

Det næste stadium i menneskets evolution

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

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

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

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

»Opdel Øst- og Sydasiens maritime område i tre hovedkategorier: Kina, en gigant; Indien, en gigant; og så den maritime forbindelse, i hele Sydøstasiens maritime områder. Tilføj indvirkningen af sådanne tre-i-én maritime og relaterede forbindelser, til de fysisk-økonomiske relationer til de amerikanske kontinenter mod øst, og til Mellemøstens underside og Afrika. Så kommer udviklingen af Kra-kanalens potens til syne som ikke alene et eminent muligt træk, men som en strategisk, politisk-økonomisk kraft for hele planeten.«

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

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

Kina og Japan har lagt projektet for Kra-kanalen[1], der er en hovedforbindelse i den Maritime Silkevej, frem på bordet igen. Samtidig, som en del af Silkevejen for Afrika, har Kina engageret sig i Transaqua-projektet, det største infrastrukturprojekt, Afrika nogensinde har overvejet, som det rapporteres i *EIR*-magasinet fra 6. januar. Som Cladio Celani her skrev, så handler denne idé om »en vandvej, der vil være i stand til at genopfylde Tchad-søen og samtidig skabe en

gigantinfrastruktur for transport, energi og landbrug i Centralafrika. Byggeriet af et sådant infrastrukturprojekt ville tilbyde jobs til millioner af afrikanere og lægge fundamentet for fremtidig udvikling.«[2]

Vidtrækkende, som det er, så er Verdenslandbroen blot en del af dette Nye Paradigme. Til dette hører også den nye, »økonomiske platform«, som udgøres udviklingen af det umiddelbare rum (dvs., Solsystemet). Det er fuldt ud opnåeligt, at, i den umiddelbare fremtid, vil nationer gå sammen om et rumprogram, hvis amerikanske komponent alene vil blive langt større end Kennedys Måneprogram. Og vi kan og må have et succesfuldt, internationalt program for at producere stort set gratis energi til menneskeheden, på basis af kernefusion. Disse programmets nødvendige grundlag er et statsligt banksystem og en statslig kreditpolitik, der er målrettet herpå, og som må begynde med en genoplivelse af Franklin Roosevelts beskyttelse gennem Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven.

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

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

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

Vi slutter med Krafft Ehrickes ord fra 1966, som vi tidligere

har citeret her i lederartiklen:

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

Vi kan vinde dette her.

Foto: USA's præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt, der i 1933 satte Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven i kraft, som indledte USA's udtræden af 'Den store Depression' og en udvikling, der ved slutningen af hans præsidentskab, ved hans død i 1945, havde gjort USA til den største fysisk-økonomiske magt, verden havde set.

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

<https://larouhepac.com/20170117/major-breakthrough-kra-canal-potential>

[2]

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19.

januar 2017: Dagen før Trumps indsættelse

Med formang Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

Kom til koncerten:

En Musikalsk Dialog Mellem Kulturer

Fredag den 17. februar 2017, kl. 19,

Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur

Vester Voldgade 11, København.

Gratis adgang.

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

**Kinesisk medie rapporterer,
at »Bælt-og-Vej«
får støtte fra
indflydelsesrig tysk
politiker,**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, på seminar i Stockholm

17. jan., 2017 – *China Radio Internationals* engelske webside, CRIEnglish.com, rapporterer i dag, at »Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ har fået støtte fra en indflydelsesrig, tysk, politisk aktivist, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, medstifter af Internationale Schiller Institut, sagde, at Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet ikke alene var en god idé, men også meget praktisk. Gennem at bygge infrastruktur, sagde hun, forbedres folks levestandard og fattigdom lettes, gennem et fokus på udvikling.

»Zepp-LaRouche talte på et indflydelsesrigt seminar (11. jan.) i den svenske hovedstad Stockholm, med deltagelse af henved 100 personer, de fleste af dem honoratiores fra diverse ambassader i byen.

'Geopolitik har været årsag til de to verdenskrige, og jeg mener, vi må gå over til menneskehedens fælles mål; jeg mener, det absolut er den substantielle udfordring for os at løse. Og jeg mener, at det kinesiske tilbud om at få en win-win-situation for alle lande i verden er det eneste, praktiske initiativ på bordet'«, sagde LaRouche.

»Det kinesiske forslag om Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet bringer henved 60 lande sammen i Asien, Europa, Mellemøsten og Afrika, for at fremme handel og samarbejde. Det blev først fremlagt som forslag af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping i 2013 og består af to hovedgrene – det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej.«

»Helga Zepp-LaRouche optrådte på seminaret som medforfatter af en ny bog, *Fra Silkevejen til Verdenslandbroen* [sic], der er blevet oversat til kinesisk, arabisk og flere andre sprog. I denne bog udtrykker hun sin stærke overbevisning om, at

strategien med Bælt-og-Vej er et godt paradigme, der vil erstatte geopolitik.«

»'Jeg mener, at det er en udvikling i den rigtige retning, for i begyndelsen tænkte folk, at det er enten Kina eller Rusland, eller Centralasien; enten nord eller syd, øst eller vest, men i mellemtiden har det strategiske partnerskab mellem Rusland og Kina løst dét problem.'«

»LaRouche mener, at kun gennem udvikling kan krige og konflikter undgås, som hun føler, er de største fjender af udvikling og byggeri af infrastruktur, der i sig selv er befordrende for udvikling og forbedring af menneskers liv. Medforfatter Hussein Askary sagde, at deres bog havde til formål at udarbejde nogle meget praktiske planer, for eksempel, hvordan Irak kunne finde sin plads i ideen om Bælt-og-Vej.«

»'Man behøver ikke at sende penge til Irak eller selv Afrika, for disse lande har resurser; det, som disse lande behøver, er teknologi. Og det er, hvad Kina stiller til rådighed. Kina leverer teknologi og spørger ikke, om man har penge eller ej, for, når ens naboer bliver rigere, vil man selv drage fordel af det, man skaber et marked, man skaber ny teknologi og innovationer.'«

»Helga LaRouche fortsatte med at sige, at hun mener, at Kina vil blive en virkelig model for relationer landene imellem, gennem samarbejdende udvikling.«

Artiklen ledsages af to fotos, der viser Zepp-LaRouche tale ved arrangementet, samt dias-billedet, der viser »Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet og LaRouche-planer«.

(Se Helgas tale i Stockholm her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17330>)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 16. januar
2017:**

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

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

1. del:

2. del:

**Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på
seminar i Stockholm, 11.**

januar, 2017. Video; engelsk udskrift.

Stockholm EIR/Schiller Institute Seminar Wednesday, January 11, 2017

[The video is available on the Schiller YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdl0Hxg_Ubc

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm

HUSSEIN ASKARY: Thank you very much everybody for attending the seminar, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Your Excellencies, and ladies and gentlemen, we are very, very pleased that we have a special guest. It's all clear that the interest for this theme is very big, and this is a very special; there are many expectations on the new administration and new policy, but there are also many challenges around the world. And we have the honor of having Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and chairwoman of the International Schiller Institute, who has not only followed at very close range, followed developments internationally, both strategic, economic and cultural, but she herself and her association were actually contributing to what we call this new paradigm in international politics. But this new paradigm in international politics of course, we will hear from Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

We will have Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche's presentation and then I will make a short presentation and then we'll have a break... [applause]

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Good day, ladies and gentlemen. We are in indeed in very, very fascinating times. And I think there is much reason to be hopeful. I know that for the last 16 years, most people in the United States and Europe thought there is no great future. But I think that there is

[annulation? 2.29] of strategic realignments which have shaped up over the last three years, but especially in the last year, where one can actually see the potential for a completely new kind of relation among nations is on the horizon and that we may actually have the chance to bring a peaceful world.

Now, obviously, in the system of globalization as we have known it, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, that system is completely unhinged and this is cause for a lot of freaked out reactions by those people who were the beneficiaries of that system of globalization, but I will hopefully be able to develop that this is a temporary phenomenon, and it will be replaced by some more optimistic developments.

What we see right now is a completely new paradigm emerging, a system which is based on the development of all, a "win-win" potential to cooperate among nations and obviously the idea for what was the axiomatic basis of the globalization system since '91 to insist on a unipolar world, is failing, or has failed already. And with that, a system which tried to maintain this unipolar world with the policy of regime change, of color revolution, or humanitarian intervention, or so-called humanitarian intervention to defend democracy and human rights, which obviously has led the world to a terrible condition, but this is now coming to an end.

So obviously, the statement by Francis Fukuyama at the end of the Soviet Union that this was the "end of history" and that there would be now only democracy, was really pretty sure; because you have a complete backlash right now, which takes

different forms in different in different parts of the world against this system of globalization, and in the Asian countries it takes the form of more and more countries joining with the New Silk Road perspective offered by China, the offer to work

together in a "win-win" cooperation with the Belt and Road

Initiative which is now already involving more than 100 nations and international organizations; and is already engaged in the largest infrastructure project in the history of mankind.

