en person i hele kristendommen; hun er en hovedperson i Frankrigs historie. Her er hun så, en ung kvinde (17), der kom fra bondestanden, og som havde forhåbninger om, at Frankrig måtte befries fra de normanniske ridders forfærdelige besættelse; at Frankrig måtte blive en sand nation, og at det måtte løftes ud af sin tilstand og blive en nation for at tage sig af disse problemer; at Gud ønskede, dette skulle ske. Så, gennem flere hændelser, henvendte hun sig til en prins, som var den nominelle arving til Frankrigs trone, og hun sagde til denne prins – jeg har glemt, der var diverse akkreditiver – 'Gud ønsker, at du skal blive konge'. Og han så på hende og sagde, 'Hvad ønsker du af mig?' Hun svarede, 'jeg ønsker ingenting af dig; Gud ønsker, at du skal være konge'. Og, på grund af hendes kraftfulde personlighed og hendes mission, gav kongen hende kommando over nogle soldater til en meget alvorlig kamp



på det tidspunkt, idet han formodede, hun ville blive dræbt som leder af disse soldater, og det ville løse problemet. Men hun blev ikke dræbt, hun vandt slaget, som hun personligt anførte. Og Frankrig blev mobiliseret til sin uafhængighed; ideen var dets uafhængighed i det store og hele som et resultat. Så kom tidspunktet, hvor kongen blev kronet, prinsen blev kronet til konge: men så forrådte kongen hende, til Frankrigs fjender, til briterne, normannerne. Og hun blev retsforfulgt af inkquisitionen, som var en rædselsfuld ting, den værste form for uretfærdighed man kan forestille sig. Og under retssagen blev hun tilbudt lokkemad; hvis du trækker dig lidt, vil vi ikke brænde dig levende på bålet. Hun sagde nej; hun veg tilbage; måske skulle jeg gå på kompromis, hun havde præster, der forsøgte at få hende til at gå på kompromis. Hun sagde, 'jeg vil ikke gå på kompromis. Jeg kan ikke forråde min mission'. Hun havde besteget bjergets top; jeg vil ikke forråde min mission; jeg vil fastholde min kurs. Så de tog hende og bandt hende til en pæl; de stablede brændet op om pælen; de satte ild til bålet, mens hun var i live og kogte hende ihjel. Så åbnede de brændestakken for at se, om hun var i live eller ej og fandt, at hun var død, og så fortsatte de processen og genantændte bålet og brændte hende til aske (hun var da 19, -red.)

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

Betydningen af dette for os i dag, er, at pga. denne sejr, pga. det, der skete med Louis 11 af Frankrig, fik vi den første europæiske stat, i hvilken *hele* regeringen var ansvarlig for *hele* folkets almene vel. Det almene vel betyder præcis det, det betyder i 1. korintherbrev, kap. 13, hvor Paulus skriver om agápe, undertiden kaldet kærlighed eller godgørenhed. Det er denne egenskab; det er ikke loven, det er ikke lovbogen, der tæller; det er ens kærlighed til menneskeheden, der tæller; at man altid må leve for ens

kærlighed til menneskeheden. Og derfor er en regering ikke legitim, undtagen som en regering, der officielt er forpligtet over for ikke alene det almene velfærd for *hele* folket, men også over for forbedringen af livsbetingelserne for deres efterkommere. Og for første gang i Frankrig, i denne stat, [fik man] princippet om forfatningsmæssig lov; at en regering ikke kan behandle nogle blandt befolkningen som menneskeligt kvæg. Det er ikke lovligt, det er ikke en nation, hvis den behandler nogle blandt sin befolkning som menneskeligt kvæg. Man skal tænke på *hele* befolkningens almene velfærd; det må være indfanget i forpligtelse over for *hele* folket, og over for deres efterkommere. For vi er alle dødelige, og for at vække i os selv de passioner, mens vi er i live, som vil tilskynde os til at gøre det gode, må vi have en følelse af, at forbruget af vort liv, brugen af vor talent, vil betyde noget for de kommende generationer. De bedste mennesker ser efter ting, ligesom Moses, som vil finde sted, når han ikke længere selv er der til at nyde dem! Denne fornemmelse for udødelighed er det, som de bedste forældre opofrer for deres børn; det er det, som lokalsamfund opofrer for uddannelse til deres børn, for deres børns muligheder. Man gennemgår pinen ved lidelser og mangel, men man har en følelse af, at man er på vej fremad, at ens liv vil betyde noget, at man kan dø med et smil på læben; man har overvundet døden, man har brugt sin talent vist, hvorfor livet vil betyde noget bedre for de kommende generationer. Det var princippet. Det princip inspirerede den mand, der blev kong Henrik 7 af England, til at gøre det samme imod den onde kong Richard 3, og til at etablere England på det tidspunkt som den anden, moderne nationalstat. Det var på en måde, hvad Martin gjorde. Samme form for proces.

Men lad os nu tage den anden side af sagen. Lad os tage tilfældet Hamlet. Hamlet siger, vi har muligheden for at kæmpe og befri os selv fra forfærdelige tilstande, men, men – hvad sker der, når vi dør? Hvad sker der efter døden? Det er frygten for, hvad der sker efter døden, som gør folk til

krystere. Og det er vores problem i USA i dag. Det er problemet med vores lederskab i det Demokratiske Parti; det er problemet med det Republikanske Parti, for det er ikke alle i det Republikanske Parti, der er dårlige, nogle af dem er meget gode, og jeg har til hensigt at inkorporere nogle af dem i min regering; jeg er ikke særlig partisk, når det drejer sig om regeringen. Jeg er partisk med hensyn til at få den etableret.

Det er pointen. Problemet her er det følgende: Tror vi rent faktisk på, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyrene? Tror I på, at, i skolerne i dag, i aviserne i dag; tror I på, at amerikanere tror på, på nogen som helst signifikant måde, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyret? Det er ikke det, vi underviser; se på vores standardpensum. Mange af jer ved noget om uddannelse. Vores uddannelsespolitik er en national forbrydelse. Man lærer ingenting; man lærer at bestå en prøve. Man spørger sig selv, om de, der udarbejder prøven, ved, hvad de taler om. Man har prøver at bestå i forskellige steder i landet, ikke for at teste, hvad man har gjort ved eleverne med hensyn til, hvad de ved; undertiden kommer eleverne og siger, 'jeg ved ingenting, i mine skoleår lærte jeg ingenting'. Sådan, som man underviser nu. Det, man tester, er elevernes lydighedstræning i dette skoledistrikt eller den del af landet, målt ud fra underlødighed. Distrikterne konkurrerer om penge! Og præstationerne, som skoleelevernes hundetræning, bliver en standard for, hvor mange penge, og hvor mange udmærkelser, dette distrikt vil modtage det følgende år. Vi er ikke længere interesseret ... Vi tror som nation ikke længere på at udvikle mennesker! Vi er, ligesom det gamle Rom, blevet et samfund for 'brød og cirkus'; få din krumme, og lad dig underholde! Og underholdningen bliver mere og mere ond, som det skrider frem. F.eks., arbejder folk i dag; er deres mentalitet, at de skal arbejde? Tror de på arbejde, tror de på, at samfundet giver dem mulighed for at arbejde? Nej, det gør det ikke. Det giver dem mulighed for at få fat i nogle penge. Hvad er den største vækstindustri i USA? Hasardspil! Hvad er Wall Street? Hasardspil. Hvad er Enron? Hasardspil.

Hvad er disse fyre, der kommer i fængsel i New York? Hasardspillere. Mentaliteten i landet er, at, hvis du sidder i held og vinder i lotteriet og vinder på væddeløbsbanen, så går det fremad for dig. Til trods for, at ens industri er ved at kollapse, ens landbrug er væk, byrådet ikke længere har råd til at sørge for centrale behov; vi er blevet et hasardspilssamfund. Vi er afhængige af hvad? Masseunderholdning. Hvilken form for masseunderholdning? Er dette noget, man i realiteten bør skamme sig over?

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

Jeg startede en ungdomsbevægelse for henved 4 år siden, der fokuserer på unge mennesker, 18-25 årige, dvs. aldersgruppen for universitetsstuderende. Som I ved, når folk bliver omkring 18 til 25 år, under normale betingelser, er de gået videre end til at tænke på sig selv som unge mennesker, halvt voksne, halvt børn, og til at blive voksne mennesker. De har den voksnes selvtillid, den voksnes impulser osv. De er klar til at påtage sig ansvar i samfundet. I et velordnet samfund, ville alle have adgang til en kvalitetsuniversitetsuddannelse, for at udvikle den enkeltes talenter for at finde ud af, hvad deres mission i livet skal være, hvilken form for karriere, de skal satse på, og man giver dem muligheden for at gennemarbejde dette, finde ud af dette, finde ud af, hvem, de virkelig er som voksen, og at vælge deres fremtidige profession i livet på denne basis. Det, jeg understreger med denne træning, er, forstå forskellen mellem menneske og dyr.

Jeg bliver lidt teknisk omkring dette, for det er et vigtigt punkt. Hvad er forskellen mellem menneske og dyr? Kan man bevise, at mennesket ikke blot er et dyr? Og hvordan kan man bevise det? Hvis mennesket var en abe, f.eks., ville det menneskelige befolkningstal på denne planet aldrig have oversteget et par millioner individer. Så lad være med at gøre mennesket til en abekat (et fjols). Vi har nu over 6 mia. mennesker, vi skal sørge for, på denne planet, og tallet

vokser. Pointen er, at mennesket har været i stand til at opdage, hvad intet dyr kan gøre, at opdage universelle, fysiske principper i universet, og at anvende disse opdagede principper til at frembringe forbedringer i samfundet, som øger menneskets magt over naturen; præcis, som man kan læse i Skabelsesberetningen i 1. Mosebog: mand og kvinde skabt i Skaberens billede, efter hans lignelse; og ansvarlige for denne funktion. Det er, hvad vi er. Når vi underviser i fysisk videnskab; når vi underviser i klassisk kunst og den slags ting, når vi underviser i historie ud fra dette standpunkt, formidler vi i realiteten en fornemmelse af deres menneskelighed. De er i stand til at genopføre fortidens store principper, det være sig inden for kunst eller inden for fysisk videnskab. Når de kender dette, kender de forskellen på sig selv og dyret; de bryster sig af dette og siger, vi er menneskelige. Og de kan se på hinanden med kærlighed, en form for kærlighed, der kommer til udtryk inden for uddannelse med den rigtige form for undervisning, hvor eleverne er delagtige i processen med at kæmpe sig igennem handlingen for sig selv at opdage et princip, der præsenteres for dem som en udfordring og et paradoks. Det vil sige, en kærlig relation, en klasse med typisk 15-25 universitets- eller skoleelever, hvor eleverne gives ansvaret for, gives en udfordring med at kæmpe sig igennem det for sig selv, og den gode lærer forsøger at fremkalde denne form for respons blandt eleverne; finde to til tre i klassen, der kan starte diskussionen og få hele klassen involveret i diskussionen, så det, der kommer ud af det, ikke er udenadslære fra en lærebog, men at det, der kommer ud af det, er en proces, hvor man i en social oplevelse opdager betydningen af et princip, som om de selv havde gjort den oprindelige opdagelse. Dette gøres, ikke ved at undervise den enkelte elev, selv om det nogen gange virker, men ved at få eleverne til at interagere i diskussionsprocessen. Det er derfor, man helst skal have en klassestørrelse på mellem 15-25 elever. Ikke for mange, som kan udelukke muligheden for, at alle kan deltage. Og ikke for få, så man ikke får stimulering til at starte diskussionen. Det er denne sociale proces med en

relation mellem mennesker, der elsker hinanden i en højere forstand, fordi de har været fælles om processen med at opdage et princip. Eller ... noget om historie; men de var fælles om det, og ideen om at være fælles om menneskelig viden, som menneskelig viden, er den essentielle kærlighedshandling. Man elsker menneskeheden og er tilfreds med menneskeheden, når man har arbejdet sammen for at gøre en opdagelse sammen. Og man indser, man kan regne med dem til denne form for metode – har man et problem med dem? Gå tilbage til metoden. Tal med dem på samme måde, som man gør i klasseværelset. Og man kæmper sammen igennem det, disse unge mennesker kæmper til kl.3-4 om morgenen. Når jeg holder foredrag for disse fyre, er de over mig i henved fire timer. Jeg holder en præsentation på en times tid, de er over mig konstant. Men det er smukt, det er vidunderligt. Jeg tror, at alle, der har arbejdet med undervisning, ved, hvad jeg taler om. Det er smukt; det er vidunderligt.

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

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

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

Og det er vores situation i dag, og grunden til, at jeg er så glad for denne lejlighed til at være sammen med jer, for I typificerer dem, der kæmper med vanskeligheder, i dette land og uden for dette land, for den såkaldte 'glemte mand'; som Franklin Roosevelt, der i 1933 blev indkaldt til at være præsident. 80 % af befolkningen i USA i særdeleshed, og mange i hele verden, er den glemte mand og kvinde. Der er ikke rigtig nogen, der kerer sig om dem. Tag eksemplet med historien om sundhedssektoren; tag eksemplet med alle mulige ting. Den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan forny en nation, som Martin ydede et stort bidrag til en fornyelse af USA, er, at man må gå til den glemte mand og kvinde; især til de ubemidlede, og hvis man kan udtrykke en kærlig holdning over for problemet med de ubemidlede, dem, der befinder sig på den laveste side i livet, så er man i stand til at repræsentere det princip, på hvilket moderne regeringsførelse bør baseres; det samme princip, som Jeanne d'Arc på sin vis muliggjorde gennem sit bidrag til Frankrig som den første, moderne nationalstat, der var helliget det almene velfærd. Hvis man vil være en ægte politiker, må man være forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Man må være forpligtet over for menneskeheden,

og for at være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, må man se på det menneske, der befinder sig i de *værste* omstændigheder, generelt, og løfte dem op. Så har man virkelig bevist, at man kerer sig om det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke går til disse mennesker, er man ikke *med* det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke har sine rødder i kampen for det almene velfærd, er man ikke i stand til at lede vores nation, som er en nation, der forfatningsmæssigt er forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Martin havde dette. Alle de store ledere i historien er som regel kommet fra denne form for baggrund; de fødtes ikke til at være ledere, de blev ikke valgt som ledere; nogle blev valgt i løbet af livet, men de startede ikke med at etablere deres lederskab ved at blive valgt. De etablerede deres lederskab ved at finde deres rødder i kampen for menneskehedens velfærd. De blev repræsentanter for en eller anden gruppe, der kæmpede for deres rettigheder, eller de blev fortalere for denne gruppe, der kæmpede for sine rettigheder. Og de kom frem til en lederposition, fordi de havde en indbygget, moralsk karakter, i billedet af Kristi passion og korsfæstelse. Og jo mere, de kommer ind i det, og jo farligere, det bliver, i takt med, at de vinder mere indflydelse – livet *bliver* farligere i takt med, at man vinder mere indflydelse – så indser de, at de sætter deres liv på spil, og de må spørge sig selv: hvad er det, jeg vil risikere mit liv for; hvad er det for en sag, jeg ikke vil forråde, selv, hvis prisen er, at det koster mig mit liv? Og han kastes direkte tilbage til Kristi korsfæstelse og passion. Og dér er vi i dag. Martin havde dette; og problemet med USA og bevægelsen i dag, er, at bevægelsen er blevet, skal vi sige, for 'civiliseret' med hensyn til at bøje af for at komme ud af det med det politiske *establishment*, og hvor den tenderer mod at tro på, at vejen til succes er at bøje af for at komme ud af det med dem. Man fortaber passionen, som bør motivere den sande, politiske leder. Og passionen er denne helligelse; man har en talent, man har en fornemmelse af, hvad ens liv betyder, man har en fornemmelse af forpligtelse, af en mission i livet, for at opløfte nationen ved at løfte en bestemt del



af befolkningen, eller hele befolkningen. Og man vil *ikke gøre noget som helst* for at forråde dette. Det giver én kraft. Det giver én kraft til at være et menneske, der er skabt i den levende Skabers billede. Man tapper ind i det. Martin tappede ind i det. Han var en Guds mand, ikke kun af Gud, men en Guds mand. Han var en mand, som, i løbet af livet, af skæbnen fik givet missionen at være en Guds mand. Og han havde styrken til at gøre det. Han havde styrken til at gå i Kristi fodspor; til at gennemleve Gethsemane; til at gennemgå korsfæstelsen. Han havde denne styrke. Som Jeanne havde på sin måde.