This new paradigm economic system, already involves 4.4 billion people; it is already in terms of spending, in terms of buying power in today's dollars, 12 times as big as the Marshall Plan was after the Second World War, and is open for every country to join, including Sweden, including the United States, including every other country on the planet. And I will talk about that in a little while.

And in the trans-Atlantic sector you have a different kind of anti-globalization revolt, which is still ongoing, it's not yet settled how this will turn out. It started in a visible form with the vote of the British population in June last year with the Brexit, which was the first real upset; everybody was totally unexpected it, except a few insiders. This anti-globalization revolt was obviously continued with the election of President Donald Trump in the United States; it was continued with the "no" to the Italian referendum organized by Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, to change the Constitution. And it's coming to all of these developments, Brexit, Trump, no to the referendum in Italy, is that is caused by a fundamental feeling of injustice of ever larger parts of the population which were victims of that system, which increasingly made the rich richer, made more billionaires richer, but destroying successively the middle range of society, and making the poor poorer. It is my deepest conviction that that revolt will continue until the causes of this injustice are removed, and it will continue, it will hold the measuring rod to President Trump, if he will fulfill his election promises; and if he would not do that I believe the same people would turn against Trump as they turned against Hillary.

So that means that the future of the European Union

and the euro is very doubtful. We have elections coming in this year in France in April. This election as of now is completely up in the air. There is no firm prediction possible. You have a very tumultuous situation in Italy, where a coup was just attempted by Beppe Grillo and Verhofstadt [in the European Parliament] which failed, trying to get the Five Star Party into the Liberal Group [ALDE] in the European Parliament, which was rejected by the Liberal Group so it didn't function. Then you will have elections in Holland, and in September in Germany which, you know, the star of Mrs. Merkel is also no longer as shiny as it may have been a while ago.

So we are looking into dramatic changes.

Now, let me start with the Trump election. Now, I have in my whole political life, which is now becoming quite long, several decades – I have never in my whole political life, seen such hysteria on the side of the neo-cons, on the side of the mainstream politicians, on the side of the liberal media, as concerning Trump. Now, admittedly, Trump does not fulfill the behavior code of Baron von Kligel, who was a German in the 18th century who developed the code for good diplomatic behavior. But what was caused Trump, is that he simply promised end the political paradigm which was the basis of eight years of George W. Bush and eight years of Barack Obama, which was a direct continuation of the Bush-Cheney policy.

And it was a good thing, because it was very clear that if Hillary Clinton would have won the election in the United States, that all the policies she was pursuing, including an no-fly zone over Syria, and an extremely bellicose policy towards Russia and China, would have meant that we would have been on the direct course to World War III. If you have any doubts about that I'm perfectly happy to answer questions about that, in the question & answer period.

So the fact that Hillary did not win the election was

extremely important for the maintenance of world peace. And I think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the fact that he said, and by the appointment of these different cabinet members, if they all get through the nomination process in the Senate, that he will normalize the relationship between the United States and Russia, is, in my view *the most important step*. Because if the relationship between the United States and Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I think there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world. And if that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world peace is in extreme danger.

So from my standpoint, there is reason to believe that this will happen. The Russian reaction has been very moderately, but optimistic that this may happen. If you look at the appointments, you have several cabinet members and other people in other high posts who are also for improving the relationship with Russia, such as Tillerson who is supposed to become Secretary of State; General Flynn, who is a conservative military man but also for normalization with Russia, and many others, so I think this is a good sign.

Now, if you look at the reaction of the neo-con/neo-liberal faction on both sides of the Atlantic to this election of Trump, you can only describe it as *completely* hysterical. The *Washington Post* today has an article "How To Remove Trump from

Office," calling him a liar, just every derogative you can possibly imagine, just an all-in-one unbelievable; the reaction in Germany was – von der Leyen, the Defense Minister, in the morning after the election said she was "deeply shocked," this was "terrible," this was a catastrophe, and it keeps going like that. So they have not recovered.

And then naturally, you have the reports by the different U.S. intelligence services, Clapper, Brennan, Comey from the FBI, they all put out the fact that that it was Russian hacking of the emails of the DNC and Podesta which would have stolen the election, because they would have shifted the view of the Americans to vote for Trump.

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many cyber experts, also in Europe but also in the United States, already said that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an insider leak giving this information out, is more and more likely, and there's absolutely zero proof that it was Russian hacking. Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is that was the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved that Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie Sanders! That is not being talked about any more; but if there was any thought, I would say, look there, and there are many people who recognize, for example, a very important French intelligence person with the name of Eric Denécé who is a top-level think tanker in France who said: Well, it is quite clear why they put out this story, because the neo-cons had to expect the great cleanup and many of them would lose their positions, and this is why they basically all agreed on this story and changed the narrative.

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the neoliberal system of globalization which simply violated the interests of the majority of the people, especially in the "rust belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so arrogant that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states which are formerly industrialized. Where, you have to see that the United States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western media in Europe, the United States is in a state of economic collapse. They have for the first time, a shrinking life-expectancy; there is one indicator which shows if a society is doing good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first time for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment. There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever

finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

So the vote, therefore, the narrative, that was the reason why Hillary was voted out because she was being perceived as the direct continuation of these 16 years, and so the attempt to change that narrative by saying it was "Russian hacking" is pretty obvious.

Now, however, we have now I think ten days or nine days left, until the new President comes in. And this is not a period of relaxation, because again, in an unprecedented way, the old team of Obama is trying to create conditions for the incoming President Trump to force him to continue on the pathway of Obama. For example, just a couple of days ago, they started a deployment of a U.S. and NATO troops to be deployed at the Russian border in the Baltics, in Poland, and Romania, through the German city of Bremerhaven, where 6,000 troops landed with heavy military equipment; for example, the U.S. Abrams tanks, Paladin artillery, Bradley fighting vehicles, 2,800 pieces of military hardware, 50 Black Hawk helicopters, involving 1,800 personnel; 400 troops to be attached to the 24 Apache helicopters.

Now, obviously, the deployment of this is supposed to be a provocation against Russia and it's supposed to make it very difficult for Trump to start to improve relations.

A second area where you can see this effort to pin Trump down is the question of the THAAD missiles in Korea, where basically now North Korea has claimed to be able to be able to launch their ICBM anywhere, any time; and according to Chinese experts, the United States is entirely to blame why North Korea is behaving this way.

South Korea with the outgoing President Park Geun-hye, who may be impeached soon, actually in days or weeks, she agreed to have a special brigade of 1,000-2,000 task force which is supposed to eliminate the Pyongyang command under conditions of war, including Kim Jong-un; and obviously this

is aggravating the situation because given the history of such things, one is not sure when is the moment of such action.

Thirdly you can see it with the deployment of the U.S. aircraft carrier group *USS Carl Vinson* to the Asia, in the vicinity of China. This aircraft carrier is of the Nimitz-class nuclear-powered, and it will arrive exactly on 20th of January, the day Trump is will take office. *Global Times*, the official Chinese newspaper, said that this deployment is set to disrupt potential talks between China and other countries in the region; naturally, also it's supposed to put a sour note on the U.S.-China relations.

There are other efforts to change and determine the narrative in the post-Obama period. Ash Carter, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, just gave a press conference where he said that it was only the United States which was fighting ISIS in Syria. Now, that takes some nerve to say that, because everybody in the whole world knows that without President Putin's decision to militarily intervene in Syria starting in September 2015, and with the tremendous support of the Russian Aerospace Forces for the fighting of the Syrian troops, this military situation in Syria would have never developed. And it was to the contrary, the very dubious behavior of the United States supporting various kinds of terrorist groups which prolonged this process and slowed it down.

But also in the attempt to pin down the narrative, of course, John Kerry, who a week or so ago, gave a speech saying that it was the British Parliament which would have prevented the U.S. military intervention in Syria. Now – I mean, all of these

people must think that the whole world has a very short memory, because I remember very vividly that it was Gen. Michael Flynn, in his capacity as head of the DIA, [Defense Intelligence Agency], who had put out a public statement that it was the

intention of the Obama administration to build up a caliphate in the region, in order to have regime-change against Assad,

and he was then fired by [DNI] Clapper. And it is of a certain irony that just on Friday, when Trump met with Clapper, Brennan and

Comey, in the Trump Tower where these three gentlemen wanted to impress Trump with their story about the Russian hacking; the other person who was with Trump was General Flynn, who is now in the driver's seat [to be National Security Advisor]. So anyway, you can expect the truth not be suppressed forever.

And as a matter of fact, it was in the moment shortly before the U.S. military intervention in 2013, the U.S. military action was prepared to occur Sunday evening; we had gotten that from

well-informed circles in Washington, and then in the very last minute the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Martin Dempsey went to Obama and said, "You should not a start a war where you don't know how it ends. And if you don't ask the Congress you will be impeached, or you run the risk of being impeached." And only because of that Obama went to ask the U.S., Congress, the U.S. Congress voted no, and the U.S. military intervention was prevented.

So this was quite different. And you know this attempt to fix the narrative will not be successful.