Og det er den lektie, jeg mener, må undervises, må blive forstået, hvis vi skal redde denne nation. Vi må tappe ind i denne kraft. Og som jeg siger, blandt alle de billeder af nylige, politiske ledere i USA, er Martin, både som en national leder og som en global leder, hvilket han også var med hensyn til sin indflydelse, det bedste eksempel på den form for personlighed, vi må have og må udvikle for at komme ud at det forfærdelige, frygtindgydende rod, der i dag truer os.

Mange tak.«

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

---

## **Lyndon LaRouche: Det britiske Imperium er stadig den**

# civiliserede verdens fjende nr. 1

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

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

*Lad os lytte til LaRouche:*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Theresa Mays anti-russiske korstog er intet andet end UK's krig mod Trump

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 26. marts, 2018* – Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har hen over de seneste 35 år spillet en hovedrolle i udformningen af relationer mellem nationer til det bedre: gennem LaRouches idé til præsident Reagans Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) fra 1983, og gennem »LaRouche-doktrinen« for stormagtsrelationer, som ledsagede denne idé; og gennem deres kampagne fra 1989 for den »Eurasiske Landbro«, som sluttelig bidrog til Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, der nu udvikler mange nationer i hele verden. Hele vejen igennem var fjenderne af disse tiltag hen mod et nyt paradigme for udvikling, City of Londons finansimperium og britisk geopolitik.[1]

Denne tidligere, hyppigt skjulte virkelighed er pludselig, på dramatisk vis, blevet åbenlys. Den britiske premierminister Theresa May og udenrigsminister Boris »bondske« Johnson har tyranniseret USA og 14 europæiske nationer ind i en eskalerende konfrontation med Rusland, der tilsigter at ødelægge stormagtssamarbejde for fremskridt gennem projekterne i Bælte & Vej, og som meget hurtigt kan føre til verdenskrig.

I går understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at London har gjort dette som en reaktion på miskrediteringen af det af britisk efterretning styrede Russiagate-kupforsøg mod præsident Donald Trump. Hun sprængte den udokumenterede sag om »russisk nervegift« som værende intet andet end Russiagate fortsat, genopfundet og genoplivet. Denne sags foreløbige succes, efter at Russiagate mod Trump var slået fejl, er ekstremt farlig, sagde hun. Både Kina og Rusland vil reagere på denne ændrede,

transatlantiske dagsorden.

Kina har, gennem sin præsident Xi Jinping og sine partiorganer som *Global Times*, indset, at Kinas fredelige opkomst, konfronteret med et sandt stormløb af britisk geopolitisk og økonomisk krigsførelse, måske ikke vil få lov at blive let eller fredelig.

Men Kina har udløst en udviklingsdynamik og hæver produktivitet og levestandarder i mange nationer, såvel som i sin egen, og bruger et nyt koncept, som Lyndon LaRouche for 30 år siden kaldte »Verdenslandbro-udviklingen«. Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ tiltrækker nu også nationer fra selv Vesteuropa. Dets lederskab vil ikke lade sig standse af toldkrig eller investeringsembargo; i stedet anvender det dette nye paradigme for at stoppe dem.

Som Helga LaRouche udtrykte det, så er Kina omsider i færd med at feje Londons århundredelange Malthus-politik og nulsums-geopolitik til side; og Kina erstatter det med et Nyt Paradigme for gensidig fordel for nationer, for udryddelse af fattigdom, videnskabeligt fremskridt og for »et fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«. Lyndon LaRouche har i 50 år insisteret på nødvendigheden af denne udskiftning. Hans LaRouche-bevægelse har fremlagt ammunitionen til overvindelse af angrebene mod præsident Trump, som kommer fra britisk efterretning, og for de tiltag for en økonomisk politik, der kan virkeliggøre Amerikas fremtid på den »Nye Silkevej«.

[1] Se **Harley Schlangers præsentation af geopolitikken historie**, fra serien, 'Hvad er det Nye Paradigme' (video; dansk pdf.)

*Foto: Præsident Donald Trump i samtale med britiske PM Theresa May under et bilateralt møde i det ovale kontor, 27. januar, 2017. Premierminister May var det første statsoverhoved, der aflagde statsbesøg i Det Hvide Hus. (Official White House Photo)*

---

# Videnskaben om at gøre en ende på fattigdom og geopolitik

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 25. marts, 2018* – I det aktuelle, globale miljø, med undertiden hektiske diskussioner om geopolitiske forholdsregler og modforholdsregler, om handelssanktioner og gengældelse, om udskiftninger af personer og personel i ledende regeringer i verden – side om side med det klare potentiale for dramatiske ændringer, som præsident Trumps nylige, improviserede opringning til præsident Putin var et bevis på – er det nyttigt at træde et skridt tilbage og vende tilbage til nogle grundlæggende spørgsmål, som begynder med et halvt århundredes fundamentale opdagelser af Lyndon LaRouche, især inden for videnskaben om fysisk økonomi.

Denne eneste måde, hvorpå vi kan gøre en ende på det nuværende, geopolitiske mareridt, som er Det britiske Imperiums system, og etablere det politiske fundament for en varig fred, skrev Lyndon LaRouche tilbage i marts 1984 («LaRouche-doktrinen: Udkast til aftalememorandum mellem USA og U.S.S.R.»), er ved at sikre: »a) Alle nationalstaters ubetingede suverænitet, og b) Samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater med henblik på promovering af ubegrænsede muligheder for at blive delagtig i fordelene ved teknologisk fremskridt, til gensidig fordel for hver enkelt nationalstat, og alle nationalstater.«

Et afgørende spejlbillede af et sådant fremskridt er udryddelse af fattigdom og inkludering af voksende befolkningslag i teknologisk progressive former for produktion. Her har Kina i løbet af de seneste 35 år været

ledende i verden og har reduceret sin fattige befolkning fra 875 million i 1981 til i dag 30 million. Tilbage i 1981 husede Kina 46 % af verdens fattige inden for landets grænser; i dag er denne procentsats mangefold reduceret, til 5 %.

Denne udvikling accelererede med begyndelse i 2008, da politikken med at bygge et netværk af højhastigheds-jernbanekorridorer blev sat i gang i Kina og bragte industrialisering og teknologisk fremskridt til alle hjørner af landet. Et resultat har været, at fattigdom i Kina blev reduceret med ikke mindre end 85 % mellem 2008 og 2017 – under et årti.

Med præsident Xi Jinpings lancering i 2013 af Bælte & Vej Initiativet, er denne samme drivkraft for udvikling begyndt at stråle ud over hele planeten – spredningen af den Nye Silkevejsånd, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche så ofte refererer til.

Lad os overveje Kinas præstationer i lyset af de indledende bemærkninger i Lyndon LaRouches artikel, »Om LaRouches opdagelse«, fra 21. november, 1993 (genudgivet i *EIR*, 11. aug., 2017):

»Det afgørende indhold af mit originale bidrag til Leibniz' videnskab om fysisk økonomi, er skabelsen af en metode til at behandle det kausale forhold mellem, på den ene side, enkeltpersoners bidrag til aksiomatisk revolutionerende fremskridt inden for videnskabelige og analoge former for viden og, på den anden side, de heraf følgende forøgelse af den potentielle befolkningstæthed i de tilsvarende samfund.«

En lignende fremgangsmåde – om end uden den dybtgående, videnskabelige og filosofiske stringens, LaRouche har skabt – er i realiteten grundlaget for Kinas præstationer. Som præsident Xi Jinping præsenterede sine marchordrer for økonomien i en tale 9. juni, 2009:

»Udløs i størst mulig grad videnskabens og teknologiens enorme potentiale som den primære kraft for produktion ... og

udvikling, støttet af videnskab og teknologi, og som er rettet mod fremtiden, og fremskynd tempoet for opbygning af et innovativt land.«

Man kunne således udmærket karakterisere Kinas fremgangsmåde i dag som anvendelsen af det Amerikanske Økonomiske System med kinesiske karaktertræk, en fremgangsmåde, der har ført til en succes uden sidestykke i udviklingen af Kinas relative befolkningstæthed, og på det seneste, med Bælte & Vej Initiativet, hele verdens.

Tiden er inde til, at USA atter vedtager denne politik som sin egen og herved omsider gør en ende på fattigdom over hele planeten, og samtidig driver en pæl i hjertet på britisk geopolitik.

*Foto: Kinesiske børn hilser præsident Trump med flag under hans besøg i Kina, november, 2017.*

---

**Kreativitetens musik.**

**LaRouchePAC's**

**Undervisningsserie 2018**

**»Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«**

**Lektion 4,**

**17. marts, 2018: pdf,**

# dansk/engelsk; video

*I dag vil jeg guide jer til den fremtidige renæssance af klassisk kultur, som jeg er overbevist om, ikke ville have været mulig uden Lyndon LaRouches opdagelser om kreativitetens forrang, ikke blot i menneskelige relationer, men også i universet som helhed. Jeg træder i baggrunden til fordel for Lyndon LaRouche selv; og til fordel for forskellige uddrag af hans mange skrifter, og ligeledes klip fra video og audio, håber jeg at kunne komme ind på de hovedtemaer, som har optaget ham hele hans liv, som begyndte i 1922. Dette vil også være meget nyttigt, for det vil gøre det muligt for os at fortsætte, hvor Dennis Small slap i den foregående lektion, hvor han talte om den særdeles uheldige David Hume. Jeg vil diskutere den ondartede indflydelse fra den måske ondeste filosof til alle tider, en person, der er baseret på Hume, men som gjorde noget endnu værre; nemlig Immanuel Kant.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ 35 år i**



# dag: Omsæt Lyndon LaRouches vise ord til handling for et Strategisk Forsvar af Jorden. LPAC Internationale Webcast, 23. marts. 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: Det er i dag den 23. marts, 2018, en meget gunstig dato: Det er nemlig 35 års dagen for en meget vigtig dato, som var 23. marts, 1983, hvor præsident Ronald Reagan annoncerede vedtagelsen af det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ** (SDI; Strategic Defense Initiative). I dag er det et meget passende tidspunkt for at bedømme den stadig mere presserende nødvendige vedtagelse af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur for planeten, og den samtidige nye økonomiske arkitektur, som må ledsage den.

Vi befinder os i et meget dramatisk øjeblik i verdenshistorien, og jeg mener, at, hvis vi træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede, så står det klart, at verdensordenen, som vi har kendt den i de seneste 70 år, er i færd med at undergå en total transformation. Og udfaldet af de strategiske kampe, der raser netop nu, både på den nationale scene her i USA, men især på den globale scene; udfaldet af disse strategiske kampe vil afgøre menneskeheds historie i mange generationer fremover.

Med de begivenheder, der har fundet sted i løbet af de seneste tre uger, siden den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin den 1. marts annoncerede, at Rusland havde udviklet en helt ny generation af strategiske våben, baseret på avancerede fysiske [principper], og som er i stand til at gennemtrænge alle kendte forsvarssystemer, har vi set, hvor dramatisk nødvendigt det er, med det presserende i en sådan ny

sikkerhedsarkitektur. Ikke én, der bygger på Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD; garanteret gensidig ødelæggelse), men derimod én, der bygger på win-win-overlevelse og økonomisk fremskridt *for alle nationer* på denne planet; nødvendigheden heraf bliver i stigende grad mere presserende. Jeg vil gerne fremhæve, hvad præsident Putin selv sagde i denne tale 1. marts til den føderale forsamling:

Han sagde:

*» ... lad os sætte os ved forhandlingsbordet og sammen udtænke et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation. ... Dette er et vendepunkt for hele verden og for dem, der er villige til, og i stand til, at forandre sig; de, der handler og går fremad, vil tage føringen.«*

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/56957>

Men, snarere end klart og nøgternt at vurdere denne ændrede, strategiske virkelighed, med denne game-changing tale af Ruslands præsident, og besvare dette tilbud for at forhandle, med hans ord, »et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation«, for endelig at bringe denne nihilistiske dødsspiral med stadigt mere dødbringende masseudslettelsesvåben til en afslutning; snarere end at gøre dette, har briterne og deres såkaldte »partnere« i Europa forsøgt at oppiske en generel støtte til en krigskonfrontation mod Rusland ved anvendelse af det, Labour-partiets leder, Jeremy Corbyn, meget korrekt karakteriserede som det, han kaldte »fejlbehæftet efterretning« og »uvederhæftige dossiers« af den type, som blev brugt til at retfærdiggøre invasionen af Irak. Og som Jeremy Corbyn advarede om, så bør vi ikke »affinde os med en ny Kold Krig ... og en intolerance over for dissens som under McCarthy-perioden«.

Som **Helga Zepp-LaRouche** i går understregede i sin

**internationale webcast**, så har briterne og Theresa May, i deres forsøg på at gennemtvinge en sådan krigsprovokation, overspillet deres hånd. Deres metoder og deres mål står nu afsløret for hele verden at se. På trods af Theresa Mays bestræbelser på at presse præsident Trump over i et hjørne, hvor han ikke ville vove at forsøge at tage skridt, der ville gøre det muligt for ham at honorere sin forpligtelse til at forbedre relationerne med Rusland; snarere end at lade sig blive bakket ind i et hjørne, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde, så udmanøvrerede præsident Trump imidlertid hele operationen ved at tage telefonen og ringe til præsident Putin og lykønske ham med genvalget og hans næste periode som Ruslands præsident, og fortsatte med en meget sober diskussion mellem de to statsoverhoveder om nogle af de meget vigtige, fælles bestræbelser og fælles udfordringer, som disse to nationer, USA og Rusland, sammen konfronteres med; og som, hvis vi fik lov at gøre det, vi kunne arbejde sammen om at løse, såsom krisen i Syrien; såsom muligheden for et totalt gennembrud for fred på Koreahalvøen; såsom den igangværende situation i Ukraine; og meget signifikant, såsom at forhindre et nyt våbenkapløb.

Umiddelbart efter denne telefonsamtale, blev pressen, som I kan tænke jer, hysterisk, og Det Hvide Hus' pressesekretær Sarah Sanders holdt en pressekonference i briefing-værelset i Det Hvide Hus, hvor hun ikke mindre end et halvt dusin gange understregede den absolutte betydning af at opretholde en dialog mellem USA og Rusland på lederskabsniveau, omkring fælles interesser og fælles udfordringer.

Jeg vil afspille nogle eksempler på nogle af disse gentagne udtalelser fra Sarah Sanders på denne pressebriefing i Det Hvide Hus.

*Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:*

SARAH SANDERS: We want to continue to have a dialogue with Russia, and continue to talk about some of the shared interests

we have, whether it's North Korea, Iran, and particularly as the

President noted today, slowing the tensions when it comes to an

arms race, something that is clearly important to both leaders...

We want to continue to have dialogue so that we can work on some of the issues that concern both countries, and we're going

to continue to do that, while also continuing to be tough on a number of things...

The President once again has maintained that it's important for us to have a dialogue with Russia so that we can focus on some areas of shared interests...

These are conversations that sometimes take place, and certainly the President finds there to be an importance in having

that dialogue with Russia so that we can talk about some of the

big problems that face the world...

We disagree with the fact that we shouldn't have conversations with Russia. There are important topics that we should be able to discuss, and that is why the President's going

to continue to have that dialogue.

Again the focus was to talk about areas of shared interests.

We know that we need to continue a dialogue. It's important for

a lot of the safety and security of people across the globe.

We

would like to be able to work with them on things like North Korea, on Iran, and also both countries shared interest in

lowering the tensions when it comes to an arms race, recognizing that that's not the best thing for either country, and so we want to be able to have those conversations and that was the point of today's call.... [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's a very clear message, obviously. Now, on the same day, President Trump himself reiterated exactly the same

points in a couple of tweets that he posted, and I would like to

just read you those tweets. He said:

"I called President Putin of Russia to congratulate him on his election victory (in past, Obama called him also). The Fake

News Media is crazed because they wanted me to excoriate him.

They are wrong! Getting along with Russia (and others) is a good

thing, not a bad thing."