Now, I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about: I think we will see probably only by February or even into March who will be actually in his cabinet, who will get approved by the Senate. But there are other interesting elements, for example: Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion into the renewal of the

infrastructure in the United States. That is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in North Carolina,

that he would implement the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial

system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and *only* if you have a Glass-Steagall law in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt,

what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot

finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure.

But one step in a positive direction is the fact that for example the former deputy foreign minister of China, and chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs committee of the National People's Congress, Mme. Fu Ying, made a speech in New York, about

six weeks ago, where she said that indeed the Trump infrastructure program can be a bridge to the New Silk Road program of China. And that is quite the case: Just yesterday, Trump met with Jack Ma who is the chief executive of Alibaba, a

Chinese e-commerce firm, and Jack Ma said that he can help Trump to create 1 million jobs in the United States by initiating a platform for U.S. small businessmen to sell to Chinese consumers over the next five years, and vice versa, how the Chinese can invest in the United States. Trump afterwards said this was a great meeting, we will do great things together; and Jack Ma said that Trump was a very smart man and they got along very well.

So this is very good, because the Schiller Institute already in 2015 published a report for the United States to join the New Silk Road, which is a whole approach how you have to have a fast train system for the United States; as you know, China built as of the end of 2014, 20,000 km high-speed train systems. China wants to have to 50,000 km by 2020, connecting every major city in China with a fast train system. And the United States has none.

So the United States urgently needs a fast train

system connecting the East Coast, the West Coast and the Midwest. Build some new science cities in the South, get rid of the drought in the Southwest, California and the other states. So there are many, many things which urgently need to be done.

OK. Now, let me make a few remarks about the Schiller Institute, given the fact that many of you may not know much about us. And I want to underline the fact that we are not commentators on this whole question, but that we are responsible for many of the ideas which are now coming into effect.

The Schiller Institute was created by me in 1984, and it was, at that time we had the still the intermediate-range missile crisis, which brought the world to the verge of World War III; if you remember, the Pershing 2, the SS20, where there was a very short warning time, in permanent alert; and the relationship between Europe and the United States was really in a terrible condition.

So I created the Schiller Institute with the idea that you needed an institute, a think tank to put the relations among nations on a completely different basis. One of the most important aspects of the work was to work towards the establishment of a just, new world economic order, in the tradition of the Non-Aligned Movement. And there, my husband, already in 1975, had proposed to replace the IMF with an International Development Bank, which would organize large credits for technology transfer from the industrialized countries to the developing sector, to overcome the underdevelopment.

That proposal went into the Colombo Resolution of the Non-Aligned Movement in 1976 in Sri Lanka. So we had the idea that that policy had to come back on the agenda, that we had to create economic development in the southern hemisphere, so that every human being on this planet could have dignified potential their lives, develop all the potentialities embedded in them.

But from the beginning, we said that such a new world economic order can only function if it's combined with a Classical Renaissance, that we have to reject the popular culture as it is associated with modern globalization, because it is

depraved and degenerate. And that we had to go back to the revival, a Renaissance of the best traditions of every culture and have a dialogue among them. For example, in Germany, obviously you would emphasize the German Classical culture of Schiller, Beethoven, the whole Classical music; in China, you would emphasize Confucius; in India you would emphasize the Vedic writings, Tagore, and so forth. So you would go and revive in every country simply what they have contributed to universal history and make that known.

Now, the present policy, of a "win-win cooperation", is exactly an echo of what we had proposed since '84, and to replace geopolitics with an approach of the common aims of mankind. In 1984, my husband, Mr. LaRouche, also uniquely predicted the collapse of the Soviet Union. He said if the Soviet Union would stick to their then-existing policies of the Ogarkov Plan, that they would collapse in five years. Now, there was nobody else who said the Soviet Union would collapse; it was completely unthinkable, but we observed the economic problems and on Oct. 12, 1988, my husband and I made a press conference in Berlin, in the Bristol Kempinski Hotel, where we said Germany will soon be unified – also nobody believed that at the time – and Germany should adopt the development of *Poland* as a model for the transformation of the Comecon with high technology.

Now, in '89 therefore, when the Berlin Wall came down, we were the only ones who were not surprised. As a matter of fact, we immediately published a report, how the unified Germany should develop Poland, and we called this program, the "Productive Triangle Paris-Berlin-Vienna," which is an area the size of Japan; it had the highest concentration of industry and the idea was to develop development corridors from that Productive Triangle to Poland, Warsaw, to Kiev, to

the Balkans, and transform the Comecon that way. It was before the D.D.R. collapsed; and here if that had been picked up, maybe the Soviet Union and the Comecon would not have collapsed.

Anyway: Because you had Bush, Thatcher and Mitterrand, they did not like this at all, so in '91, when the Soviet Union collapsed, we immediately proposed to prolong this program of the Productive Triangle into the Eurasian Land-Bridge: The idea that you would connect the population and industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. The Iron Curtain was no longer there, so it was the natural thing to have infrastructure corridors to develop the landlocked areas of Eurasia.

Now we proposed at the time to all the countries of Eurasia, and the only country which responded positively was China. So in 1996, they organized a very big conference in Beijing, called "The Development of the Regions along the Eurasian Land-Bridge," and I was one of the speakers there. And China at that point declared the development of the Eurasian Land-Bridge to be the long-term perspective of China until the year 2010.

As you know, then came '97 the Asia crisis; '98 the Russian GKO crisis, so this whole development became interrupted. But it basically did not stop us from making conferences about this proposal on five continents, all the U.S. cities, all the European cities; even in Latin America, São Paulo, Rio, New Delhi, even some African countries, Australia. We kept organizing for this idea that the natural next phase of the evolution of mankind would be the infrastructure connections of the entire planet.

Obviously, what happened in '99 also was the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act in the United States, which gave way to the unregulated speculation, leading to the present bubble.

Now, in September 2013, when Xi Jinping in Kazakhstan

announced the New Silk Road, we simply took all the different studies we had made in these 24 years, and published them, and we called it: "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge." This is a comprehensive proposal which has the yellow line there in the middle between China and Central Asia; this was the initial One Belt, One Road proposal by China, and we added simply – they had the Maritime Silk Road – but we had a whole infrastructure program for Africa, for the South of Europe, the Balkans, many corridors, including a Bering Strait Tunnel connecting the Eurasian infrastructure with the American system, with highways and high-speed trains all the way to Chile and Argentina. And eventually, when all of this is built, you can go by maglev train from the southern tip of South America to the Cape of Good Hope in Africa.

We published this proposal; and the actual book you can find at the book table, including an early report about this, from 1997. The first report we published in German, in '91. This is not just about connection of infrastructure, but it has all the scientific conceptions of Mr. LaRouche's notion of physical economy.

Mr. LaRouche is probably the only economist in the West who deserves that name, because all the other neo-liberal economists have been so wrong in their predictions that they should probably take another job. Mr. LaRouche has given up his own scientific method and in this report you find there such extremely important conceptions as the connection between energy flux density in the production process and the relative potential population density, which can be maintained with that energy flux density; and there are other such important conceptions.

So this report was immediately published in China; the Chinese translated it into Chinese. We presented it in China in 2015. It was recommended by all the people who presented to all Chinese scholars, as the standard text on the Silk Road; and it

has been sent to all major faculties and universities in China.

It was also published in Arabic, as you will hear about from Hussein Askary. And it is now coming out shortly in Korean, in German, and we have requests in other languages to come out also.

So, while we were publishing these reports, the New Silk Road promoted by China which has a few different names – first they called it One Belt, One Road; now they call it the Belt and Road Initiative; I always call it the "New Marshall Plan Silk

Road," so that people get an idea. In any case, this policy of China has taken on a breathtaking dynamic. (Next slide)

In the meantime, many of these proposals are in different phases of realization. It has the Maritime Silk Road which is the outer line. In the meantime, China is building six economic corridors – as I said, it involves 70 nations, and over 30 international large organization, 4.4 billion people, and trillions in investments. And as I said, already now it's 12 times bigger than the Marshall Plan was.

(Next slide). This is the original One Belt, One Road, connecting China and Central and West Asia through an economic corridor. In June 2015, China and the five Central Asian governments agreed to build that and additional routes are being

planned to go into Afghanistan. One is already going into Iran; when President Xi was in Iran last year, he promised, – or they both promised that they would extend this New Silk Road beyond Iran into Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Turkey.

(Next) This is the new Eurasian Land-Bridge which connects China with Western Europe and it has shortened already the transport time for cargo, to two to three weeks from China – different cities, Chengdu, Chongqing, Yiwu, Duisburg, Lyon, Rotterdam, Hamburg, from five weeks via ocean. Already by mid-2016, there were over 2,000 rail shipments from China to Europe, and it is picking up speed. All the cities in Europe that are termini, such as Madrid,

Lyon, Duisburg, they're all happy; they realize that they have tremendous benefits from it.

(Next. No, the next one, the China-Mongolia) This is China-Mongolia-Russia corridor. In June 2016, the three presidents signed a trilateral economic partnership, at the 11th Shanghai Cooperation Organization meeting; and this corridor alone involves 32 projects.

(Next) This is the China-Pakistan economic corridor, which is creating 700,000 new jobs in Pakistan. It will produce 10,400 MW power capacity and the investment of 46 billion by the Chinese in this corridor equals all the foreign investment since 1970 in Pakistan.

(Next) This is the China-Myanmar-Bangladesh corridor. This creating for the first time an express highway between India and China, and it goes through Bangladesh and Myanmar. This corridor will be 1.65 million km long; it will encompass 440 million people.

(Next). The China-Indochina Peninsula corridor. This will be a highway/rail and high-speed transport system connecting the ten largest cities of the region.

(Next) Africa – Djibouti-Ethiopia. [showing picture of refugees instead] Leave this picture please; this is very important. Because as we know Europe has been in large part destabilized by the refugee crisis, and there *is* a very big incentive, one would think, for Europeans to help develop Africa.

But so far, it is not coming from Europe, it's coming from China, India and Japan.

So, the Djibouti-Ethiopia railway just opened yesterday, so this is extremely good news. It opened yesterday, from Djibouti to Addis Abeba, 750 km and it was built by China; it employed about 20,000 Ethiopians and 5,000 Djiboutian, and it will be connected to the standard gauge railway in Kenya, which again, created 30,000 jobs. And this will obviously, among other things, transform the port of

Mombasa and it will take cargo and passengers to the Ugandan border in one-tenth of the time it takes by road. A professor from the University of 'Nairobi School of Diplomacy', Prof. Gerishon Ikiara, said, and I agreed, that this whole program will "radically transform African participation in global trade in the next two decades and will catalyze the industrial transformation of Africa."

Now, there is another extremely important project (next), which is the Transaqua project. Here you see the cover story of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Lake Chad Basin Commission and the Chinese engineering firm PowerChina. Now PowerChina is the company which built the Three Gorges Dam and several other large projects so they really know what they're doing; and they agreed with this contract to do a feasibility study about the Transaqua project.

This is the largest infrastructure project ever entertained in Africa. It was developed in the late '70s by an Italian firm Bonifica, and there, in particular, Dr. Marcello Vichi. Mr. LaRouche has promoted this project since he got news of it, because it was a perfect way of solving many problems at the same time. As you know, Lake Chad is shrinking; it is presently only about less than 10% of its original size, and it affects the life of the entire people, 40 million people, in the Chad Basin. And naturally, it is already having drought effects and so forth.

The concept is simply to transfer the water from the Congo River, using the unused discharge of the Congo River water going into the ocean. Now, the Congo River is the second largest river in the world and it discharges 41,000 cubic meters/second into the ocean – unused. And the idea is to take only 3-4% of that water and bring it into Lake Chad. There was a big campaign trying to convince the people in the different states along the Congo River, that it's stealing their water, and so forth,

but that was really an effort by the Greenies and it has no substance to it whatsoever.

First of all, the idea is not to take the water from the Congo River, but from the west bank tributaries at an altitude that allows to bring water per gravity until the C.A.R./Chad watershed, which is an elevation of 500 meters, and then pour it into the Chari River which is a tributary of Lake Chad. So this way you would create a 2,400 km long waterway which would bring eventually 100 billion cubic meters of water per year into Lake Chad and also create navigable infrastructure.

Obviously, the Republic of Congo would be also a big beneficiary because it would give them access to a navigable waterway, electricity production, regulation of rivers and so forth.

PowerChina is now financing a feasibility study for a first phase of the project which would involve building a series of dams in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, and the Central African Republic. It would also potentially generate 15-25 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectricity through the mass movement of water by gravity; it would potentially create a series of irrigated areas for crops, livestock, of an area of 50-70,000 sq km in the Sahel zone in Chad, in the northeast of Nigeria, in the north of Cameroon, and in Niger. It would also make possible an expanded economic zone basically creating a new economic platform for agriculture, industry, transportation, electricity for 12 Africa nations.

So PowerChina has put up \$1.8 million for the first phase of the feasibility study and if the construction starts, this is a big project so it's not expected to be finished overnight, but it will take generations: But it will create livelihoods for 40 million people in the basin. And this is just one project, but there are many others. For example, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi is just on a five-nation tour through Africa [Jan. 7-12] and was already in Madagascar, in

Tanzania, is going to Zambia, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, and he's inviting all Africa nations to join the Belt and Road Initiative.

(Next) This is the expanded program of railways, nuclear power, just transforming the entire African continent. (Next) These are development plans for Latin America. The blue lines you see there, these are the longstanding, proposed high-speed railway routes in Latin America, which the Schiller Institute has proposed. In 1982, when Mr. LaRouche was working with President José López Portillo of Mexico on these projects, he called it "Operation Juárez," to refer back to the best traditions of Mexican-American cooperation. And these are all projects which are obvious. If you look at the map of Africa or Latin America, you don't see that kind of infrastructure! If you see some railway, you see it as a small line from a mine to the port to exploit the raw materials, but you don't have infrastructure. And we had this idea, which Alexander von Humboldt, by the way, proposed in 19th century, so it's not that revolutionary; it's sort of obvious.

The red lines are the various Chinese proposals since the BRICS summit in Brazil in July 2014. The solid red line is the northern route of the Brazil-Peru transcontinental rail line. This was already agreed upon between the governments of Brazil and China a year ago; but then they had the coup in Brazil, Dilma Rousseff was impeached, so this came to a halt; also the new government in Peru is very reluctant. But there's a big movement: I just addressed a conference of economists in the Amazon region two months ago, and there's a whole movement, also associated with Fujimori party, who absolutely won the fight for that rail line because it is the step to the future.

There are three additional lines, one line would be including Bolivia into this rail line, and three additional lines through Argentina and Chile; China also wants to build three tunnels between Chile and Argentina to connect the Pacific and the Atlantic.

(Next) This is the Nicaragua Canal which is in the

early stages of completion, also built by China. This will increase the speed of global shipping between Belem and Shanghai and cut the current route across the Atlantic and around Africa by 10% of the time.

So I can only mention the most important projects. There are many, many others. For example, China and Ecuador are building a science city in Ecuador where President Correa at the recent state visit of President Xi Jinping said that the collaboration between Ecuador and China will mean that Ecuador soon will be on the same level as all industrialized countries. They have the idea to overcome poverty forever. The science city is going to have the most advanced fields of science.

Bolivia – Bolivia, which used to be a coca producing country, is now cooperating on space projects with China, with Russia, with India. So there is a completely new mood! I talked with many Africans – there was a big conference in Hamburg just a couple of months ago, where the Africans said, there is a completely new mood in Africa, there is a new paradigm: China, Japan, India are all investing, and the Europeans, if they don't shape up, they will become marginal and irrelevant. So there is a completely new optimism caused by this dynamic.

Now, just on a diplomatic level, this process of integration is going absolutely rapidly, especially since September last year, when you had on Sept. 2-3, the Eastern Economic Forum in Vladivostok where the integration of the Eurasian Economic Union and the Belt and Road Initiative was on the table. The Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe participated in that conference, and Japan is now massively investing in the Far East of Russia, in terms of energy cooperation. Putin was just in Japan, as a state visit; Abe will go on a state visit to Russia this year. They're talking about settling the conflict concerning the Northern islands, the Kuril Islands. They're talk about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan, and obviously there is a complete strategic realignment going on. President Duterte changed the

role of the Philippines from being the aircraft carrier for the United States in the South China Sea, to now, collaborate with China on economic cooperation, and also with Russia. The same by

the way, goes for Turkey, which is now shifting and working with Russia, Iran and Syria, to bring peace to the region.

So there is a complete strategic realignment going on, which the Western media and Western politicians have just not got it yet. But this is very, very interesting.

So, then this continued from Vladivostok, immediately afterwards on Sept. 4-5, the G20 Summit in Hangzhou, where China took real leadership in saying the future recovery of the world economy must be based on innovation *and* he made very clear that this innovation must be shared with the developing countries, not to hold up or hinder their development.

So, it's a completely new paradigm, and I'll say something about that in a second.

Then you continue to the ASEAN meeting in Laos, the BRICS meeting in Goa, India in October, the APEC meeting in Lima in November, and it is involving all of these organizations and spreading very fast.

Why is Europe not joining this? Look, Europe is in bad shape. The EU is collapsing, the people in Italy *hate* by now the ECB, they hate Merkel, they have Schäuble, they hold Merkel responsible for the suffering of the population in Italy which is now reaching dimensions like Greece; Greece was destroyed – one-third of the Greek economy was destroyed by the austerity policy of the Troika. And you know, there's *nothing* left of the idea of unity in Europe. There are borders being built, Schengen is dead; look at the Eastern European countries, they're simply not – the Eastern European and Central European countries are reorienting towards China! The 16+1 this is the Central and East European Countries, they have extensive infrastructure cooperation with China. China is building up the port in Piraeus port in Greece; they're building a fast railway between Budapest and Belgrade, and many other projects.

But the problem with Europe is that at least the European EU bureaucracy and some governments, like the German one, they are still on the old paradigm, the geopolitical paradigm of globalization, of neoliberal policies, and they don't understand that what China has proposed and what is now the basis of a very close and determined strategic partnership between Russia and China they have put on the agenda a different model: To overcome geopolitics by a "win-win" strategy.