"They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, ISIS, Iran, and even the coming Arms Race. Bush tried

to get along, but didn't have the 'smarts.' Obama and Clinton tried, but didn't have the energy or chemistry (remember RESET).

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!" he concludes.

Now of course that final phrase is a quotation directly from President Ronald Reagan. And this direct reference is a very timely one, and perhaps is not merely a coincidental one: As I

said, today, March 23rd, is the 35th anniversary of one of the groundbreaking moments in modern history, and it's one which completely reshaped the global, strategic geometry at that time,

and which remains immediately relevant all the way up to the

present day.

That moment, March 23rd, 1983 was representative of a complete shock, a shock wave which was felt around the world. This was the surprise announcement by President Ronald Reagan at

the conclusion of a live, national television broadcast which was

an address to the nation, nominally on national security. But what President Reagan did at the conclusion of that broadcast, to

the surprise of almost all of his leading advisors in the White

House even, was to announce what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, what President Reagan called a "vision of the future, which offers hope."

In the speech, what President Reagan did was that he committed the United States to a crash program, a crash scientific program for the development of advanced technologies

which would be based on new physical principles to (quote/unquote) "free the world from the threat of nuclear war."

And so, in so doing, President Reagan completely overthrew the ideology of retaliatory nuclear deterrence through the threat of

instantaneous, total nuclear response in the event of the detection of a nuclear attack against the territory of the United

States. This was what was so-called Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).

President Reagan completely rejected the very premise of Mutually Assured Destruction and in so doing, Reagan shocked the

world, and truly did change the course of world history. So, right now, why don't we wind the clock back 35 years, and listen

to what the world heard on that night, March 23rd, 1983:

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century...

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never

be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and

defend against aggression – to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States,

or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks

to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he

won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works.

But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one

kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now

that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful

nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the

ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is

planning

to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable – quite

the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is

based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any

attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different

world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age...

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other

occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have

proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisors, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have

underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must

thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and



for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides....

Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly

lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisors, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we

embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat

with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and

destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own

soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current

technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort....

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive

policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great

talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies,

I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research

and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of

eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles.

This

could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose – one all people share – is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history.

There

will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it.

As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you. [end video]

OGDEN: That was 35 years ago today.

Now, just as a side note, incidentally, President Trump is not ignorant of this history. In 1999, far before he ever was a

candidate for President, in a an interview with none other than

Wolf Blitzer on CNN, President Trump actually addressed what he

thought of as the necessity for the Strategic Defense Initiative,

but also the necessity for sitting down and having talks to work

out the tensions between the United States and Russia. Here's just a quick quote from President Trump. He said:

"As far as nuclear is concerned, this country, us, we need a shield..."

Wolf Blitzer said, "A Strategic Defense Initiative?"

And Trump affirmed that, saying, "Because Russia is unstable. We need a missile defense shield. People used to criticize Reagan, but now it's very developable. We need a shield... We need a change. The ABM Treaty was 1972. Who knew what technology would develop? We have to sit down with the Russians and many others."

So, that was just a side note. That was Nov. 28, 1999. But as I think you can see, now-President Trump remains committed to

that inclination to sit down with the Russians and many others –

North Korea, for example; and to resolve these nuclear threats.

If you just go back again to that date in 1983, this was 35 years ago. In President Reagan's own words, he said that what he

announced that night would, indeed, change the course of world history; and it did. And, it took most of the world completely

by surprise. But, it didn't come out of nowhere, and this history is very important for viewers to understand.

Let me just read you a portion of what Lyndon LaRouche had to say at that time. This is a statement that he issued the morning following that historic speech, so this is from March 24,

1983. What Mr. LaRouche had to say was the following:

"Only high-level officials of government, or a private citizen as intimately knowledgeable of details of the international political and strategic situation as I am privileged to be, can even begin to foresee the Earth-shaking

impact the President's television address last night will have throughout the world... [T]he words the President spoke last night can never be put back into the bottle. Most of the world will soon know, and will never forget that policy announcement.

With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

"Today I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope for humanity's future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of greatness never to be forgotten."

So that was Lyndon LaRouche, March 24, 1983. Now, as LaRouche alluded to in that statement, he was no bystander or casual observer of the events of that night President Reagan announced the SDI. In fact, the grand idea behind what Reagan announced that night, came directly from none other than Lyndon

LaRouche himself. I would like to play for you a brief excerpt

of Mr. LaRouche, in his own words, speaking about the background

to what had shocked the world that night – March 23, 1983.

This

is taken from a video that LaRouche PAC published about ten years

ago, back in 2008, on the 25th anniversary of the SDI speech.

The video was titled "A Brief History of Lyndon LaRouche's SDI."

So, let's listen to what Mr. LaRouche had to say in that video.

LYNDON LAROUCHE

: I had been organizing the SDI operation, including initially from 1977, long before it was called an SDI. I was the one who said, "We're going to make a project of this thing." So, I adopted this and stated this as my program in 1979, when I was running as a Presidential candidate.

Then, I had this conversation with Reagan, and then as a follow-up after he was President, we had a follow-up with various

people in the Reagan circle; including his National Security Council. I was working with the head of the National Security Council on this operation, and with people from the CIA and this

and that. I was sworn to this and sworn to that, so I was doing

the whole thing. The SDI was my work, which they liked. And there was a faction, including the President, who liked it.

He

liked it because he was against, he always hated Henry Kissinger;

and he hated Henry Kissinger particularly because of the so-called "revenge weapons." The idea that you build super weapons, and if somebody throws a bomb at you, you obliterate the

planet. That is not considered a good defense, and he was against that. When he saw from experts that what I was saying was accepted experts – military and others – and this was French intelligence, the leadership of the Gaullist faction in France; this was the leadership of the German military; this was

the leadership of the Italian military, and all over the world.

So, I was the creator of the SDI. Reagan liked it, he adopted

it. I was creating the thing in direct cooperation during the entire period, with the cooperation of the National Security Council and the heads of the CIA. People recognized that I was right; I had the scientific capability and knowledge to do it, and we were doing it.

OGDEN: So, that's the story in Lyndon LaRouche's own words. That is merely the tip of a very fascinating iceberg. We encourage you to watch that full video that I cited that that excerpt was taken from. But also, to visit the page on the LaRouche PAC website which gives you the full background of this story. As you can see there, the link is [larouchepac.com/sdi](http://larouchepac.com/sdi). That gives you this full, historic background. But as you heard

Mr. LaRouche say there in that video clip, this effort on his part to craft the idea of what then became adopted by the President of the United States in the form of the SDI, this effort went all the way back to the mid-1970s. Here's an image of a campaign pamphlet which was commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, titled "Sputnik of the '70s: The Science behind the Soviets' Beam Weapon." In this pamphlet, Lyndon LaRouche called for an international crash program to develop a space-based missile defense system based on new physical principles. A Manhattan project-style mission which would provide the economic driver to fuel global development. The pamphlet proposed "... Long-range economic and scientific collaboration with the Soviet Union, among other nations, which would eliminate the danger of world obliteration," and it emphasized "... Tremendous revolutionary industrial implications available to this nation and the world if

the political will of the United States forces a recommitment to technological progress in the form of an International Development Bank and its national concomitant Third National Bank.”

So, as you can see, Lyndon LaRouche’s idea of this missile defense system, was always framed around the idea of not unilateral defense systems, but rather, a joint missile defense

and joint scientific and economic collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union. To do so, would be to unleash the revolutionary industrial and economic implications of

such technological breakthroughs as the basis for a new international, economic order; something which he had been involved in all the way back to at least 1971 when he first issued the proposal for a new International Development Bank – the so-called IDB. So you can see in LaRouche’s idea, the kernel

of what became the SDI, always had with it a new international security architecture, overthrowing this entire reign of terror

of Mutually Assured Destruction and revenge weapons. But concomitantly, a new international economic order, which would be

driven by the revolutionary, unprecedented economic boom that would come out of the progress associated with such technological

breakthroughs around these new physical principles in the collaboration of US and Soviet scientists to develop this joint

missile defense to make International Ballistic Missile and nuclear war impotent and obsolete.

The history is as fascinating as it is extensive. Here is not the time or the place to go through every single aspect of this history; but the full background, again as I said is available on that webpage – [larouchepac.com/sdi](http://larouchepac.com/sdi). But if you

fast forward from that pamphlet "Sputnik of the '70s" all the way to the lead-up into the 1980 Presidential campaign in which Lyndon LaRouche himself was a candidate for President of the United States. Let's take a look at a picture here of Lyndon LaRouche meeting face-to-face with then-candidate Ronald Reagan at a candidates' forum that took place in Concord, New Hampshire. During this face-to-face meeting and in several other opportunities to interface with the Reagan campaign team, Lyndon LaRouche presented this idea, in principle and in detail. Following Reagan's victory and his election, Lyndon LaRouche and representatives of his organization, were brought in for meetings with first the Reagan Presidential transition team, and then with leading members of the National Security Council and Reagan's intelligence community. They discussed LaRouche's idea for this new strategic doctrine, and the related scientific and energy policies that would go along with it. So, Lyndon LaRouche commissioned numerous reports and campaign pamphlets promoting this idea. As you can see here, this is from {Fusion}; this is a special report titled "Directed Energy Beams; A Weapon for Peace." Here's the next one; this is an edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine from November 30, 1982. Again, before the March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI. This was titled "Beam Weapons: The Science to Prevent Nuclear War." Here's another one; this is a pamphlet. "How Beam Weapon Technologies Can Reverse the Depression." So, all along, this was always an economic idea from Lyndon LaRouche's standpoint.



As you can see, being an American at this point, in the years preceding the 1980 Presidential election and then coming out of

Reagan's victory, 1980, '81, '82, the idea of this Beam Defense

system which would be based on new physical principles, was associated – including in the popular mind – it was associated with Lyndon LaRouche. And it had been associated with Lyndon LaRouche for at least half a decade prior to Reagan's historic,

groundbreaking speech.

The morning after Reagan's March 23rd address, the media was scrambling to try to find experts to interview to explain what it

was that Reagan had presented the night before. Naturally, they

had to turn to representatives of the LaRouche organization.

Here's a photograph of Paul Gallagher, who was at that time Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, appearing on

CBS' Evening News program on March 24, 1983 – the day following

Reagan's address – to explain the science behind Reagan's policy

that had been announced the evening before.

Immediately following Reagan's address to the nation, Lyndon LaRouche launched a mass educational campaign to educate the American people as to what their President had just presented.

He published and commissioned the publication of numerous mass circulation reports to inform the American people and also policymakers on the details of how such a program would work.

This image here is an array of different publications that were

issued by the LaRouche movement, supporting Reagan's announcement

of the Strategic Defense Initiative and detailing the scientific,

the economic, and the military-strategic implications of the policy. There you can see one pamphlet – “Support the President’s Strategic Defense Initiative; Kill Missiles, Not People.”

As should be very clear, Lyndon LaRouche was in a leading position of authority following this groundbreaking announcement,

and the influence that his ideas had come to wield put him in a

position of real power inside the political structure of the Presidency of the United States. He used that influence to launch and to escalate on his campaign to completely reorganize

the entire international economic and strategic architecture of

the planet. Let’s take a look at a document that Lyndon LaRouche

released exactly one year following Reagan’s March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI program. This was called “The LaRouche

Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and the USSR.” This was published March 30, 1984. Let me

read you some excerpts from what Lyndon LaRouche published under

this title “The LaRouche Doctrine.” He begins by saying:

“The political foundation for durable peace must be: a) The unconditional sovereignty of each and all nation-states, and b)

Cooperation among sovereign nation-states to the effect of promoting unlimited opportunities to participate in the benefits

of technological progress, to the mutual benefit of each and all.

“The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the monetary,

economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and

those relatively subordinated nations often classed as 'developing nations.' Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there

can be no durable peace on this planet.

"Insofar as the United States and Soviet Union acknowledge the progress of the productive powers of labor throughout the planet to be in the vital strategic interests of each and both,

the two powers are bound to that degree and in that way by a common interest. This is the kernel of the political and economic

policies of practice indispensable to the fostering of durable peace between those two powers.

.. [T]he general advancement of the productive powers of labor in all sovereign states, most emphatically so-called developing nations, requires global emphasis on: a) increasing globally the percentiles of the labor force employed in scientific research and related functions of research and development ... b) increasing the absolute and relative scales of

capital-goods production and also

the rate of turnover in capital-goods production; and c)

combining these two factors to accelerate technological progress

in capital-goods outputs.

"Therefore, high rates of export of such capital-goods output to meet the needs of developing nations are indispensable

for the general development of so-called developing nations: Our

common goal, and our common interest, is promoting both the general welfare and promoting preconditions of durable peace between our two powers...

"By supplying increased amounts of high-technology capital

goods to developing nations, the exporting economies foster increased rates of turnover in their own most advanced capital-goods sectors of production...

“The importer of such advanced capital goods increases the productive powers of labor in the economy of the importing nation. This enables the importing nation to produce its goods at

a lower average social cost, and enables it to provide better-quality and cheaper goods as goods of payment to the nations exporting capital goods.

“Not only are the causes of simple humanity and general peace served by such policies of practice; the arrangement is equally beneficial to exporting and importing nations...

.. [T]he general rate of advancement of the productive powers of labor is most efficiently promoted by no other policy of practice.”

Then a little later in the report, he reviews the situation of strategic tensions between the USSR and the United States.

He

says:

“Since the rupture of the wartime alliance between the two powers, U.S. military policy toward the Soviet Union has passed

through two phases. The first, from the close of the war until a

point beyond the death of Joseph Stalin, was preparation for the

contingency of what was sometimes named ‘preventive nuclear war.’

The second, emerging over the period from the death of Stalin into the early period of the administration of President John F.

Kennedy, was based on the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response ...

“From approximately 1963 until approximately 1977, it might have appeared, as it appeared to many, that the doctrines of

Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response had succeeded in preserving a state of restive peace, something called 'détente,'

between the two powers. This appearance was deceptive; during the

period 1977-83, there was an accelerating deterioration in the military relationships between the two powers....

"Beginning shortly after the inauguration of President Jimmy Carter, the deterioration of the military situation accelerated....

"In response to this direction of developments, the U.S. public figure Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. proposed that both powers

develop, deploy, and agree to develop and deploy 'strategic' defensive, anti-ballistic-missile defense based on 'new physical

principles.' This proposal was issued publicly by LaRouche beginning February 1982; he proposed to U.S.A., Western European,

and Soviet representatives that the development and deployment of

such strategic defensive systems be adopted policy, as a means for escaping from the 'logic' of Nuclear Deterrence....

.. The true solution must be found in the domain of politics and economics, and the further shaping of military relations between the powers must produce military policies by each coherent with the direction of development of the needed political and economic solutions....

"On the part of the United States of America, the government is committed to avoiding all colonial, imperial, or kindred endeavors in foreign policy, and to establish, instead, a growing

community of principle among fully sovereign nation-states of this planet. This shall become a community of principle coherent

with the policies of the articles of this draft memorandum. If any force should endeavor to destroy that community of

principle,  
or any member of that community of sovereign nations, the  
United  
States will be prepared to defend that community and its  
members  
by means of warfare, should other means prove insufficient.  
With  
respect to the Soviet Union, the government of the United  
States  
offers the Soviet Union cooperation with itself in service of  
these principles, and desires that the Soviet Union might  
enter  
fully into participation within that community of principle...  
“Under these conditions, provided that all nations share in  
development of the frontiers of scientific research, in  
laboratories, and in educational institutions, all nations  
will  
be made capable of assimilating efficiently the technological  
by-product benefits of the military expenditures on systems  
derived from application of ‘new physical principles.’  
“To lend force to this policy, the powers agree to establish  
new institutions of cooperation between themselves and other  
nations in development of these new areas of scientific  
breakthrough for application to exploration of space.  
“To this purpose, the powers agree to establish at the  
earliest possible time institutions for cooperation in  
scientific  
exploration of space, and to also co-sponsor treaty-agreements  
protecting national and multinational programs for  
colonization  
of the Moon and Mars.  
“At some early time, the powers shall enter into  
deliberations, selecting dates for initial manned colonization  
of  
the Moon and Mars, and the establishment of international  
space  
stations on the Moon and in the orbits of Moon and Mars,

stations

to be maintained by and in the common interest and use of space

parties of all nations.