Now, most people at least in Europe and in the United States have a very hard time to think that. They cannot imagine that governments are for the common good, because we have not experienced that for such a long time. The common idea of all the think tanks, or most think tanks, is "China must have ulterior motives"; "China is just trying to replace the Anglo-American imperialism, with a Chinese imperialism." But that is not true! I mean, I'm not naïve: I have studied this extensively. I was in China for the first time in 1971, in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. I have seen China, how it was then, I travelled to Beijing, Tientsin, Qingdao, Shanghai, and to the countryside, and so I know what *enormous* transformation China has made in this period.

I went back to China in '96, after 25 years; already then it was breathtaking. But if you look, the Chinese economic model which has transformed 700 million people from extreme poverty to a decent living standard; and China is now committed to develop the interior region as part of their building of the New Silk Road, to eliminate poverty from China totally by the year 2020, and there are only 4 % left in poverty right now.

Now, China is offering their Chinese economic model to all participating countries in this New Silk Road conception and it is in the interest of Sweden. It would be in the interest of Germany because Germany is still, despite the Green insanity which has deformed many brains, is still a productive country.

The German 'Mittelstand' is still producing, I think, the third largest number of patents in the world. It is their natural interest to find cooperation not only in a bilateral cooperation, but in investments in third countries. It would be in the *best interest* of Germany – if Germany is freaked out about the refugees, which really has meant a complete destabilization of the country, why is Germany not cooperating, with Russia, with China, India, Iran, in the reconstruction of the Middle East? I think, now that the Syrian government has started to rebuild Aleppo, at least building the hospitals, the schools, the Schiller Institute had proposed already in 2012 a comprehensive proposal for the development of the entire Middle East, from Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the Caucasus to the Gulf States, and it would be in the absolute self-interest because – sure you have to destroy ISIS and the terrorists with military means. But then you have to create conditions where young people in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, have a reason to become doctors, scientists, teachers, so that they have a future, that that way you drive out terrorism forever!

And if all the big neighbors would cooperate: Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, Turkey, Italy, France, Germany, Sweden, you could change this region in no time! And you will hear about that soon from Hussein.

The same for Africa. The only minister in Germany who is reasonable is the Development Minister Gerd Müller, because he travels all the time to Africa and he says there will be the need for many millions of jobs for the young people of Africa in the next years; if we don't have them to create these jobs, many, many millions of people will flee from hunger and war and epidemics.

So would it not be in the self-interest that all the European nations join hands *with* the Chinese Silk Road initiative, and help to reconstruct and build up the economies of southwest Asia and Africa? I think that that mission would also really help to overcome the disunity of Europe, because you

will not solve that problem by looking at your navel; but you will solve that problem by a joint mission for the greater good of mankind.

So, I think that this is all possible. It can happen this year, it can start this year, because China has committed itself to have two big summits this year – one summit will involve all the heads of state of the Belt and Road Initiative, and it can be the year of consolidation of the new paradigm.

Now there are a couple of elements which are also important for this new paradigm, because we are not just talking about infrastructure, and overcoming poverty. The next phase of the evolution of man is not just to bring infrastructure to all continents on this planet, but to continue that infrastructure into close space around us. This is the first time formulated in this way by the great German-American space scientist and rocket scientist Krafft Ehrlicke, who was the designer of the Saturn V of the Apollo project. He had this beautiful vision that if you look at the evolution over a longer period of time, life developed from the oceans with the help of photosynthesis; then you had the development of ever higher species, species with a higher metabolism, higher energy-flux density in their metabolism.

Eventually man arrived. Man first settled at the oceans and the rivers; then with the help of infrastructure, man developed the interior regions of the continents; and we are now with the World Land-Bridge picture – go back to the first image – this

will be, when it is built, the completion of that phase of the evolution of mankind, by simply bringing infrastructure into all landlocked areas of the world, and you will have – with the help of new methods to create water, with modern technologies,

create new, fresh water. For example, if you have peaceful nuclear energy you can desalinate huge amounts of ocean water; through the ionization of moisture in the atmosphere you can create new waters to solve the problem of desertification.

Right

now all the deserts are increasing; with these new technologies you can reverse that, make the deserts green, and just make this planet livable for all human beings!

But this is not the end: Mankind is not an Earth-bound species. Mankind is the only species which is capable of creative discovery, and the collaboration of all nations for space exploration and space research is the next phase of our evolution. Now China has a very ambitious space program. They already landed the Yutu rover in 2014. Next year, they will go to the far side of the Moon, and eventually bring back helium-3 from the far side of the Moon, which will be an important fuel for

fusion power economy on Earth. Right now, we are very close to making breakthroughs on fusion power. The Chinese EAST program [Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak] has reached, I think, 50 million degrees for plasma for several seconds. And just a couple of days ago, the stellarator in Greifswald, Germany, reached 100 million degrees for – I've forgotten how many seconds. But it means that in a few years, we can have fusion power! And that will create energy security, raw materials security, on Earth.

So we're looking at a completely new phase of civilization, and the far side of the Moon is very important because will not have the disturbances of cosmic radiation, as you have on the Earth-facing side of the Moon; the Sun and the Earth – this far side is shielded from a lot of this radiation so it will be possible to put up much better telescopes, you will be able to look into Solar System, into the Galaxy, into other galaxies much, much farther than so far.

And I don't know if any one of you have seen these pictures from the Hubble telescope: If you have not done that, please, go home or next weekend, take the time to look at these pictures from the Hubble telescope. I saw them, and I was completely excited, because now we know that there are – at least – 2 trillion galaxies! Now, I have a good imagination, but I cannot imagine that. It's just too big.

And when you see these pictures which have already been taken, you have galaxies which look like the Milky Way; then you have totally different nebulas; you have all formations. And not one galaxy is like the other. Just imagine how big the Universe is?

And we know very, very little! But man is the only species which *can* know! No donkey will ever know about the great galaxies or – no dog will ever be able to breed rabbits to have better breakfast. They all like better breakfast, but they don't know how to do it. Man is capable of overcoming every limitation, and the mind of man is a physical force in the Universe. We're not outside of the Universe, but what our mind invents or discovers, *is* part of the Universe. And that is a very exciting thing.

And there is lots to be found out about what is the origin and essence of life. What governs the laws of the Universe? What is the role of the mind in the Universe? I mean, these are all extremely exciting questions, and they all prove that man is not an Earth-bound species. So there is no need to be a Greenie, because we can bring man's knowledge applied to expand our role in the Universe. Even the ESA is now talking about a "Village on the Moon."

Krafft Ehrlicke at the time had said, that building an industrial center on the Moon as a stepping stone for further travel of space will be important. And you now see the shaping up of new economic platforms. The first platform, Mr. LaRouche has developed this notion of an economic platform to signify a period of economic development which is governed by certain laws, like for example, the development of the steam engine created a new platform; the development of railway created a new platform; fission is creating a new platform. And that platform is always governed by the most advanced technologies of that time. And you can already see that this infrastructure development of close-by space, the first platform is simply that man is able to reach the orbit! That's not self-

evident. If you would have told man in the Middle Ages that you will get on a spaceship and go into orbit, he would have said you're crazy!

Now we can already see we have manned space travel and we can now connect to where the Apollo project stopped after the assassination of Kennedy, 40 years ago; but now China, India, Russia, they all continue that process. India has also been extremely ambitious space project.

And so, the first economic platform will be simply to leave the planet Earth and to go into orbit; the second economic platform of space research will be to have an industrial base on the Moon and to eventually start to produce raw materials from space. Because you will, as this continues, not always transport materials from the Earth for your space travel, but once you have fusion as a propulsion fuel where the speed will become much larger, you will be able to take materials from asteroids, from other planets, for your production and your requirements in space. And then longer space travel between planets as the third platform, which is already visible.

Now, I could – this is very exciting, and once you start to think about it, it shows that mankind is really capable of magnificent achievements, and that we should really overcome geopolitics. Geopolitics is like a little, nasty two-year-old boy who is not yet educated and who knows nothing better than to kick his brother in the knee. Now that's about the level of geopolitics.

What Xi Jinping always talks about is that we have to form a "community of destiny for the common future of mankind," and that is exactly what the Schiller institute set out in '84, when we said we have to fight for the common aims of mankind. And these common aims of mankind must come first, and no nation should be allowed to have a national interest or the interest of a group of nations, if it violates this higher common aims of mankind. And the areas of working together, a

crash program for fusion, space cooperation, and breakthroughs in fundamental science.

All of this however must be combined with a Classical Renaissance, a dialogue of cultures on the highest level, and we have already very successfully at Schiller Institute conferences, practiced that, where we had European Classical music, Bach,

Beethoven, Verdi, Schubert, Schumann; Chinese Classical music, Indian poetry. You have this coming Saturday in New York, a beautiful event on style of civilizations, of cultures, where we will have a Chinese professor talking about literati painting.

You know, in Chinese painting, you have poetry, calligraphy and painting, in one. And for Westerners, it's a complete revelation, because this does not exist in European painting. People get completely excited because they discover that there are beautiful things to discover in other cultures! And once you study and know these other cultures, xenophobia and racism disappears! Because you realize that it's beautiful that there are many cultures, because there are universal principles to be

discovered in music, one musician will immediately understand another musician because it's a universal language. Scientists speak a universal language; they understand each other.

And so the future of civilization will be a dialogue between Plato, Schiller, Confucius, Tagore, and many other great poets, scientists of the past. So, if you give every child access to these things, which is also in reach, I can see that we will have

a new era, a new civilization of mankind. And I would invite all of you to not just look at it, but be part of it.

[applause]

Gennembrud for Schiller Instituttet i svenske medier

Fra vores svenske søsterorganisations Ulf Sandmark har vi modtaget følgende korte rapport om en artikel om Schiller Instituttet i Sundsvalls Tidning den 2. januar, 2017:

»Sundsvalls Tidning bruger Mats Lönnerblads artikel, 'Fred i Stedet for geopolitisk kaos – Schiller Instituttet peger på en løsning', til at vise en udvej i det nye år. Dette er den bedste artikel om Schiller Instituttet nogensinde!«

Et uddrag af artiklen lyder:

»Alle vil have fred, men det geopolitiske kaos vokser. I stedet for, at landene vedtager de love, som flertallet vil have, får økonomiske, monopolitiske særinteresser lov at råde. En ny, mere human orden, som ville gavne både velfærdstaterne og udviklingslandene, må have prioritet. Nu tvinges unge mennesker til at vokse op i en verden af rædsel uden at kunne glæde sig over humanisme og menneskelighed, og bliver snydt for deres løfte.

Det er derfor på høje tid at forsøge at generobre den humanistiske tradition, som Schiller Instituttet skriver om i sin rapport [»Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«], og som også filosoffer som G.W. Leibniz og William Penn efterlyser. Der kan vi begynde at virke for en retfærdig verdensorden, hvor nationale, suveræne republikker forenes for en fælles udviklingsplan, som gavner alle.«

<http://www.st.nu/kultur/fred-i-stallet-for-geopolitisk-kaos-schillerinstitutet-visar-pa-en-vag>

RADIO SCHILLER den 3. januar 2017:

Året 2017: Hvor vi konsoliderer verdens nye Silkevejsparadigme

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

God grund til optimisme: Et nyt paradigme for 2017! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Kina vil i det nye år afholde to topmøder, hvor konsolideringen af Silkevejsinitiativet bliver temaet, og hvor det bliver klart, at en økonomisk model med win-win-samarbejde er langt den mest attraktive og for længst er blevet magneten i den globale udvikling. Dette globale udviklingsperspektiv er allerede nu det største infrastrukturprogram i menneskehedens historie, som over 100 nationer og internationale organisationer deltager i, allerede berører 4,4 mia. mennesker og for første gang i mindst 50 år repræsenterer et realistisk håb om, at problemer som sult, fattigdom, sygdomme, vi for

længst har kunnet behandle og manglende uddannelse, én gang for alle kan overvindes.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

Dette kom som en overraskelse for alle, med undtagelse af Vladimir Putin selv og Lyndon og Helga LaRouche – men denne form for overraskelser har i realiteten i mange år været

markant for Vladimir Putins karriere. Vi har allerede set det i »Traktaten for godt venskab og samarbejde mellem naboer, mellem Folkerepublikken Kina og den Russiske Føderation«, fra 16. juli, 2001. Traktatens 25 punkter opstiller krav om »en fair og fornuftig, ny, international orden«, og om at »løfte relationerne mellem de to lande op til et helt nyt niveau« og afgør, »at venskabet mellem vore to folk vil fortsætte i alle fremtidige generationer«. Hver af parterne har forpligtet sig til aldrig at gå med i en alliance, der truer den anden part; aldrig at rette deres missiler imod hinanden; og omgående at rådføre sig med hinanden, hvis en af parterne trues af aggression.

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

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

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

På lignende måde har Putins geni vist sig i skabelsen af BRIKS, endnu en grundpille i det nye, fremvoksende, globale

arrangement sammen med de ovenfor anførte organisationer. Her ser man klare påvirkninger fra Putins forgænger, nu afdøde Jevgenij Primakov. Men selve Putins rolle ville have været utænkkelig uden Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange lederskab, udøvet gennem det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i 1977 og de efterfølgende år, og gennem initiativet med den Eurasiske Landbro, som de udarbejdede i kølvandet på Berlinmurens fald, og som nu har udviklet sig til det verdensomspændende initiativ fra den kinesiske regerings side under præsident Xi Jinping, kaldet »Bælt-og-Vej«.

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

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

**Obama truer med åbne og skjulte operationer mod Rusland:
Hvad med, at Tyskland i 2017**

bliver en kraft for det gode i verden?

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

17. december, 2016 – Under sin embedsperiodes sidste pressekonference beskyldte præsident Obama Rusland og præsident Putin personligt for at have manipuleret den amerikanske valgkamp med cyber-angreb, og bebudede repressalier – hvoraf nogle ville blive eksplicitte og offentlige, mens andre ville blive af en sådan art, at Rusland ville erkende ophavsmanden. Disse bebudede, hemmelige operationer må give anledning til et globalt alarmberedskab – hvilken form for operationer menes der, droneangreb eller »indirekte skader« af enhver art? Obama vil tydeligvis bruge sin resterende tid i Det Hvide Hus til fordel for en konfrontation med Rusland, en konfrontation, som Trump gennem sine udnævnelser til regeringsposter har signaleret, at han vil stoppe. De neokonservative, til hvilke Obama, gennem sin fortsættelse af Bush' og Cheneys politik, absolut hører, vil tydeligvis ikke acceptere deres tab af magten.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Foto: Bruno Kahl og kansler Angela Merkel har advaret om virkningen af cyber-angreb i opløbet til næste års valg i Tyskland.

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

Den 12. december 2016 var Helga Zepp-LaRouche – Lyndon LaRouches hustru, Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og en international nøgleperson i kampen for et nyt globalt udviklingsparadigme – særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar på Frederiksberg med titlen: »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Blandt deltagerne var diplomater, aktivister og repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

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

finde sin sande identitet. Hele talen og den efterfølgende diskussion kan ses, høres og læses på: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16773.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Efter Aleppos befrielse kan Tyskland forme G20-dagsordenen med en Marshallplan

17. december, 2016 – Den tyske statskvinde Helga Zepp-LaRouche giver i en artikel i den tyske avis *Neue Solidarität*, skrevet den 17. dec., et strategisk overblik, hvor hun latterliggør den tyske regering og efterretningsfolk for at gå med på den absurde anti-russiske og anti-Putin kampagne, som præsident Obama endnu engang har optrappet, fordi det ligeledes går med på geopolitikken.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche bemærker om Syrien, at den syriske regering, med støtte fra Rusland og Iran, var nødt til at benytte udvejen med en militær løsning »for at befri Aleppo og andre dele af Syrien fra ISIS, al-Nusra og andre terroristgrupper«, fordi præsident Obamas fortsatte bevæbning af sådanne grupper udelukkede enhver anden mulighed. Hun anklager desuden alle dem, der refererer til Aleppos »fald« i

stedet for til Aleppos »befrielse«, for åbenbart at »stille sig på ISIS' side, dvs., den gruppe, der ikke alene er ansvarlig for utallige dødsfald i Mellemøsten, men også for terrorangrebene i Frankrig og Tyskland«.

Ulykkeligvis »er krigens ulykke den, at der i krigsforløbet finder rædsler sted, især, når krigen raser i mange år og i realiteten er en stedfortræderkrig, der er anstiftet udefra, og disse rædsler frembringer en kæde af rædsler uden ende. Det er derfor så meget desto mere presserende, at alle naboerne i området, Rusland, Kina, Indien, Iran og Egypten, men også Tyskland, Frankrig og Italien, sætter en storstilet genopbygning af hele Mellemøsten på dagsordenen«. Det faktum, at Donald Trumps udpegede nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, general Michael Flynn (pens.), har krævet en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten, er forstået, men med en advarsel om, at det »kun kan lykkes, hvis alle de betydningsfulde magter samarbejder og viser folk i dette ødelagte område, at der er et reelt perspektiv for fremtiden. Schiller Instituttet har for længst fremlagt et konkret forslag til fremgangsmåden for denne genopbygning, i sit »Projekt Fønix: En genopbygningsplan for Syrien« og for genopbygningen af Aleppo og **forlængelsen af den Nye Silkevej ind i Sydvestasien.**«

I dag er det lige så presserende og nødvendigt at implementere »et omfattende industrialiserings- og udviklingsprogram for Afrika. Det første lille skridt i den rigtige retning er netop taget af den tyske udviklingsminister, Gerd Müller, der har planer om at motivere tyske entreprenører til at investere mere i Afrika. Det er fremskridt, i det mindste i sammenligning med finansieringen fra NGO'er, hvis søndagsprædikener om demokrati og menneskerettigheder stort set intet har frembragt.« Zepp-LaRouche bemærker, at Kina, Indien og Japan allerede er aktive i Afrika med »betydelige investeringer i infrastruktur og industrizoner, alt imens afrikanere indbyrdes helt åbenlyst taler om, at europæerne snart vil være helt irrelevante på kontinentet, med mindre

deres ligegyldighed over for Afrika meget hurtigt ændrer sig«.