“The powers jointly agree upon the adoption of two tasks as the common interest of mankind, as well as the specific interest

of each of the two powers: 1) The establishment of full economic

equity respecting the conditions of individual life in all nations of this planet during a period of not more than 50 years;

2) Man’s exploration and colonization of nearby space as the continuing common objective and interest of mankind during and beyond the completion of the first task. The adoption of these two working-goals as the common task and respective interest in

common of the two powers and other cooperating nations, constitutes the central point of reference for erosion of the potential political and economic causes of warfare between the powers.”

That was known as the “LaRouche Doctrine,” published March 30, 1984. As you can see, what Lyndon LaRouche outlined in that

document was the basis for exactly what we’re calling now a new

international economic and strategic architecture. In fact, the

one requires the other. You cannot have a new strategic architecture without resolving what Lyndon LaRouche characterized

as the root causes behind the conflict between these nations; the

persisting inequalities between nations. And you cannot have the

kind of cooperation needed for the common, mutual economic development and the application of these groundbreaking new

physical principles and the technologies that are derived from those, without the establishment of a new international economic

order. Elsewhere in that document, Mr. LaRouche described exactly how such an economic order must take place; with fixed exchange rates between currencies, massive credits – both domestically within countries for the upgrading of the technological and infrastructure platforms within those nations

– but also, international credit treaty agreements in the form of what he originally described in 1971 as the International Development Bank, or the IDB.

As you can see, and I think any astute reader of that document now, almost 35 years later, that document laid the basis

for what we now see as the so-called “win-win” new economic paradigm. This idea of the common benefit of all; mutual cooperation for joint development; the upgrading of the so-called

“developing” nations, which were still suffering under the effects of colonialism and post-colonial policy. So, when President Xi Jinping of China speaks about “win-win” economic development and a new community of nations with a shared destiny,

I think that the echoes couldn't be more clear of what Lyndon LaRouche himself was describing at that time in the middle of the

1980s, almost 35 years ago today. When Xi Jinping offers the United States to join this new “win-win” system, the Belt and Road Initiative, which is already resolving these persisting inequalities that the world has been suffering, such as in Africa

or Central and South America. Or, when President Putin offers to

“sit down at the negotiating table and devise together a new and

relevant system of international security and sustainable



development for human civilization," we should reflect on what was laid in that document. That LaRouche Doctrine now almost  
35

years ago today, in the wake of that history-changing announcement by President Ronald Reagan, at which he called a spade a spade. The world could no longer survive under the dictatorship of Mutually Assured Destruction; that reign of terror that President Kennedy characterized as the Sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads over every man, woman, and child on this planet, threatening nuclear annihilation. What Lyndon LaRouche characterized at that moment

as the "LaRouche Doctrine" is the principle behind the new economic and new security architecture which must be adopted on

this planet today. Not as a recipe, not taking everything exactly as it was said, because clearly of course, the world has

changed; and we must apply the principles that lay at the root of

exactly what Lyndon LaRouche had in mind when he proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative and when he proposed the subsequent

LaRouche Doctrine, and apply those to evolve necessarily to fit

the specific conditions of today.

One thing that Lyndon LaRouche alluded to explicitly in that document, was the need for joint cooperation in the colonization

and exploration of space. In fact, that is the form that the idea of a revived SDI has actually been taken. The proposal for

not an SDI, but what's now called an SDE – the Strategic Defense

of Earth – to literally re-tool the strategic nuclear weapons with these massive payloads that have been accumulated by the United States, Russia, also other nations – China and India

and

other nations. To re-tool those nuclear weapons and also the delivery systems, these high-power intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also the new technologies that Russia has just announced. To re-tool these technologies and have what were offensive weapons become defensive tools against asteroids and other threats to planet Earth which we may encounter from outer

space. While this was proposed under that name, the SDE, by certain individuals inside Russia about five years ago, coinciding with the 30th anniversary of the original SDI speech.

What this originally actually came out of, had its origins in the

late 1980s and the early 1990s with the scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Teller was actually one of the leading scientific advisors of President Reagan in the 1980s around the SDI initiative, but following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr.

Edward Teller travelled to Russia and visited some of the leading

science cities that had been involved in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. He met with some of the leading former Soviet scientists, the Russian scientists, and proposed exactly this. He proposed the idea of the United States

and Russia saying the Cold War is over; let's now cease this policy of aiming our nuclear missiles one against the other, and

let's now aim them against the common threats that mankind as a

whole faces. Especially with the latest news of an asteroid which poses a credible threat – what's called a "non-zero threat" – to the Earth in the foreseeable future, which was just discussed in the media over the past week, this proposal is

all the more timely and all the more relevant today.

So, what I'd like is to just play an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's international webcast that she delivered yesterday. She takes up exactly this idea, so here's an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think that the SDI proposal, which was absolutely not what the media made out of it, calling it "Star Wars," and things like that, the SDI proposal of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche was an absolutely farsighted vision of a New Paradigm! And if you read the relevant papers about it, especially the proposed draft for a dialogue among the superpowers, which was published one year later, which you can find in the archives or in the newer {EIR}s. This was a vision where both superpowers would develop together, new physical principles which would make nuclear weapons obsolete. And I think what Putin announced on March 1st in terms of new physical principles applied for new weapons systems, is absolutely is in this tradition. And Putin also asked, now they have to sit down and we have to negotiate and put together a new security architecture, including Russia, the United States, China, and the Europeans. This was all envisioned by my husband in this famous SDI proposal, and it was a very far-reaching to dissolve the blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to cooperate instead among sovereign republics, which is exactly what the New Silk Road dynamic today

represents. And it was also the idea to use a science-driver in the economy to use the increased productivity of the real economy for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector, in order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

And this is what we're seeing today, also, in the collaboration between China, Russia, and the countries that are participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.

So I think, in a certain sense, part of this danger of peace breaking out, that there is right now the very vivid tradition and actualization of that tradition of the SDI, and I think we should circulate this proposal by my husband again. I think we

should enlarge it to become the SDE, the Strategic Defense of the

Earth, because it was just discovered that very soon, another big asteroid is already taking course on the planet Earth. So we need

to move quickly to the common aims of mankind, and all countries

should cooperate and be a shared community for the one future of humanity.

This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of cooperation

where we put all our forces together to solve those questions which are a challenge to all of humanity – nuclear weapons, poverty, asteroids – there are so many areas where we could fruitfully cooperate – space exploration is one of them. And I

think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we

need

more active citizens. So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

OGDEN: So, that was Helga LaRouche's call to action, and I think that's a perfect concluding point for our webcast today, as

we observe this very auspicious date – March 23rd – the 35th anniversary of President Reagan's groundbreaking speech announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative. Let's take that kind of sense of victory and the optimism that indeed, ideas can

change the course of history, and consolidate this New Paradigm;

this new security architecture and new economic architecture for

the planet. The opportunity is greater than it ever has been before; but the need is ever more dire.

Thank you for joining me, and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).

---

**Hvad er geopolitik? Anden del: Er du human, eller Hume-an? Filosofien bag geopolitik.**

**LaRouche**

**PAC's**

# Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?« Lektion 3, 3. marts, 2018; pdf, dansk, og video

*Så for Leibniz er mennesket ikke Gud, men det er i stand til skabende fornuft af den form, som Gud har begavet det med i universets udvikling. Så for Leibniz er mennesket skabende, som det også er for Cusanus. Denne kreativitet, og kun denne kreativitet, er det, som skænker mennesket fri vilje. Med andre ord, så er mennesket i stand til at gøre noget, eller ikke gøre noget; eller at gøre A eller B; der er fri vilje. Og det er det samme som kreativitet, mener jeg, det er rimelig indlysende. Men det er også kilden til moral. Så kreativitet, fri vilje og moral er i realiteten det samme, videnskabelige begreb. Af den grund, siger Leibniz, så er det, der er formålet med vores liv, eftersom vi har fået denne kreative evne, at få det, han faktisk kalder lykke (happiness), at udvikle stræben efter lykke. Han siger ikke 'liv, frihed og stræben efter nydelse'; han siger ikke 'liv, frihed og stræben efter at undgå smerte'; han siger, 'liv, frihed og stræben efter lykke', som han undertiden også kalder 'felicity' (det betyder også lykke).*

*Dette er altså det stik modsatte af Benthams idé om nydelse; det er lige så modsatrettet som Satan er til Gud.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Billede: 'Lysternes have'. Maleri af Hieronymus Bosch, 1403-15.

---

# Hvad er geopolitik? Første del: Historie.

## LaRouche PAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, Lektion 2, 17. feb. 2018

*Der var de fortsatte provokationer i Mellemøsten, provokationer i Asien, Koreakrigen, Vietnamkrigen – dette var geopolitik med det formål at bevare Det britiske Imperium. Og desværre, med mordet på Kennedy, blev USA en partner i det, man kunne kalde et »anglo-amerikansk geopolitisk imperium«.*

*Og hvad gik politikerne ud på? Frihandel, neoliberal økonomi, nedskæringspolitik. Svækkelse af regeringer, svækkelse af ideen om national suverænitet og etablering af institutioner som den Europæiske Union, der ønsker ikkevalgte bureaukrater til at bestemme politikker for det, der plejede at være nationalstater.*

*Det så ud, som om alt dette kunne ændre sig i 1989, med den kommunistiske verdens fald, med det østtyske regimes kollaps og Berlinmurens fald. På dette tidspunkt interвенerede LaRouche-organisationen meget direkte, for et alternativ til geopolitik. Lyndon LaRouche var blevet fængslet af George Bush, med assistance fra den daværende vicestatsanklager i*

*Boston, Robert Mueller. Men Helga Zepp-LaRouche anførte kampen for det, vi dengang kaldte den Produktive Trekant Paris-Berlin-Wien, og dernæst, så tidligt som i slutningen af 1990, det, der blev kaldt den »Nye Silkevej« eller den Eurasiske Landbro, som et middel til at bringe nationer sammen og overvinde disse kunstige opdelinger, skabt af Det britiske Imperium.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**LaRouches fysisk-økonomiske  
målemetode,  
Del II: Hvordan værdi  
defineres.  
LaRouche PAC Videnskabsteams  
undervisningsserie 2017 i  
økonomi:**



# Lektion 6. pdf og video.

*Denne case study er også meget nyttig for at se på den omvendte proces og komme med et par meget vigtige konklusioner i dagens diskussion – og dette er noget, jeg aldrig har hørt hr. LaRouche ikke sige – og det er, at nulvækst, eller såkaldt bæredygtighed, ibrønde vil slå samfundet ihjel. Det er en fundamental naturlov; og i dette kapitel fastslår han denne pointe ...*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**Afsæt Mueller og vedtag de  
Fire Love  
som politisk, økonomisk  
program.  
LaRouche PAC Internationale  
Webcast,**

# 22. dec., 2017.

**Vært Matthew Ogden:** Det er den 22. dec., 2017, og jeg er vært for vores faste udsendelse fra larouchepac.com med vores strategiske gennemgang her ved ugens afslutning.

Der er nu 40 dage til præsident Trumps planlagte 'State of the Union'-tale for den samlede Kongres den 30. januar. Hen over de kommende 40 dage vil vi se en kamp af hidtil usete proportioner udspille sig på verdensscenen og den internationale scene; en kamp om selve dette præsidentskabs sjæl. Selv om dette har taget form af en angivelig juridisk kamp mht. den såkaldte Mueller-efterforskning, må vi aldrig fortabe os i den konstant udviklende histories ugræs, med alle disse 'connectos' og skikkelser i denne virkelig tragiske komedie af meget dramatiske proportioner. Vi må aldrig glemme, at det, der til syvende og sidst står på spil her, er en krig, der raser på højeste niveau af politisk beslutningstagning i dette land om, hvad USA's fremtidige politik skal være. Dette gælder især for vore relationer med resten af verden, og i særdeleshed med Rusland og Kina. Spørgsmålet er, om USA vil fortsætte med at vedtage det 20. århundredes fejlslagne geopolitik, der har bragt verden på randen af Tredje Verdenskrig? Eller vil vi forkaste hele denne fejlslagne ideologi og i stedet vedtage en vision for verden, hvor suveræne nationer ikke blot arbejder for deres egne snævre egeninteresser og i relationer, der udgør en slags imperialistisk blok, som vi har været så vant til under den Kolde Krig; men derimod arbejder for alles fælles fordel.

Sammenhængen i hele dette kupforsøg, som nu udspiller sig og er ved at blive optrævlet, blev fremlagt i det oprindelige **dossier**, som vi nu genoptrykker – 2. oplag på 10.000 eksemplarer.

Hvis man ser på det afsnit, der hedder, »The True Origins of the Coup Against the President« (Den virkelige oprindelse til kuppet mod præsidenten), så fremlægger det præcis, hvad den globale, politiske sammenhæng var, for fremkomsten af de operationer, der medgik til skabelsen af det såkaldte »Steele-dossier« og lagde fundamentet for det, der har fået betegnelsen »Russiagate«. Som forfatteren af dette dossier (EIR's Mueller-dossier) gennemgår, så er den virkelige historie her spørgsmålet om krig og fred og involverer hele spørgsmålet om det, der voksede frem fra det tidspunkt, hvor præsident Xi Jinping annoncerede Bælte & Vej Initiativet i Kasakhstan i 2013, hvor han fuldstændig styrkede den eksisterende, geopolitiske verdensorden og fastslog en fuldstændig ny vision for et potentielt »win-win«-samarbejde mellem alle verdens nationer, til alles gensidige fordel.

Som dette dossier gjorde det meget klart, så er og var »disse begivenheder i 2013-2014 en direkte udfordring af det britiske imperiesystem. De udfordrer direkte det monetære system, som er kilden til den angloamerikanske verdensdominans. De udfordrer direkte fundamental, britisk, strategisk politik, der har eksisteret siden Halford Mackinders dage. Under initiativet for 'Ét Bælte, én Vej', og i forening med Ruslands Eurasiske Union, vil Mackinders 'verdensø', bestående af Eurasien og Afrika, blive udviklet, gennemkrydset af nye højhastigheds-jernbaneforbindelser, nye byer og vital, moderne infrastruktur, baseret på den gensidige fordel for alle de derværende nationalstater. Under den britiske, geopolitiske model«, har krig, ustabilitet og udplyndring af råmaterialer været virkeligheden for hele dette område i århundreder. »Xi Jinping har også angrebet de geopolitiske aksiomer, ved hvilke USA og briterne har opereret« i årtier. »Han foreslog i stedet en model for 'win-win'-samarbejde, hvor nationalstater samarbejder om udvikling, baseret på menneskehedens fælles mål.«

Så igen, dette er sammenhængen for hele denne krig over det

amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Spørgsmålet er altså, om USA vil opgive disse geopolitikker og i stedet vedtage dette totalt anderledes paradigme med menneskehedens fælles 'win-win'-mål?

Dette blev meget klart formuleret af præsident Xi Jinping, faktisk før det nylige Bælte & Vej Forum (maj 2017); dette går tilbage til FN's Generalforsamling i 2015. Præsident Xi Jinpings tale dér havde titlen, »At arbejde sammen for at udarbejde et nyt partnerskab for 'win-win'-samarbejde og skabe et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid'. Så dette er ikke blot en abstrakt idé. I sin historiske tale for FN's Generalforsamling fremlagde præsident Xi Jinping især, hvad denne idé med et 'win-win'-samarbejde og et «fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid» i virkeligheden vil sige. Her er et par uddrag fra Xi Jinpings tale. Han sagde:

»Verden gennemgår en historisk proces med accelereret udvikling: Fredens, udviklingens og fremskridtets solskin vil være stærkt nok til at trænge igennem krigens, fattigdommens og tilbageståendehedens skyer.

Som et kinesisk mundheld lyder, 'Det største ideal er at skabe en verden, der i sandhed er fælles for alle'. Vi bør indgå en fornyet forpligtelse til at 'bygge en ny form for internationale relationer med win-win-samarbejde og skabe et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid'.

Vi bør vedtage en ny vision, der søger win-win-resultater for alle, og afvise den forældede tankegang, at 'den enes død er den andens brød' eller 'vinderen tager alt'.