Med hensyn til kansler Merkel, så meddelte hun i et videobudskab, at Tyskland ønsker at gøre Afrikas udvikling til et hovedtema på G20-topmødet i Hamborg i juli næste år, som Tyskland vil præsidere. »Forberedelser til dette topmøde og dernæst selve topmødet kunne blive et vendepunkt for genopbygningen af Mellemøsten og industrialiseringen af Afrika, men kun, hvis den tyske regering tilslutter sig den høje standard, som Kina satte under sidste års G20-topmøde i Hangzhou, hvor præsident Xi Jinping lovede, at Kina ville være forpligtet over for industrialiseringen af Afrika.«

Hvis derimod, fortsætter Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Merkels program for Afrika fremmer politikken med »dekarbonisering af verdensøkonomien«, som blev fremlagt på en pressekonference i Berlin den 13. dec. i forventning om, at Tyskland overtager G20-formandsskabet i 2017 med Joachim »John« Schellnhuber, Kommandør af Det britiske Imperium, og Dirk Messner, så »vil Tyskland komme i miskredit, de asiatiske lande vil udvide deres indflydelse i Afrika, og Europa vil marginalisere sig selv. Den verdensomspændende revolution, der er i gang, retter sig netop imod denne tyndt forklædte, **neokolonialistiske politik, som Schellnhuber eksemplificerer**«.

Tyskland kunne møde udfordringerne i 2017 på helt andre måder, konkluderer Helga Zepp-LaRouche, nemlig ved at tage imod Kinas tilbud om win-win-samarbejde omkring opbygningen af den Nye Silkevej, som *EIR* og Schiller Instituttet har promoveret. Tyskland kunne på denne måde blive »en kraft for det gode« i 2017.

»Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme« (DANSK) Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale ved Schiller Instituttet/EIR's seminar i København, 12. dec., 2016.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og

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

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

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

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

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

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

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

—

English: Introductory article

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on `Donald

Trump and the New International Paradigm'

COPENHAGEN, Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS) – Today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche was the special guest speaker at a Schiller Institute/{EIR} seminar in Copenhagen entitled, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Eight diplomats from six countries attended, including two ambassadors. There were nations from Western Europe, Southwest Asia, Western and Eastern Asia, and Africa. In addition, there were around 30 Schiller Institute members and contacts, as well as a few representatives of various Danish and international institutions.

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

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

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

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs.

Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Discussion:

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

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

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

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

So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWII, and that was really the primary point, because if Hillary Clinton would have been elected – unfortunately, Hillary Clinton, when she was in the Obama administration, transformed from being a relatively OK person, she was never great, but in 2008, she was relatively decent, compared to

what she became, because she capitulated to Obama, and when she made this terrible statement, for example, in Libya, about the murder of Gaddafi, "We came, we saw, and he died." This is barbarism.

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

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

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

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

I joined Mr. LaRouche because I went to China, Africa, other Asian countries, and I saw the horrible, horrible underdevelopment. So I came back from this trip, and I said,

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

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

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

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

expression of the same effort.

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO2 emission trade, you have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing, because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, "Against the Stream," is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

The question is, 'What is the source of wealth?' Is the source of wealth cheap labor, to buy cheap raw materials, produce cheaply, and sell expensive? Is that the cause of wealth? No.

The only cause of wealth is the increase in the creativity of labor power. And a good government is, therefore, investing the maximum amount into education, into sponsoring the creativity of youth, of labor, and the more people in the labor force, by percentage, are engineers, scientists, the more productive the economy becomes.

And the free trade system, of which NAFTA is just one example, did exactly the opposite. China, which was part of this in the beginning – the reason why China today has so many environmental problems, like smog, like a large amount of groundwater being contaminated, is the result of the fact that China, in the beginning of its industrialization, accepted being a cheap labor production place for the U.S. and for Europe. When I was in China, even in 1971, I visited some factories which were horrible. They were absolutely horrible. The working conditions were terrible, the labor force, which

produced electrical devices for radios, it was horrible. They worked for 18 hours. No health system. It was just terrible. And that is how China developed in the first phase.

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

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

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

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

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election

result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

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

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

Now, if you decarbonize the world economy, without having fusion, that would be one thing, to have fusion power in place. Then you can talk about getting rid of fossil fuels, but without having fusion, and being against nuclear energy, fission, it means that you will reduce the world's population to 1 billion or less, because there is a direct correlation between the energy-flux-density, and the number of people you can maintain. Schellnhuber said that the carrying capacity of

the Earth is maximum 1 billion people. He didn't say that he wants to do with the 6 billion who are already there. If he would be consequent, he should hop away from this planet.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now

underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

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

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

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

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

Then you have Japan, which was the junior partner of the U.S. in the Pacific. Abe went to Sochi, meeting with Putin. In three days from now, Putin will go to Japan to have a state

visit. They are talking about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan.

All of these are new alignments. There is a shift in the strategic situation, and I don't think that that shift can be reversed.

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

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

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

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

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

nations, 28 histories, 28 cultures.

That doesn't mean that you can't work together. I think that the idea of Charles de Gaulle to work together as an alliance between perfectly sovereign fatherlands, that is a correct idea. And all these fatherlands can adopt a joint mission, like to develop Africa, or other things.

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

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

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

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

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

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

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

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

A: Well, because, the question is not that I'm saying that China is perfect. I'm not saying that. But when you look at anything, you have to look at the vector of development, is it going upward, or is it going downward? And from that standpoint, I had the advantage that I was in China in 1971, which was in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. This was so different than China today.

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

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

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

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

And I don't think that the Chinese leadership would agree with me when I say this, but I think that they are less communist than Confucians. They probably would not admit that, because

they are officially the Communist Party, and that's OK, but, I come from Trier, and Trier is the birthplace of Karl Marx, so I have studied Karl Marx, and I think that they are still socialist, or communist, or whatever, but they always said that they are communist with Chinese characteristics, and these Chinese characteristics are Confucianism.

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

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

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

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

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

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals

where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey democracy,' and do nothing.

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

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

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

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

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

And he really described, with many quotes from Furtwängler, that what is needed is this inner quality of truthfulness.

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

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

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

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

And then we win.

End of discussion

Kinesisk energiekspert til nyvalgte præsident Trump: USA kan tilslutte sig Kinas Bælt-og-Vej

9. dec., 2016 – Dr. Patrick Ho, en fremtrædende politisk og sundhedsvidenskabelig personlighed fra Hong Kong, der var hovedarrangør af »Bælt-og-Vej Forummet«, som afholdtes i Washington onsdag (7. dec.), afsluttede konferencen med et magtfuldt overblik over Kinas historiske forbindelser med verden i de sidste 1000 år, og konkluderede med fem forslag til nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump til, hvordan USA kan blive integreret i Bælt-og-Vej-projektet:

1. Betragt Bæltet-og-Vejen som en platform, som kan være spydspids for initiativer og programmer, der vil frembringe et tættere samarbejde mellem USA og Kina;
2. Juster handelsaftaler med de asiatiske stillehavsnationer, så de imødekommer Bæltet-og-Vejen;
3. Juster USA's holdning til at imødekomme de internationale udviklingsbanker og promover deres evne til at være med til at støtte infrastrukturudvikling;
4. Vær med til at sikre sikkerheden langs med Bæltet-og-Vejen;
5. Få de internationale institutioner til at arbejde sammen med Bæltet-og-Vejen.

Dr. Ho sagde, at Bæltet-og-Vejen ikke blot er forbindelser fra ét sted til et andet, men forbindelser mellem hjerter og hjerner, der forbinder sjæle, som et middel til at virkeliggøre fredeligt samarbejde, der forbinder den kinesiske drøm med den amerikanske drøm, og andre nationers drømme: frihed for

afsavn, frihed for frygt,[1] harmoni med naturen og fred.

Hans gennemgang af Kinas historie beskrev tre »Bank på Kinas dør« fra Vestens side og tre »Bank på Vestens dør« fra Kinas side:

1. Matteo Ricci og jesuitermissionærerne, der fandt en åben dør i slutningen af det 16. århundrede og med sig bragte vestlig religion, filosofi og videnskab. Dette blev undergravet og kollapsede i det 18. århundrede;
2. Det britiske Imperium, der slog døren ind med Opiumskrigen og lancerede et århundrede med underkastelse og fattigdom;
3. Nixons besøg i Kina i 1972, der indledte det økonomiske samarbejde og Kinas fremvækst.