Vi bør 'opgive koldkrigsmentaliteten i alle dens manifestationsformer og skabe en ny vision for fælles, omfattende, samarbejdende og vedvarende sikkerhed'.

Vi må 'arbejde sammen for at sikre, at alle er befriet for nød, har adgang til udvikling og lever med værdighed'.

I deres interaktioner må civilisationer acceptere deres forskelligheder. Kun gennem gensidig respekt, gensidig læring og harmonisk sameksistens kan verden bevare sin diversitet og trives. Hver civilisation repræsenterer sit folks enestående vision og bidrag. De forskellige civilisationer bør have dialog og udvekslinger i stedet for at forsøge at udelukke eller erstatte hinanden. Vi bør lade os inspirere af hinanden for at styrke den menneskelige civilisations kreative udvikling.«

Så igen, det er den vision, som Xi Jinping fremlagde i sin tale for FN i 2015, med titlen, »At arbejde sammen for at udarbejde et nyt partnerskab for 'win-win'-samarbejde og skabe et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid«. Denne tale i 2015 ligner faktisk temmelig meget den vision, som Lyndon LaRouche fremlægger i sin bog, der blev udgivet i 2005, med titlen *Earth's Next Fifty Years (Jordens kommende 50 år)*. I denne bog definerer han rammen for denne nye form for relationer mellem landene. Hvis man går tilbage til denne bog af Lyndon LaRouche fra 2005, så var det en samling af flere artikler, han skrev, og ligeledes nogle taler, han tidligere havde holdt under en turne, han foretog i Europa og Eurasien. Men i denne bogs hovedartikel, der havde titlen, »Den kommende eurasiske verden«, forklarer Lyndon LaRouche detaljeret ideen om, hvad denne vision for en ny form for relationer mellem lande bør være. Og faktisk, hvad er det princip, det videnskabelige princip, ud fra hvilket nationer kan relatere til hinanden ud fra standpunktet om den højeste fællesnævner, i modsætning til det laveste.

Her er den vision, som Lyndon LaRouche fremlagde. Han sagde, »Tag en anden fremgangsmåde. Denne anden fremgangsmåde er menneskehedens fælles interesse. Det, vi bør tilsigte med kulturen, er ideen om menneskets natur; at mennesket har en vis, iboende rettighed, der adskiller mennesket fra dyret. Lad os individuelt og kollektivt bekræfte regeringsstyrelsens forpligtelse over for menneskets værdighed, som det kommer til

udtryk i dette menneskes, denne families, rettighed til, for deres børn og børnebørn, at have udsigten til forbedrede livsbetingelser, en meningsfuld fremtid og en anerkendelse af deres personlige identitet som en person, der i sin levetid har fået muligheden for at bidrage til menneskehedens fremtid som helhed; til ære for fortiden og til fordel for fremtiden. Vi må indse, at intet folk kan være funktionelt suverænt mht. forpligtelsen over for sit eget folks overbevisninger, med mindre de er fuldstændigt suveræne mht. deres nationale anliggender. Denne suverænitets afgørende funktion må erkendes som værende kulturel i sin essens. For at regere sig selv må et folk have et fælles grundlag af viden. Relationerne staterne imellem må finde sted efter princippet om en platonisk, sokratiske dialog om ideer. Der er almene principper, der forener nationer omkring et fælles mål, men denne almenhed må udarbejdes i udviklingen af ideer; af nationale kulturer i dialog med nationale kulturer. De principper, der står frem som fornødne, fælles mål, er hovedsageligt sådanne principper som videnskaben om fysisk økonomi. Processen med udvikling af missionsorienteret samarbejde mellem denne planets kulturer må ses som en fortsættelse af en fortsat proces henover de fremtidige generationer.«

Dette var et kort uddrag af en meget omfattende bog, udgivet af Lyndon LaRouche i 2005. Men man ser harmonien mellem den vision, som Lyndon LaRouche her fremlægger, og så det, Xi Jinping siger i sin tale for FN ti år senere, i 2015. Men imellem de to ser man en vision, og nu ser man virkeligheden i det, som denne idé om et 'win-win'-paradigme for relationer mellem landene faktisk repræsenterer; i modsætning til den fejlslagne form for vision, vi kender fra den Kolde Krig, og som har bragt verden til punktet, hvor vi har haft flere verdenskrige, og nu til punktet, som kunne være truslen om en atomar konflikt mellem nationer.

Ser man på, hvad Lyndon LaRouche sagde i denne bog, og ser man

der næst på, hvad Xi Jinping så smukt sagde i sin tale for FN, og sætter man det i kontrast til det katastrofale, beskæmmende, nationale sikkerhedsdokument, der netop er blevet offentliggjort af Trumps Hvide Hus; så ser man et meget signifikant problem mht. den kamp, der stadig raser omkring dette præsidentskabs sjæl og politik. Dette er på ingen måde en sort/hvid eller fuldført kamp. Vi ser, at, på højeste niveau, inkl. internt i administrationen, foregår der stadig denne kamp over, hvilken retning USA vil tage. Vil vi fortsat vedtage geopolitik? Eller, vil vi gå i retning af denne idé med 'win-win'-relation mellem lande, som det er blevet forklaret af præsident Xi Jinping og Lyndon LaRouche?

***Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.***

So, let me just give you a little taste of some of the attitude that is represented in this national security policy document. Here are two short quotes. Let's start with this one:

"After being dismissed as a phenomenon of an earlier century, great power competition returned. China and Russia began to reassert their influence regionally and globally. Today, they are fielding military capabilities designed to deny America access in times of crisis, and to contest our ability to operate

freely in critical commercial zones during peace time. In short,

they are contesting our geopolitical advantages and trying to change the international order in their favor." Here's another

short excerpt: "Although the United States seeks to continue to

cooperate with China, China is using economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to

persuade other states to heed its political and security agenda.

China's infrastructure investments and trade strategies reinforce its geopolitical aspirations. Its efforts to build and militarize outposts in the South China Sea endanger the free flow of trade, threaten the sovereignty of other nations, and undermine regional stability." Etc., etc., etc. Those are just two very short excerpts from a document which is very lengthy; but you can see from those two quotes that the inclination of the authors of this report is to continue to view the world from the standpoint of geopolitics, geopolitical competition between nations and blocks of nations. And you can even see a not-so-veiled reference to the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative right there in that quote where they said China's economic and trade agenda is only being used to try to advance its geopolitical advantage.

So, that's a view straight out of the think tanks in Washington and the {Economist} magazine of London. It's very curious, because it actually goes contrary to exactly what President Trump himself has represented on the world stage; including on his recent "state visit-plus" to China, where he talked very positively of the initiatives that China has taken and has forged a very close personal relationship with President Xi Jinping. Exactly contrary to this view that China is somehow our economic and strategic rival, and that we have to compete with them on the geopolitical world stage.

People have pointed out that when President Trump presented this national security policy, in a highly unusual way; it's very unusual for the President himself to make the speech presenting



the policy document. But when he did make that speech, he used very different language, especially in regards to China. He spoke about the importance of sovereign nations that are respecting each other and are working together. He did not use some of the more egregious and inflammatory language which is contained within this document. But still, the very fact that this document was published shows you that we have a lot of work to do to continue to wage this battle inside the United States over what our policy will be. Will we continue to embrace geopolitics, or will we embrace this new "win-win" paradigm which is emerging now as a replacement to that failed Cold War mode of thinking?

I'd like to play for you just a short excerpt from the webcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche conducted yesterday, where she spoke about her reaction to this national security policy document. So, here's what Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say:

[\(Hele Helgas tale kan ses på dansk her\)](#)

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: This document is clearly looking at the world from the standpoint of, as you said, geopolitics, and if you look at it from that standpoint, naturally, then China and Russia, but especially China which is rising, are regarded as rivals or enemies. And I think that this paper – Trump, which is very unusual – insisted that he present the paper, and not the National Security Advisor who normally is presenting such a report; and obviously, it seems that he did

that in order to soften certain formulations. For example: Apart from going through some of the language of the report, he also said that he wants to build a very strong partnership with Russia and China, and for example, this had the ridiculous effect that some European newspapers would say, "he can't even read the paper, because he said things which are different than in the report." And I think it reflects the fact that the faction fight in the Trump administration is far from being over, that there is still the effort by the neo-cons and by leftovers of previous administrations, in various aspects of this administration, which expressed themselves in this report. And Trump, who after all had a very successful state visit to China a little while ago and who has talked successfully on the telephone with Putin in the last week, defeating a terrorist attack which was planned for St. Petersburg and similar very productive things; so I think Trump still has the inclination that he wants to work with Russia and China. But I think if you look at the very sharp, extremely sharp reactions coming from the Russian Foreign Ministry, from Peskov, the spokesman of the Kremlin, from {Global Times}, from the Chinese Foreign Ministry, from the Chinese Embassy in Washington, they all basically say this doctrine reflects an outmoded kind of thinking; they point to the fact that there is a completely

new

era shaping especially the West Pacific, because in this paper,

there are six regions, one of them being the western or eastern

Pacific, and obviously this is one of the areas which is completely changed through the Belt and Road Initiative, where all the countries in the region are cooperating with China in a

“win-win” cooperation to the mutual benefit of each of them; and

that therefore, and since the offer was made many times to the United States, and to Europe to cooperate with the Belt and Road

Initiative, there is actually no reason to go into such an adversarial position. The Russians basically called it an “imperial document,” insist it still reflects the desire to still

insist on a unipolar world, which is long gone, so it’s a completely futile effort. And the Chinese also were extremely critical and saying this is an “outmoded way of thinking” and cannot lead to anything positive.

But it shows you that the world is very far from being out of danger zones, and I’m normally giving credit to Trump because

unlike his predecessors, Bush and Obama, he has stretched out his

hand to Russia and China, and he still has the potential to move

the world into a different direction. But nevertheless, when he

does something which I’m not so happy about, I also take the liberty to say so.

But I think we are in one of these areas, and one of the commentaries in one Chinese paper said, that there are many different conceptions how the future of mankind should be shaped,

and that is not yet a settled question. And I think that that is absolutely true, but that is why it is so absolutely important to overcome this geopolitical view which has the idea that you have groups of countries, or one country which has a legitimate interest against the others, I mean, that is the kind of thinking which led to two world wars in the 20th Century, and I think it should be obvious to anybody, that in the age of thermonuclear weapons, that thinking can only lead to the possible annihilation of the human species: We should get rid of it.

OGDEN: So, as you just heard Helga Zepp-LaRouche say, we are in the midst of a continued battle over really what will be the soul of this Presidency. This national security study report reflects a very bad and failed geopolitical mode of thinking. Those who are the authors of that represent a leftover aspect of this kind of neo-con approach to the world which has gotten us into endless wars, and has really brought us to the brink of a possible world war conflict between the United States and Russia, or the United States and China. In fact, we need to embrace the new "win-win" paradigm of thinking, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said. On that note, there is a continued development on the front of this battling against this attempted coup against this Presidency, and to try to create the conditions where President

Trump can remain true to what is clearly his personal commitment to a positive relationship between the United States and Russia, and the United States and China, to solve the world's problems. To take problems which are common problems to the entire world – terrorism, economic crises, other things such as that – and to work together in a great powers relationship to resolve those problems.

Now, a couple of updates on the continued unravelling of the so-called "Mueller-gate" as we continue to see that there was really, as it's been characterized, a fifth column inside this apparatus; who really before Trump was elected, already had made it clear through those text messages from Peter Strzok and others for example, that they were completely opposed to the election of Donald Trump and politically biased beyond hope. But then have allowed that political bias to be continued in after his election, and even after his inauguration to try to bring down this Presidency from the inside. More and more people are now beginning to see that there was an actual collusion between the intelligence agencies and the Obama administration and the Clinton campaign to try and set this thing in motion. That has continued to operate. Here is an article from a news publication called {The Tablet} magazine. The title of this article is "Did President Obama Read the Steele Dossier in the White House Last August?" The question that they have is a very legitimate

question. The beginning of this article reads as follows, and I think it raises some very important aspects of exactly how this collusion operation worked. Here's the beginning of the article.

It says:

"To date the investigation into the Fusion GPS-manufactured collusion scandal has focused largely on the firm itself, its allies in the press, as well as contacts in the Department of Justice and FBI. However, if a sitting president used the instruments of state, including the intelligence community, to disseminate and legitimize a piece of paid opposition research in

order to first obtain warrants to spy on the other party's campaign, and then to de-legitimize the results of an election once the other party's candidate won, we're looking at a scandal

that dwarfs Watergate – a story not about a bad man in the White

House, but about the subversion of key security institutions that

are charged with protecting core elements of our democratic process while operating largely in the shadows.

"Understanding the origins of the 'Steele dossier' is especially important because of what it tells us about the nature

and the workings of what its supporters would hopefully describe

as an ongoing campaign to remove the elected president of the United States. Yet the involvement of sitting intelligence officials – and a sitting president – in such a campaign should

be a frightening thought even to people who despise Trump and oppose every single one of his policies, especially in an age where the possibilities for such abuses have been multiplied by

the power of secret courts, wide-spectrum surveillance, and the centralized creation and control of story-lines that live on social media while being fed from inside protected nodes of the federal bureaucracy.”

Then the story goes on, using public-source documentation to link together this entire apparatus going all the way back to the

origins of the Steele dossier. But this question – Was a sitting President involved using his intelligence agencies to try

to bring down a political opponent? That is a story that rises

to the level of Watergate and beyond. What Helga Zepp-LaRouche

has pointed out, is that this entire thing – that as an example

– the questions are now being asked; including by members of the

United States Senate and United States House. Devin Nunes, Grassley, Trey Gowdy, Jim Jordan. And she acknowledges that there has been a full mobilization of activists here in the United States to distribute this Mueller dossier that’s been circulated in the Congressional offices and the Senate offices.

There’s been very in-depth interest from the relevant people involved in this counter investigation into what’s contained in

this dossier. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche said in her webcast yesterday, “The tide is now beginning to turn.”

So, let me play another short excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s webcast from yesterday:

**ZEPP-LAROUCHE:** There are rumors circulating that Trump may come out with a “Christmas surprise.” Now if that would happen, it would be an interesting thing, and it

obviously  
would be somebody to investigate this whole complex in the  
form  
of a special investigator. But I think also, already now,  
these  
Congressmen and Senators you mentioned, Nunes, Grassley in the  
Senate, Gowdy, and Gaetz, and various others, I think they're  
quite fired up already about what they're finding.  
And even the media are not entirely covering it up any more.  
There was a quite good article in Denmark, in the conservative  
daily {Berlingske Tidende}, which said: Obama bureaucrats  
conspired to prevent the election of Trump and after that  
failed  
they're trying to topple him; and then they go through the  
whole  
story of who are the culprits. So it is coming out. Even the  
[major German daily] {FAZ} could not avoid reporting it, even  
though, in their typical way, they tried to downplay it and  
say,  
all these people who say "Deep State," these are conspiracy  
theorists, and so on. But the truth is coming out.  
Now, we in the United States that is, our colleagues from  
LaRouche PAC, they made a full mobilization with a lot of  
activists; they distributed the dossier about Mueller in all  
the  
Congressional offices and all the Senate offices, and as they  
were saying they had many in-depth discussions where the  
interest  
about what is happening has been increasingly there. Because  
it  
seems that some people in the Congress realize that what's at  
stake is the Constitution of the United States. Congress has  
oversight rights against the intelligence agencies, and if  
these  
agencies are loyal to a previous administration who was  
involved  
in such incredible schemes, they are aware of the fact that if



they don't act right now, then you can throw the Constitution of the United States in the wastepaper basket. But I think it will require a continuous effort and mobilization, because these people are quite desperate. Because they see that their whole system is coming down, and if this investigation continues, I mean, there were several people who said what was done by the Department of Justice, or some people in it and in the FBI, were felonies. So they are trying to twist the situation to avoid the consequences of their doing, but I think it's reaching a very, very serious point where the tide is turning already. But it is a fight, so stay tuned with us, and don't be complacent, don't eat too many cookies over Christmas: Stay tuned and stay mobilized.

OGDEN: Well, as Helga LaRouche said, the tide is indeed turning, and we're seeing evidence of that. But the sense of urgency has to be there. Over this next 40 days, through the holiday period, all the way up to this State of the Union, the fight to protect the constitutionality of the US Presidency and the integrity of that, is definitely something which is continuing to rage. However, at the same time, we have to continue to have a sense of urgency around the fight for the economic program. The positive economic solutions to the crisis that we face, which is this Four Economic Laws campaign. To bring the United States into this New Paradigm of development. That sense of urgency for a victory on that Four Economic Laws package came into stark perspective again this week with this horrific tragedy, this horrific train derailment that occurred

up

near Tacoma, Washington. The Amtrak train that jumped the tracks

and came over the bridge and onto the I-5 interstate below.

An

absolutely horrific tragedy. President Trump actually responded

quite properly to that horrible accident by issuing the following

tweet. As you can see on the screen here, he said "The train accident that just occurred in Dupont Washington shows more than

ever why our soon-to-be-submitted infrastructure plan must be approved quickly. \$7 trillion spent in the Middle East, while our

roads, bridges, tunnels, railways and more crumble. Not for long."

Indeed, this brings the attention to the necessity for a massive infrastructure plan. And as President Trump said all the

way back to the beginning of his administration, he's called for

a \$1 trillion infrastructure plan. Now, we don't know what that

infrastructure policy will be once it's finally submitted, and once it finally becomes public. We don't know what kind of funding mechanisms the Trump White House is thinking about; we don't know what kind of form that's going to take. But the form

that it must take is the form that's contained in those Four Economic Laws by Lyndon LaRouche. There can be no variation, there can be no compromise. We need to have an immediate Glass-Steagall reorganization in order to erect a firewall between productive credit that should be going into infrastructure and productive employment, and speculative gambling that takes place on Wall Street. But we need to have a

national bank; we need to go back to what Hamilton originally conceived when he created the first national bank. And we can apply it in the way that Hamilton did, or we can apply it in the way that Franklin Roosevelt did. He had an idea for a national infrastructure bank. But you need to have this kind of direct Federal credit that is directed into these projects and into productive employment. Unfortunately, we haven't seen anything from President Trump in now almost a year, even though he's professed that his number one agenda item was infrastructure. According to some accounts, the reason why President Trump won the Rust Belt was because of his commitment to infrastructure. These areas of the country where infrastructure has been crumbling, responded to what President Trump was talking about with \$1 trillion of infrastructure investment. However, under the current situation, first President Trump's attention was completely focussed on repealing Obamacare; now it's completely focussed on the so-called tax reform package, which has done nothing. It's done nothing but continue to delay the follow-through on President Trump's stated, professed agenda of \$1 trillion for infrastructure investment. It's also, by the way incidentally, set the stage for Paul Ryan and others of that ideological bent, to admit that they're already setting things in motion to come right on the heels of the so-called tax reform package with major cuts to Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid – so-called “entitlement reform”. But this is a distraction. This so-called GOP agenda is a

distraction and we must stay focussed on exactly what the agenda must be. And it's these Four Economic Laws. As Helga LaRouche said in her webcast yesterday, she was asked directly by the moderator what her reaction was to this so-called tax reform package. She stated unequivocally that this much ballyhooed tax bill will do nothing without the full package of Glass-Steagall, national banking, and the rest of the Four Economic Laws. So, I'd like to actually play for you in her own words what Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say yesterday in response to this tax reform bill during her webcast. Here's Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: obviously, this is celebrated as the first big victory of President Trump. I don't think it will solve anything, if you don't put it in the package of other measures, like for example Glass-Steagall, a credit system, like Roosevelt's Reconstruction Finance Corp. or like the National Bank of Alexander Hamilton; and basically ending the speculation in the derivatives sector. If you only lower the taxes under these circumstances without curbing the other factors I just mentioned, what it probably will do, it will attract some investment in the United States for sure. But people in Germany already say, "well, we have to protect ourselves, take countermeasures against it," so it will lead to an increased tension internationally; and probably in the United States, the present big corporations and banks will just use these tax cuts to invest more in the stock market, in buying up their own shares, what they have been doing since the crisis of 2008

with

quantitative easing and the zero-interest-rate policy. And I think one reason why this is to be feared is Jamie Dimon, for example, laughed, and said: This is wonderful, this is quantitative easing four.

I think it just requires a continuation of our mobilization. I know our colleagues in the United States from LaRouche PAC, they have produced a new pamphlet with the demand to implement the Four Laws of my husband, of Lyndon LaRouche, and why the United States must join with China in building the New Silk Road,

both domestically and internationally. This pamphlet ["LaRouche's Four Laws & America's Future on the New Silk Road"]

is out. I would encourage you, our viewers and listeners to get

ahold of this document: Read it, because it has all the solutions, what are the correct economic conceptions for the United States and the rest of the world to get out of this present crisis.

This is all extremely urgent, because we could have a meltdown of the system any minute. And just to mention it briefly, this bitcoin mania which is going on, is really a reminder of the Tulip Bubble [in 1637] before it burst. China has recognized that danger, they're basically banning speculation

in bitcoins. And all of these crazinesses make just clear, the

urgent need to implement Glass-Steagall, and the entire Four Laws

of Mr. LaRouche, which especially includes a massive increase in

the productivity of the workforce through a crash program in fusion technology, in space cooperation, in high-tech investments

in general; and unless that is done, including high-technology infrastructure – and the recent Amtrak accident in Washington

State just underlines that this absolutely is necessary – unless this is all done as a package, I don't think the world will get out of this crisis.

OGDEN: So, as you just heard Helga Zepp-LaRouche state, we have in fact published a new pamphlet. This is LaRouche PAC's newest pamphlet, called "The Four Economic Laws: The Physical Economic Principles To Create a Recovery in the United States. America's Future on the New Silk Road". This is available both in print form and in digital form; it's on the LaRouche PAC website. You can see the front cover there, also the back cover which has got a map of some of the key nodal points of the connectivity of the planet through this idea of a World Land-Bridge. This is what would happen if the United States were to join the New Silk Road. Then, there listed in summary form, are the Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws. So, the contents of that pamphlet, as LaRouche said, absolutely must be studied; must be emulated by the citizens of the United States; and must be made the policy of the United States Presidency. That's in fact how we started this program with the 40-day countdown to President Trump's State of the Union address on January 30th. As you heard, there is a battle which is raging for the soul of this Presidency. The role that the LaRouche movement is playing is indispensable. We have not achieved victory yet. We have very clear indications that victory is close at hand on many fronts, and that victory is indeed attainable. But it must be

viewed from the highest possible standpoint; not just piecemeal victories here and there. We have to view this from the standpoint of a total policy shift in terms of how the United States sees itself in the world. We have to abandon geopolitics; we have to embrace the new paradigm of “win-win” relationships between countries. We have to return to the Hamiltonian principles of economics – credit creation for high technology investment. And we have to join the New Silk Road. This is our job over the next 40 days; and we can take encouragement from the standpoint of the fact that indeed, we have absolutely gained major victories in the past period. Both in terms of the victories against this attempted coup against the Presidency of the United States, but also victories in terms of securing the New Paradigm abroad. We should take a look at what President Xi Jinping said in that speech to the United Nations General Assembly, and continue to keep that vision in mind. In fact, we should continue to go back to what Lyndon LaRouche himself said in 2005 in that historic document, {Earth’s Next Fifty Years}. That’s our mission. We have 40 days between now and the State of the Union. With the new pamphlet that’s just been issued – that “The Four Economic Laws: The Physical Economic Principles To Create a Recovery in the United States. America’s Future on the New Silk Road” – we have everything that we need to gain a victory over the course of the next 40 days. So, thank you very much for watching, and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). We wish you a Merry Christmas, and we will continue to be bringing you breaking developments over the

coming

days. Thank you very much, and please stay tuned. Good night.

---

**»Den Nye Silkevej er en ny  
model  
for internationale  
relationer«**  
**Hovedtale af Helga Zepp-  
LaRouche  
på Schiller Institut  
konference,  
25.-26. nov., 2017,  
Frankfurt, Tyskland:  
»At opfylde menneskehedens  
drøm«**

*»Jeg mener, at den Nye Silkevej er et typisk eksempel på en idé, hvis tid er kommet; og når en idé på denne måde først er ved at blive en materialistisk virkelighed, bliver den til en fysisk kraft i universet. Jeg har personligt haft mulighed for at se udviklingen af denne idé, der på mange måder reelt set begyndte med dette store menneske – min ægtemand, Lyndon*



*LaRouche; der, for mange årtier siden – for næsten et halvt århundrede siden – fik ideen om en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden. Dette blev dernæst mere manifest i 1970'erne, '80erne og især i 1991, da Sovjetunionen opløstes, og hvor denne idé om at skabe en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden blev meget fremtrædende.»*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Vi er vidne til indvielsen af en helt ny æra på planeten. LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 1. dec., 2017**

**Vært Matthew Ogden:** Godaften; det er 1. dec., og dette er vores strategiske fredags-webcast fra [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).

Vi har meget stof at gennemgå i aften, for vi bliver i øjeblikket vidne til indvielsen af en helt ny æra på denne planet. Det, vi bliver vidne til, især i løbet af den seneste uge, siden afslutningen af den ekstraordinært historiske Schiller Institut-konference, der fandt sted nær Frankfurt, Tyskland, i sidste weekend, er den kendsgerning, at den Nye Silkevejsdynamik – denne dynamik med store projekter og »win-win«-samarbejde, der er blevet initieret af Kina – denne Nye Silkevejsdynamik er nu den dominerende og virkelig uimodståelige dynamik på denne planet. Dette er noget, der fuldstændig er i færd med at omforme alle nationers politik på denne planet. Og tyngdecentret er skiftet væk fra det gamle

paradigme, som vi har set i det transatlantiske system, og til dette Nye Paradigme, der nu har fået overtaget pga. de initiativer, som frem for alt Kina har taget.

Jeg vil gerne lægge ud med at afspille et kort uddrag af Helga Zepp-LaRouches ekstraordinære hovedtale, som hun holdt på denne konference, der var sponsoreret af Schiller Institutet nær Frankfurt, Tyskland, i sidste weekend. Konferencens titel var »At opfylde menneskehedens drøm«, og titlen på Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale var »Den Nye Silkevej; Den nye model for internationale relationer«. Her er et kort uddrag af Helgas tale:

(Se hele Helgas video og tale i dansk oversættelse her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=22734>)

*(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet)*

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE

: So, let me start with an idea of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. He said that we are actually living in the best of all possible worlds. This is a very fundamental ontological conception. It's the idea that we are living in a developing universe; that what makes the universe the best of all possible ones is its tremendous potential for development. It is in such a way created, that every great evil challenges an even greater good to come into being. I think when we are talking about the New Silk Road and the tremendous changes which have occurred in the world, especially in the last four years, it is actually exactly that principle working. Because it was the absolute manifest lack of development of the old world order which caused the impulse of China and the spirit of the

New

Silk Road having caught on that now many nations of the world are

absolutely determined to have a development giving a better life

to all of their people.

Now, I think that the New Silk Road is a typical example of an idea whose time had come; and once an idea is in that way becoming a material reality, it becomes a physical force in the

universe.

Now the Chinese Ambassador to Washington, Cui Tiankai, recently made the point, that there were 16 times in world history,

when a rising country would surpass the dominant country up to that point. In twelve cases it led to a war, and in four cases

the rising country just peacefully took over. He said that China

wants neither, but we want to have a completely different system

of a "win-win" relationship of equality and respect for each other.

Obviously, the most important question strategically, if you think about it, is that we can avoid the so-called Thucydides trap. That was the rivalry between Athens and Sparta in the 5th

Century BC, which led to the Peloponnesian War and the demise of

ancient Greece. If this were to occur today between the United

States and China in the age of thermonuclear weapons, I think nobody in their right mind could wish that; and therefore, we should all be extremely happy that Trump and Xi Jinping have developed this very important relationship. I stuck my neck out

in the United States in February of this year by saying, if

President Trump manages to get a good relationship between the United States and China, and between the United States and Russia, he will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents of the United States. Naturally, everybody was completely freaked out because that is not the picture people are supposed to have about Trump. But I think if you look at what is happening, you will see that Trump is on a very good way to accomplish exactly that.

So, he came back from this Asia trip with \$253 billion worth of deals with China. I watched the press conference of the Governor of West Virginia, Jim Justice, where he said that now, because of China, there is hope in West Virginia. West Virginia is a totally depressed state; they have unemployment and a drug epidemic. But he said now we can have value-added production, we will have a bright future. So, the spirit of the New Silk Road has even caught on in West Virginia. Obviously the United States has an enormous demand for infrastructure, especially now after the destruction of all these hurricanes; which just to restore what has been destroyed requires \$200 billion, not even talking about disaster prevention. So, this is all on a good way that China will invest in the infrastructure in the United States, and vice versa; US firms will cooperate in projects of the Belt and Road Initiative.

So, just think about it, because almost everything I'm saying goes against everything you hear in the Western media. But think: From whom comes the motion for peace and development?

Is it coming from those who attack Putin, Xi, and Trump? And those who side with Obama? It's obviously time for people to rethink how the Western viewpoint is on all of these matters. Or change the glasses which they have to look at the world.

OGDEN: So, as you heard from Helga Zepp-LaRouche, that was just a short excerpt from her speech, but she said we have to change the glasses through which we look at the world. That's what she did really with the entirety of her keynote address; which was an hour long. It is available on the [newparadigm.schillerinstitute.org](http://newparadigm.schillerinstitute.org) website right now; but she really did change the glasses, through which people should see the world; both by reviewing what the strategic breakthroughs have been in terms of the New Silk Road dynamic which has been sweeping the planet and supplanting this outmoded and failed geopolitical world order which has brought the world really to the edge of what she said; this Thucydides trap and the danger of thermonuclear war. But she also did some very extraordinary; she took the audience back through the history of the relationship between the Confucianism of China and the Leibnizian philosophy of Europe. This was the best of European culture, and really the consolidation of the Renaissance culture of Europe. What Gottfried Leibniz was able to do in his time, recognizing the failures of European culture due to the kinds of rivalries between these warring empires and what had really turned into a corruption and a rot at the core of the European system at

that

time; he said the future can be secured if we recognize the best

of European culture – the Christianity and the heritage of the Greek philosophy which built European culture; but put this together with the aspects of Chinese Confucianism which are in fact harmonious with the best of the ideas of European philosophy. He pointed out, that the idea of an understanding of

the pre-established harmony between man's creative mind and the

created universe is something, which indeed is recognized in Leibnizian European philosophy; but is also at the core of Confucian philosophy.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche said that in a very real way, Xi Jinping has reflected a profound understanding of this kind of harmonious

relationship between man and the created world, and also between

the nations of this planet, and has given it a substance; actualized this idea through the form of the New Silk Road.

She

also reviewed the history of her husband's – Lyndon LaRouche's – role in creating the basis of the ideas that are now taking their form in this New Paradigm of development coming out of China and the Belt and Road Initiative. She traced it all the way back to a paper that Lyndon LaRouche had written in the 1970s

about the development of Africa, and the fact that his ideas – which were at the core of that vision – are now what are actually taking place in Africa and other nations that are being

touched by the Belt and Road Initiative. Again, this is an extraordinary keynote address, and we would encourage you to watch the speech in its entirety.

But after Helga LaRouche's keynote, the conference – which

was a two-day conference – unfolded; and it was a series of extraordinary panel after extraordinary panel. The first panel

was titled “The Earth’s Next Fifty Years”; obviously taking that

from the title of a wonderful book that was published by Lyndon

LaRouche over a decade ago. But this panel began with a keynote

by Professor He Wenping, who’s the Director of African Studies at

the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing. The speech

was “President Xi’s Perspective for the Year 2050 and the

Perspective of African Development”. That was followed by the

former Transport Minister of Egypt, who gave a speech called

“Integration of Egypt’s Transportation Plans 2030 with the New

Silk Road Project”. Then, there was a statement from George

Lombardi, who is the former social media consultant to President

Donald Trump; and his speech was titled “The Trump

Administration: Impending Economic Policies and Media Discord”.

Then that panel concluded with a speech by Marco Zanni, who is a

member of the European Parliament from Italy. His speech was

titled “A Future for Europe after the Euro”.

Panel I was followed by Panel II, which was the second panel

of the first day, which was titled “The Need for Europe To

Cooperate with China in the Industrialization of Africa and the

Middle East; Transaqua as the Rosetta Stone of the Continent’s

Transformation”. This began with an extensive speech by Hussein

Askary, who is the Southwest Asia coordinator for the Schiller

Institute. This was on “Extending the Silk Road into Southwest

Asia and Africa; A Vision of an Economic Renaissance”. The

bulk

of this is also actually included in a new Special Report that is

just been published by the Schiller Institute, that was jointly

written by Hussein Askary and Jason Ross. He was followed by the

Foreign Director of the Bonifaca S.p.A., Italy, company, which is

actually involved with China in building this Transaqua project.

It's called the Italy-China Alliance for Transaqua. Then, the General Consul to Frankfurt from Ethiopia spoke – Mehreteab Mulugeta Haile. The title of his speech was “The Need for Europe

to Cooperate with China in the Industrialization of Africa”.

Then that panel concluded with a speech by the Executive Manager

of Pyramids International called “Egypt’s 2030 Mega Projects: Investment Opportunities for Intermodal and Multimodal Connectivity”.

The third panel took place on the second day of the conference, and that panel was titled “Europe As the Continent of

Poets, Thinkers, and Inventors: An Optimistic Vision for the Future of Europe”. It was keynoted by Jacques Cheminade, who's

the former Presidential candidate in France. His speech was titled “What Europe Should Contribute to the New World Paradigm”.

Then, Dr. Natalia Vitrenko, who's the chairwoman of the Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine, gave a speech – “China's

Initiative from the Doom of Self-Destruction, to Prosperity and

Progress; A View from Ukraine”. Then, a speech from a representative from Serbia; an author and journalist named Dr.



Jasminka Simic. Her speech was titled "One Belt, One Road – An Opportunity for Development in the Western Balkans". Then that panel concluded with a speech from Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Professor Mariana Tian – "Bulgaria's Contribution to the Belt and Road Initiative".

There were also two other speeches; the chair of the Anglo-Hellenic and Cypriot Law Association, and the founding Director of the China Africa Advisory.

Then, the concluding panel of the entire conference, Panel IV; "The System We Live in Is Not Earthbound – Future Technologies and Scientific Breakthroughs". This was keynoted by Jason Ross, scientific advisor to the Schiller Institute. His speech was titled "The Scientific Method of LaRouche". He was followed by Prof. Dr. Helmut Alt, from the University of Applied Sciences in Aachen; who gave a speech – "Energy Transition; From Bad to Worse". Then that concluded with Dr. Wentao Guo, from Switzerland – "Current Situation of High Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactors in China".

Then there was an extensive Q&A period after that, in which there was very important input from the audience. The attendees at this event – which you could see just from the speaker's list alone – represented countries from Western Eurasia, from Central Europe, from Africa, from the United States, from Western Europe, from Scandinavia, from really literally all over the world. This was an extraordinary conference.

There was a resolution that was adopted at the concluding of the conference that I'd like to put on the screen here [Fig. 1].

The resolution is taking a note from what China has committed itself to – eliminating poverty by the year 2020 in China. So, this is the resolution adopted by the Schiller Institute conference in Bad Soden, Germany:

“At this conference, with the title ‘Fulfilling the Dream of Mankind,’ we discussed the incredible transformation of the world catalyzed by the Chinese initiative of the New Silk Road. The Belt and Road Initiative, which is creating optimism in Asia, Africa, Latin America, more and more states in Europe, and after the state visit of President Trump in China, in several states within the United States.

“The Belt and Road Initiative has the concrete perspective on how poverty and underdevelopment can be overcome through investment in infrastructure, industry and agriculture, based on scientific and technological progress. The Chinese government which uplifted 700 million out of poverty in the last 30 years, has now proclaimed the goal to lift the remaining 42 million people living in poverty out of their condition, and create a decent living standard for the entire Chinese population by the year 2020.

“Within the European Union, there are living approximately 120 million people below the poverty line, according to our own criteria characterizing the costs of life. Given the fact that Europe is still an economic powerhouse, there is no plausible reason why Europe cannot uplift these 120 million people out of

poverty by the year 2020, as well. The best way to accomplish this is for the EU, all European nations, to accept the offer by China to cooperate with China in the Belt and Road Initiative on a 'win-win' basis.

"We, the participants of the Schiller Institute conference, call on all elected officials to join this appeal to the European governments. Should we in Europe not be proud enough to say, if the Chinese can do this, we can do it, too?"

As you can see here, [newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com](http://newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com), that is the location of the proceedings of this conference which will

be published as they're prepared; but also, that resolution that

I just read to you, is available on that website –[newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com](http://newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com) – and it's collecting signatures. It's something that you can add your name to and you

can circulate that. Obviously, it applies not only to Europe, but applies to the United States as well; this goal of eliminating poverty by building infrastructure and high technology projects to increase the living standards and the productivity of our populations; as China is doing through the Belt and Road Initiative. This is what can be accomplished in the United States. We'll review a little bit of that.

I do want to note that Helga Zepp-LaRouche made a special notice of the statement by West Virginia Governor Jim Justice after he secured \$87 billion in joint investment into the state

of West Virginia; which is greater than the entire GDP of that state. This accomplishment is really the spirit of the New Silk

Road, which is now sweeping through the world and has even

taken

hold in our very own state of West Virginia here in the United States.

Now, let's look at the extraordinary rate of developments that have occurred since this conference happened in Frankfurt,

Germany last weekend. This is part of putting on those new glasses that Helga LaRouche talked about in order to see the world as it really is; not to see the world through the kind of

spin and propaganda that you're inundated with on a daily basis

by the media. If you were following the media, you would think,

that the only issue on the table, are the series of sex scandals

that are coming out from celebrities and news anchors and so forth and so on. And you would miss the fact that we are literally living in the absolute epicenter right now in history

of a total paradigm shift in the history of mankind.

So, let's look at this extraordinary rate of developments.

This conference, obviously, in Europe – the Schiller Institute conference – took place right on the heels of President Trump's

extraordinarily successful trip to Asia; where he had his state

visit-plus visit with President Xi Jinping in China. And the \$250 billion worth of deals that were signed there for joint investments, the fact that President Xi Jinping put directly on

the table the idea of the United States and US businesses collaborating with the Belt and Road Initiative, and the fact that President Xi Jinping and President Trump solidified a very

close personal relationship and really ushered in a new era of US-China collaboration. After that, just during the course of

the last five days, you've seen what was just mentioned there in the resolution from the Frankfurt conference; that nations of Europe are now beginning to reach out and reciprocate the hand of friendship that's coming from China to participate in the Belt and Road Initiative.

This is taking place most significantly in the more impoverished countries of Eastern and Central Europe. We have the just-concluded 16+1 talks, which occurred in Budapest, Hungary. This is the meeting of the so-called CEEC, or the Central and Eastern European Countries – those are the 16; and then the +1 is China. So, this is the 16+1, the Central and Eastern European Countries plus China. What was discussed at this conference was the further coordination between these countries of Eastern Europe and the Chinese, especially on the idea of the Belt and Road Initiative; the New Eurasian Land-Bridge as it was termed by Helga and Lyndon LaRouche back in the 1980s. The core feature of that proposal back in the end of the 1980s, which gave birth to this idea of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, was the idea of taking these Eastern European countries – what had been formerly part of the Soviet Union or the Soviet space – and taking what was an under-developed area of Europe and developing it through bridging Western Europe with Russia and then beyond through these kinds of transportation corridors and high technology development grids. That's exactly what China was discussing with these countries in Eastern Europe during the 16+1 conference. These are mainly countries such as Hungary, Serbia, Poland, which really this is their conception of themselves; they serve as Europe's front door onto the New

Silk

Road. As the New Silk Road comes westward across Eurasia, the front door to Europe are these Eastern European countries.

They

have gone from being on the margins of Europe with under-development and poverty and prolonged unemployment and these other crises, they've gone from being on the margins to being at the very center of this new dynamic which is sweeping from the East.

This is referred to in Hungary as their "eastward opening"; that Hungary's future is to orient towards this new era of development which is coming from Eurasia, rather than orienting

towards the collapsing system of Western Europe and the failed EU. Zhang Ming, who's China's ambassador to the European Union,

published an article that was published immediately prior to the

16+1 meeting on November 27th, in which he emphasized the central

role of the Belt and Road Initiative in China's policy towards Europe. He said, "As China and Europe work together to synergize

the Belt and Road Initiative, the 16 CEEC countries will play a

more prominent role as a hub which connects Asia and Europe.

Faster development in CEEC countries contributes to a more balanced development across Europe and European integration."

So, in other words, the faster development of these impoverished

countries in Central and Eastern Europe will be a "win-win" for

everybody involved. He used these words, that these countries will serve a "prominent role as a hub which connects Asia and Europe."

Then as Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban stated a few weeks ago – and he was the host of this meeting in Budapest,

Hungary obviously – but this was a statement that he made back in October. This is absolutely to the point of what we're discussing on this webcast today; this idea that the Belt and Road Initiative is now the irresistible and dominant dynamic on this planet. This is a quote from Prime Minister Orbán: "The world's center of gravity is shifting from West to East. While there is still some denial of this in the Western world, that denial does not seem to be reasonable. We see the world economy's center of gravity shifting from the Atlantic region to the Pacific region. This is not my opinion, this is a fact." Now incidentally, that quote, that statement by Prime Minister Orbán, is exactly the point that Lyndon LaRouche made in this book; this very prescient book that he published over a decade ago called {Earth's Next Fifty Years; The Coming Eurasian World}. In that book, Mr. LaRouche said the dominant dynamic of the world is going to be the rising countries of Asia; these are where the most concentrations of population are, this is the fastest rates of growth. And this is where the world's center of gravity is shifting economically; the coming Eurasian world, or the Pacific-centered world. So, this is a direct echo of exactly what Lyndon LaRouche said way back when before any of this economic miracle took place. But Mr. LaRouche was very prescient on that fact. Now, while a number of leading European press outlets have been doing exactly what Viktor Orbán said – denying this fact; trying to deny this inevitable fact that the center of gravity

has shifted from West to East. You had, for example, the {Financial Times} ran an extensive article headlined “Brussels Rattled As China Reaches Out to Eastern Europe”; obviously just hysterical that these Eastern European countries are now oriented towards the Belt and Road Initiative. Despite that fact, there are some leading circles in Europe who are, indeed, recognizing that Europe’s future lies in joining this New Paradigm. Obviously, that could be seen from this extensive speaker’s list at the Schiller Institute conference in Frankfurt; but there was another very significant conference that occurred just a few days later this week in Paris. This was the first annual Paris Forum on the Belt and Road Initiative; so it’s going to take place very year. This is the first annual event. It was co-organized by the Chinese embassy and the French Institute for International and Strategic Affairs – IRIS is their acronym. This is the third largest think tank in Paris. The founding director is Pascal Boniface, who is very positive in terms of his attitude towards this idea of France and Europe as a whole joining with the Belt and Road Initiative. There were some 400 people in participation at this very important event. There were think tanks, there were civil servants, people from the French government, there were heads of different French companies – CEOs – retired military, there were cultural figures, and there were media who attended. Among them, the forum was addressed by the Chinese Ambassador to France, Zhai Jun. He put directly on



the table, France, Europe should join this new emerging paradigm, this Belt and Road Initiative. This goes directly along with the attendance by Raffarin, the former Prime Minister of France to the Belt and Road Forum that occurred this past Spring in Beijing. There have been other prominent figures inside France who have done exactly what these people have done at this very significant event, and said "Look, this is the future of the world economy. The center of gravity has shifted, and we better get on board." This was also the subject, by the way, of Jacques Cheminade's speech at the Schiller Institute conference; and this is something that he's been in extensive conversation with, with numerous leading figures inside France as part of his Presidential campaign. He even met with the former President of France, Francois Hollande, while he was President at the Elysée Palace and discussed exactly this idea. So, as you can see, the movers and shakers behind this, the ideas which are driving history, are really the leaders and the collaborators of the LaRouche Movement worldwide. Let me shift focus now. We're continuing to catalog the extraordinary rate of developments that have occurred just over the last five days since this extraordinary conference in Frankfurt. Let's shift focus now to Latin America. We had the 11th China-Latin America-Caribbean Business Summit, which happened in Uruguay; actually it's still happening. It started

yesterday, and it's going through this Sunday, so it's a four-day conference. This was to discuss the idea of how Western Hemisphere countries, especially countries in South and Central America, can participate in China's One Belt, One Road Initiative. Whereas this is the 11th annual conference between the Central and South American countries and China, this was by far the largest of these conferences to have taken place. There were over 2500 people in attendance, which included high-level businessmen, government officials, and policymakers from all over Latin America. One of the plenary sessions which took place at this conference was titled, "A New Vision of Collaboration Among China, Latin America, and the Caribbean in the Framework of the One Belt, One Road Strategy". So, that's explicit; this is the idea of Latin American joining the New Silk Road. Just because we're discussing Latin America, there was a wonderful sentiment which was voiced by Chilean President Michelle Bachelet. This was a speech that she gave on November 23rd at the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Confucius Institute in Chile. She said, "The world is orienting more than ever towards China and the Pacific Basin. Therefore, we know very well that our relationship with China and the Asia-Pacific in particular, is crucial for us to fulfill our destiny." She said, "Chile's relationship with China goes

well

beyond trade ties. It is one of our primary political partners

on the path to opening integration and cooperation for progress.”

Then Michelle Bachelet said after she retires as the President of

Chile, she intends to study the Chinese language in depth.

So,

that’s a commitment that perhaps all heads of state should make,

as we recognize that the center of gravity of the world’s strategic and economic reality is shifting towards China. We did

see that from President Trump’s granddaughter, Arabella Kushner

– that’s Ivanka’s daughter – where she recorded the song in Mandarin Chinese. A video of her singing a song in Mandarin Chinese, and sent that as a goodwill offering to President Xi Jinping in China.

And one more item I should just note. This is a yet-unconfirmed report, but it’s very credible, that Japan – now

we’ve shifted from Europe to Central and South America, and now

we’re in the Asia Pacific. Japan is actively considering joint

projects with Chinese companies on building the One Belt, One Road. This is hugely significant, judging by the historic conflicts between Japan and China, which have been played on by

these Western geopoliticians for decades; to try to keep these two extraordinarily significant countries from collaborating.

If

Japan and China collaborate on the Belt and Road Initiative, this

is a dynamic which is absolutely unstoppable. There was an

article in a Japanese paper titled "Government To Help Japan, China Firms in Belt and Road". It reports that the Abe government is considering supporting companies to carry out joint projects with Chinese companies along the Belt and Road. I think underscoring this fact, as I stated in the beginning of today's broadcast, that the Belt and Road is an absolutely unstoppable and irresistible dynamic; which has now become dominant and is something which cannot be ignored. Underscoring that fact that, indeed, this New Silk Road is the dominant irresistible dynamic on this planet, here's a statement from the {Global Times} which is absolutely to the point. It says "Generally speaking, Japan's economy has been always greatly dependent on overseas markets. So, for the sustainable development of its economy, Japan needs access to the business opportunities offered by the vast infrastructure projects along the Belt and Road route." So, this is the sentiment that's being expressed by everybody. We go from the hosts of this first annual conference on the Belt and Road Initiative in Paris. Look at what Viktor Orban said at the 16+1 conference in Budapest, Hungary. Look at what Michelle Bachelet said in Chile at the Confucius Institute. Look at the statements that were made at this Central and South American-China Business Forum. Look at what's now being said in Japan. Look at the statements that were made at the Schiller Institute conference in Frankfurt. And look at what was done

by

President Trump during his trip to China, and the summit that he

had with President Xi Jinping. Everything is being shaped by this initiative, by the New Silk Road; by this initiative which

is coming out of China for “win-win” mutually beneficial cooperation on great project development for the entire planet.

This is the dominant of the future.

As Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, you need to put on the new set of glasses to be able to see reality as it really is; not through

the skewed mirrors and the propaganda which is coming out of the

Western media. I think that perhaps the best statement, and the

most candid statement of all – of all of these statements about

the reality of this future dynamic – and why the United States and Europe and South America and Asia need to jump on board with

the New Silk Road, need to join with this new dynamic and catch

this spirit of the New Silk Road; probably the best and most candid of those statements came out of Governor Jim Justice from

West Virginia during his press conference that he gave there at

the state capital, announcing this extraordinary \$87 billion deal

between China and the state of West Virginia. Here’s what Governor Jim Justice had to say:

GOVERNOR JIM JUSTICE

: And I would say to all of you

all that may be doubters that this could become a reality,  
“Don’t  
get on the wrong side of it.” Because, really and truly, it’s  
a  
comin’. It’s a comin’.”

OGDEN: “It’s a comin’.” I would say to all the doubters,  
“this could become a reality, ‘Don’t get on the wrong side of  
it.’ Because it’s a comin’,” he said. “It’s a comin’.” So,  
that was actually from the conclusion of a really wonderful  
and  
important video that was just put on the LaRouche PAC website  
this week, all about West Virginia. West Virginia, which as  
Helga LaRouche said, is known across the country right now as  
the  
epicenter of poverty, unemployment, drug epidemic overdoses,  
and  
just general backward economic conditions. West Virginia  
could  
now become the cutting edge and the economic driver of the  
entire  
Appalachian region here in the United States because of this  
“win-win” investment that came from China. So, I would  
encourage  
you to watch that video in full on the LaRouche PAC website.  
But let me just say, this is an extraordinary rate of  
development of events that have occurred over the past five  
days.  
I think that anybody who is looking at the reality soberly and  
with clarity will see that, indeed, the efforts of the  
LaRouche  
Movement over the past several years to put this question on  
the  
table; to put this idea of a New Paradigm of economic  
cooperation  
and “win-win” development, this New Silk Road – this Eurasian  
Land-Bridge, this World Land-Bridge idea. Put that on the

table

and to shape all of the discussions that are occurring at the highest levels of policymaking worldwide around that idea. I think that truly is becoming the dominant dynamic, and it's a testament to the fact that a small handful of people with very powerful ideas, can indeed be very successful in shaping the course of world history.

Now, I would say that what Helga LaRouche began, those remarks that I played at the beginning of the show; this idea of

the greatest, the best of all possible worlds – what Gottfried Leibniz had to say. This is an understanding of how the universe

corresponds to the creative will of mankind. That there is a principle of good that is behind the creation, the creation of the universe; and that principle of good corresponds with the creative nature of mankind. And when mankind acts on that creative quality, and acts for the benefit of the greatest number

of possible people, the greatest possible General Welfare; acts

on the basis of this principle of good, that the universe corresponds and, indeed, responds. Because of this harmony, this

pre-established harmony which Leibniz discussed. That was at the

core of his understanding of the best of all possible worlds.

So, with that axiomatic understanding of the philosophical nature of what this effort is all about – to bring about a New Paradigm of human relations on this planet – let's conclude with

the concluding quote from Helga Zepp-LaRouche during her keynote

at that Schiller Institute conference in Germany. Helga Zepp-LaRouche said the following: "If we revive the Classical culture of all nations, and enter a beautiful dialogue among them, mankind will experience a new renaissance and unleash an

enormous creativity of the human species like never before. "So, it is very good to live at this moment in history and contribute to make the world a better place. And it can be done, because the New Paradigm corresponds to the lawfulness of the physical universe in science, Classical art, and these principles. What will be asserted is the identity of the human species as {the} creative species in the universe." So, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, it is very good to live at this moment, and to contribute to this New Paradigm which is now emerging on this planet, and to contribute to the good of mankind. So, thank you very much for joining us here today. We strongly encourage you to not only watch Helga Zepp-LaRouche's keynote address in its entirety, but to stay tuned to that Schiller Institute channel as all of these panels, all of these videos, all of these presentations are produced and put up on the website for you to watch in their entirety. So, thank you for joining in, and let's continue to spread the spirit of the New Silk Road. Thank you and good night.

---

**»Den Nye Silkevej er en ny model for internationale relationer«**



# Hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche på Schiller Institut konference, 25.-26. nov., 2017, Frankfurt, Tyskland: »At opfylde menneskehedens drøm«

*Jeg mener, at den Nye Silkevej er et typisk eksempel på en idé, hvis tid er kommet; og når en idé på denne måde først er ved at blive en materialistisk virkelighed, bliver den til en fysisk kraft i universet. Jeg har personligt haft mulighed for at se udviklingen af denne idé, der på mange måder reelt set begyndte med dette store menneske – min ægtemand, Lyndon LaRouche; der, for mange årtier siden – for næsten et halvt århundrede siden – fik ideen om en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden. Dette blev dernæst mere manifest i 1970'erne, '80erne og især i 1991, da Sovjetunionen opløstes, og hvor denne idé om at skabe en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden blev meget fremtrædende.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Målestokken for strategisk

# Succes

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 14. nov., 2017 – I bemærkninger på Air Force One på vej hjem fra Filippinerne til USA efter sin 12 dage lange, historieskabende rejse til Asien, karakteriserede præsident Donald Trump rejsen som »enormt succesfuld«, og at de indgåede aftaler til en værdi af \$300 mia. snart ville blive tredoblet.

Men, det er mere end dette.

I et par dusin amerikanske stater – fra Alaska til Vest Virginia og Montana – der har direkte fordel af mange af disse aftaler, er en følelse af lettelse og endda optimisme ved at vende tilbage i takt med, at udsigten til at komme ud af landets lange, økonomiske mareridt begynder at tage form i folks sind.

Men det er også mere end dette.

En kronik i dag i Kinas *Global Times* går endnu videre og proklamerer i sin overskrift, at »USA's deltagelse i Bælte & Vej er uundgåelig« – et initiativ for en politik, der er markant knyttet til Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Artiklens forfatter, Wang Yiwei, direktør for Institut for Internationale Anliggender ved Renmin Universitet, skriver, at handelsaftalerne fra præsident Trumps rejse til Kina »vil gøre det muligt for USA bedre at lære om mulighederne og udsigterne for økonomisk samarbejde. På denne baggrund er tiden inde for USA til at genoverveje en tilslutning til Bælte & Vej Initiativet, der tilbyder større rum for samarbejde«. Forfatteren Wang anbefaler endda, at de to lande kunne arbejde sammen om infrastruktur, måske først i udviklede lande, som i USA's Midtvesten, og at USA og Kina kunne oprette en »global infrastruktur-investeringsbank«.

Men, målestokken for strategisk succes er mere end selv dette.

Vi står, udtalte Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag, over for en situation med endnu større muligheder end situationen i 1989, hvor Berlinmurens fald åbnede for muligheden for, at menneskeheden kunne erstatte den bankerotte, transatlantiske, gamle orden med en politik for et Nyt Paradigme, som Lyndon LaRouche og hans bevægelse på det tidspunkt specificerede. Denne chance blev på tragisk vis forspildt, har fr. Zepp-LaRouche gentagne gange udtalt.

»Dengang havde vi kun vore ideer«, forklarede hun i dag, »men man havde ingen kræfter, de ville gennemføre dem. Men nu har vi verdens største land, der går i retning af at gennemføre det, allieret med 70 andre lande. Vi har hele udviklingen i Asien, der er totalt domineret af dette nye paradigme. Og denne kendsgerning er nu også ved at slå igennem i USA og Europa.«

Det, vi er oppe imod i denne kamp i dag, er Det britiske Imperiums liberale *establishment* og deres hjernevask af befolkningen gennem organisationer såsom Kongressen for Kulturel Frihed (CCF). »Vi angreb CCF i hele denne periode«, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche. »De formede hele efterkrigstidens kulturelle paradigme. Hele den venstre-liberale elite og dens aksiomer kom fra den kulturelle hjernevask, som udførtes af CCF, der blev finansieret af CIA og Udenrigsministeriet. Og hertil kom, at vi også havde Frankfurterskolen; dernæst havde vi 68'erne; og dernæst blev det 'Grønne' paradigme gennemført. Så hvis man ser på blandingen af hele denne hjernevask, så har man eliten af neo-liberalt etablissement, som nu er ved at gå under, og som flipper ud over Trump og selvfølgelig over Kina og Rusland osv.

»Dette er et forkert livssyn, et forkert syn på verden«, fortsatte Zepp-LaRouche. »De er anti-videnskab, de er anti-klassisk kultur. Ud fra et historisk synspunkt vil de gå under, lige som Middelalderens skolastikere, fordi de troede på noget, der ikke var i overensstemmelse med universets love.

Det er vigtigt at tænke over dette, for de er vore modstandere; det er, hvad der ligger bag tankegangen à la [USA's særlige anklager Robert] Mueller, bortset fra et par andre ubehagelige, neo-konservative elementer, og så fremdeles. Grunden til, at de hader os, er på grund af det, Lyndon LaRouche har skrevet. De hader passioneret hans måde at tænke på.«

Zepp-LaRouche konkluderede: »Kampen i USA er helt uafgjort; den kan vindes. Men disse folk er der stadig, så vi må virkelig gå hårdt frem imod dem. Lyndon LaRouches tænkning er så overlegen; vi bør ikke i ét eneste øjeblik falde under denne standard. Så lad os få udsigten til at vinde denne kamp, og denne krig.«

Dette, og intet andet, opfylder hele målestokken for strategisk succes.

---

## **Vi skaber ideerne bag den fremvoksende nye æra for menneskeheden!**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 30. okt., 2017* – Kinas Kommunistiske Partis netop afsluttede 19. Nationalkongres har konsolideret ideen om, frem til midten af dette århundrede, at skabe et »smukt Kina« og en »smuk verden«, hvor regeringer vil blive styret af konceptet om at sørge for deres befolknings voksende »lykke«.

Dette er en betagende udvikling af strategisk betydning, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i denne weekend, og som er gået fuldstændig hen over hovedet på det meste af USA's og

Europas befolkning – for slet ikke at tale om, at det er en fornyet erklæring »med kinesiske karaktertræk« af de centrale, filosofiske koncepter, omkring hvilke USA selv blev grundlagt. »Hvilken leder, fra hvilket land i Vesten, har en sådan vision i dag?« spurgte Zepp-LaRouche. Hvor længe siden er det, at en amerikansk statsmand har gjort et sådant perspektiv, med samt dets medfølgende begreb om mennesket, til emnet for national diskurs?

Og dog ville disse dybtgående ideer ikke være så fremmedartede for flertallet af amerikanere i dag, hvis ikke Lyndon LaRouche, sammen med mange af hans medarbejdere, uretmæssigt og på falske anklager var blevet jaget i fængsel og hen over tre årtier fremstillet som en udstødt person. Denne forbrydelse blev begået af den samme, britisk-kørte bande af bøller, med Robert Mueller som et fremtrædende bandemedlem, og som gik videre til at dække over den saudisk-britiske rolle i 11. september-angrebet, og som nu forsøger at vælte Trump-regeringen og selve USA's forfatning – et billede, der hinsides *enhver* rimelig tvivl er bevist i *EIR's* Robert Mueller Specialrapport[1], der nu cirkuleres bredt i hele landet.

Briterne gjorde alt dette for at forsøge at bringe de ideer til tavshed, som Lyndon LaRouche på enestående vis har skabt hen over årtier, og som fastlægger grundlaget for at virkeliggøre et Nyt Paradigme for menneskeheden, der vil lægge Det britiske Imperium i graven én gang for alle. Det er de ideer, der nu tager form i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, som ubønhørligt går fremad på alle kontinenter.

»Vi skaber ideerne«, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche som et faktum. Det, der nu vokser frem på verdensscenen, er et resultat af vores mobilisering, vores organisering og vores opdragelse hen over årtier – ikke alene omkring projekter og politikker, men også omkring Lyndon LaRouches banebrydende opdagelser, hans udarbejdelse af det centrale begreb om menneskets skabende identitet og det, der adskiller mennesket fra alle andre, kendte arter. Det ville være udbytterigt at studere disse

skrifter i dag, både i Vest og Øst. I særdeleshed tilskyndede hun til læsning, eller genlæsning, af Lyndon LaRouches skrift fra 2004, »En dialog mellem eurasiske civilisationer: Jordens kommende 50 år«[2].

Åbningsbemærkningerne til denne rapport fra LaRouche, der figurerer som frontispice i bogversionen, lyder som følger:

*»Kreativitet, som jeg her har identificeret det, er forskellen på dig og en abekat. Der er faktisk to egenskaber ved denne forskel. For det første, så kan et medlem af den menneskelige art øge hans eller hendes arts potentielle, relative befolkningstæthed gennem sin viljemæssige anvendelse af kreativitet, som ingen form for dyr kan gøre. For det andet, så afhænger samfundets fremskridt hen over successive generationer af, at disse generationer gen-vedtager, eller atter sætter i kraft, den skabende opdagelse af denne form for universelle, fysiske principper. Sammen kan disse to udtryk for kreativitet (som jeg definerer det) fastlægge grundlaget for det, vi kunne kalde naturlig, menneskelig moral, den form for forskel, der adskiller menneskelig moral fra aberigets kultur.«*

Ti år tidligere, i 1993, da Lyndon LaRouche stadig var fængslet, skrev han en lang artikel, der udredte denne, hans enestående opdagelse, i en artikel med titlen, »Om LaRouches opdagelse«[3], hvis indledende afsnit lyder:

*»Det centrale træk af mit originale bidrag til Leibniz' videnskab om fysisk økonomi, er at give en metode til at adressere den årsagsmæssige sammenhæng mellem, på den ene side, enkeltpersoners bidrag til aksiomatisk revolutionerende fremskridt i videnskabelige og analoge former for viden, og, på den anden side, de heraf følgende forøgelse af den potentielle befolkningstæthed i de korresponderende samfund. I sin anvendelse i politisk økonomi, fokuserer min metode på analyse af den centrale rolle af den følgende tretrins rækkefølge: For det første, aksiomatisk revolutionerende*

*former for videnskabelig og analog opdagelse; for det andet, de heraf følgende fremskridt i principper for maskinredskaber og analoge ting; sluttelig, de heraf følgende fremskridt i arbejdskraftens produktive evne.«*

Nu er et godt tidspunkt for verden til fuldt og helt at opdage LaRouches opdagelse.

*Foto: Xi Jinping: »Flere end 60 million mennesker er blevet løftet ud af fattigdom i løbet af de seneste fem år.« (Xinhua / New China)*

[1] [Læs Mueller-dossieret her.](#)

[2] EIR, 7. januar, 2005; artiklen er indeholdt i LaRouches bog, »Jordens kommende 50 år«, der kan købes fra Amazon.com (eller ved henvendelse til vores kontor, -red.)

[Læs artiklen her.](#)

[3] [Læs artiklen her.](#)

---

**Lyndon LaRouche:  
»En dialog mellem eurasiske  
civilisationer:  
Jordens kommende 50 år« og  
»Om LaRouches opdagelse«.**

# pdf; engelsk

☒ *»Kreativitet, som jeg her har identificeret det, er forskellen på dig og en abekat. Der er faktisk to egenskaber ved denne forskel. For det første, så kan et medlem af den menneskelige art øge hans eller hendes arts potentielle, relative befolkningstæthed gennem sin viljemæssige anvendelse af kreativitet, som ingen form for dyr kan gøre. For det andet, så afhænger samfundets fremskridt hen over successive generationer af, at disse generationer genvedtager, eller atter sætter i kraft, den skabende opdagelse af denne form for universelle, fysiske principper. Sammen kan disse to udtryk for kreativitet (som jeg definerer det) fastlægge grundlaget for det, vi kunne kalde naturlig, menneskelig moral, den form for forskel, der adskiller menneskelig moral fra aberigets kultur.«*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

*»Det centrale træk af mit originale bidrag til Leibniz' videnskab om fysisk økonomi, er at give en metode til at adresse den årsagsmæssige sammenhæng mellem, på den ene side, enkeltpersoners bidrag til aksiomatisk revolutionerende fremskridt i videnskabelige og analoge former for viden, og, på den anden side, de heraf følgende forøgelse af den potentielle befolkningstæthed i de korresponderende samfund. I sin anvendelse i politisk økonomi, fokuserer min metode på analyse af den centrale rolle af den følgende tretrins rækkefølge: For det første, aksiomatisk revolutionerende*



*former for videnskabelig og analog opdagelse; for det andet, de heraf følgende fremskridt i principper for maskinredskaber og analoge ting; sluttelig, de heraf følgende fremskridt i arbejdskraftens produktive evne.«*

Download (PDF, Unknown)