Med hensyn til Kinas bank på Vestens dør:

1. Den første Silkevej, med Zhang Qians rejse til Centralasien i 139 f. Kr.
2. Zheng Hes skatteskibe i det 15. århundrede, der sejlede gennem det Indiske Ocean og den Persiske Golf og til den afrikanske kyst. Dr. Ho viste et billede af Cæsar, der siger, »Jeg kom, jeg så, jeg sejrede« og et af Zheng He, der siger, »Jeg kom, jeg så, jeg fik venner, jeg tog hjem«.
3. Den Nye Silkevej, som Xi Jinping annoncerede i 2013, og som Obama nægtede at åbne døren for. Nu banker vi på Trumps dør, sagde han. »Et stort opråb« om, at Bæltet-og-Vejen er den institution, der kan fremme en ny alliance mellem vore nationer; en impuls til at gentænke politikkerne.

Foto: Dr. Patrick Ho, fra okt., 2014.

[1] En reference til Franklin Roosevelts globale 'Fire friheder', som han formulerede i sin tale om nationens

tilstand den 6. jan., 1941. De to andre er tale- og ytringsfrihed og trosfrihed.

Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ får international konsensus med resolution i FN's Generalforsamling

9. dec., 2016 – FN's Generalforsamling blev enige om at vedtage dokument A/71/9, der opmuntrer alle medlemsstater til at støtte Kinas »Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ« med det formål at styrke udviklingen af økonomien i Afghanistan og i regionen. Desuden opfordrer dokumentet det internationale samfund til at sørge for et sikkert miljø for gennemførelsen af Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet. Det var første gang, at alle 193 medlemmer enedes om at inkorporere Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet i FN-resolutionen efter resolution 2.274, i hvilken FN's Sikkerhedsråd i marts måned opfordrede alle parter til at deltage i dette initiativ.

Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet er således blevet omsat til en international konsensus. Den udbredte accept og støtte, som initiativet har fået, er ligeledes en indikation af, at programmet er fuldstændig i overensstemmelse med FN's principper og mål.

Har Obama efterladt 'en ny, stor recession' til Trump?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 8. december, 2016 – Alt imens det aktuelle, afgørende spørgsmål er, om den tiltrædende Trump-administration virkelig vil begrave »krigsdoktrinen for regimeskifte« og forfølge produktivt, økonomisk samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, så blev vi i dag mindet om den anden, triste arv fra Barack Obama: økonomien. Det amerikanske Konkurrenceråd har udgivet en rapport om USA's produktivitet med titlen, »Ingen økonomisk genrejsning«, og i *USA Today* lød overskriften meget passende, »Obamas økonomiske genrejsning var alligevel ingen genrejsning«. Og det Nationale Center for Sundhedsstatistik udgav en grummere undersøgelse, der fandt, at den forventede levealder for alle amerikanere faktisk er faldende, og at dødsfald som følge af alle de mest almindelige sygdomme er stigende, og det samme er spædbarnsdødeligheden. En af undersøgelsens forskere sagde: »Der er simpelt hen dette fænomen med, at tingene ikke står så godt til i USA, over hele linjen.«

På trods af »markedets« kortvarige eufori over valget af Trump, så forudsiger mange økonomer, at Obama har efterladt ham »en ny, stor recession«; og faktisk, et snarligt finanssammenbrud på grund af Dodd/Frank-lovens åbenbare manglende evne til at kontrollere og undertvinge Wall Street. Mange af de mest aktive og interesserede amerikanere er også meget bekymrede over dette.

Det ovenfor nævnte «største spørgsmål» vil fundamentalt afgøre det; amerikansk velstand vil vende tilbage gennem at samarbejde omkring »Den Nye Silkevej« om store infrastrukturprojekter, gennem fælles gennembrud inden for teknologier for fusionskraft; og inden for kernekraft og afsaltning af havvand ved hjælp af kernekraft.

Som Rachel Brinkley, fra LaRouchePAC National Policy Committee, udtrykte det i en udtalelse om den mislykkede Dodd/Frank-lov: »For det første, så er der ... forøgelsen af reel velstand som resultat af forøgede rater af fysisk produktivitet. Kinas politik for den Nye Silkevej har en positiv effekt på 70 lande og 4,4 mia. mennesker, ved at fokusere på byggeriet af nye transportruter og udvikling af energi, inklusive byggeriet af højhastighedsjernbaner og mere effektive havne, at bringe elektricitet til landdistrikterne, og ved at indgå partnerskaber for avanceret, videnskabeligt samarbejde med andre lande. Dette er en aktuel, levende demonstration af, hvordan man påvirker nettorater af fysisk vækst i positiv retning. Monetære processer må altid være underordnet dette ... «

☒ LaRouches Fire Love

Men, vi må omgående have en reorganisering af bankerne gennem indførelse af Glass-Steagall – i modsat fald, med stigende rentesatser, der nu rammer kolossale gældsbobler, vil Wall Street og City of London atter kollapse og ødelægge udsigterne til fremskridt. Trump har sagt, at han vil have Glass-Steagall genindført; mange kendte økonomer siger, at Kongressen og hans Wall Street-rådgivere ikke vil tillade det.

De undervurderer det tilbageholdte krav fra millioner af informerede amerikanere, om at få retfærdighed gennem **Glass-Steagall** og få »lukket Wall Street-kasinoet ned«. Dernæst kan en politik for statslig kredit og produktivitet, i Franklin Roosevelts tradition, løfte nationen ud af det langvarige, økonomiske kollaps, i hvilket Bush og Obama har efterladt den.

Foto: Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump har forpligtet sig til, at USA skal ophøre med at føre en politik for regimeskifte ...

Syrien står umiddelbart foran befrielse

– Vil Det britiske Imperiums terrorist-instrument blive ødelagt for altid?

✘ Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt holder Pearl Harbor-talen den 8. december, 1941, til en særlig indkaldt Kongressamling.

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 7. december, 2016 – På 75-års dagen den 7. dec., 1941 – »en dag, som vil blive husket som en skændselsdag«, som FDR erklærede – breder et lignende chok sig i De forenede Stater, og i verden, med Det britiske Imperium, der står over for sin mulige, endelige død. Politisk, økonomisk og strategisk vakler Imperiet, med Olympens bjerg, der smuldrer under dets fødder.

På den politiske side har den italienske befolknings overvældende afvisning af den EU-dikterede folkeafstemning, der skulle overgive magten til Bruxelles-bureaukraterne, som handler på vegne af bankerne i City of London, føjet yderligere et slag til Brexit, Trumps valgsejr, Fillons valgsejr i Frankrig, Dutertes valgsejr i Filippinerne og den allesteds nærværende fornemmelse af, at den britiske »globalisering« af hele verden under bankierernes kontrol er

ved at være forbi.

På den økonomiske side bliver det i stigende grad erkendt, at den hektiske bestræbelse for at holde de europæiske banker oven vande gennem mere kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), mere bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindsud) og mere bail-out (statslig bankredning) – de samme, mislykkede bestræbelser, som Bush og Obama har brugt i USA – skal dække over ødelæggelsen af folks levebrød, hvor produktiv beskæftigelse og selve produktiviteten bliver lukket ned for at redde spekulanterne. Og så virker det ikke engang, for at redde bankerne!

På den strategiske side, så er krigene for »regimeskifte«, som Bush, Blair, Cameron og Obama har ført i hele Mellemøsten, og som har overgivet land efter land til bestialske terroristbander, ved at blive nedkæmpet på Syriens slagmarker. Aleppo er næsten blevet befriet fra al-Qaeda og ISIS, disse, de britiske og saudiske monarkiers skabelser. Som oberst Pat Lang (pens.) bemærkede på sin blog, *Sic Semper Tyrannis:[1]* »Det, der er sket i borgerkrigens heksekedel, er, at en ny magt er opstået i Levanten. En ny, syrisk, arabisk hær eksisterer nu, takket være russisk uddannelse, udstyr og rådgivning.«

Som en yderligere konsolidering af denne afvisning af britisk imperiepolitik, erklærede Donald Trump i går aftes i North Carolina med sin hidtil stærkeste formulering:

»Vi vil ophøre med at fare rundt for at vælte udenlandske regimer, som vi intet ved om; som vi ikke bør være indblandet i. Denne destruktive cyklus med intervention og kaos må omsider være slut ... Vi søger harmoni og god vilje mellem verdens nationer.«

✘ EIR's rapport 'Den Nye
Silkevej bliver til

Verdenslandbroen'
på engelsk, kinesisk og
arabisk

Grundlaget for denne harmoni er blevet fremlagt i detaljer i EIR's Specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, som nu cirkulerer i hele verden på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk. I løbet af den forgangne uge fortalte to politiske ledere fra Kina, Patrick Ho, tidligere Hong Kong-indenrigssekretær, og viceudenrigsminister Fu Ying fra Beijing, et amerikansk publikum i Washington og New York, at den nyvalgte præsident Trump har mulighed for at bringe Kina og USA sammen omkring global opbygning af nationer, ved at tilslutte sig Xi Jinpings Silkevejsprojekter, Bælt-og-Vej-programmet, og ved at tage imod det stående tilbud fra præsident Xi om samarbejde, som Obama havde afvist til fordel for militær konfrontation med både Kina og Rusland.

Trump har gjort det ekstremt klart, at han vil arbejde sammen med præsident Putin omkring bekæmpelse af terrorisme, samt inden for andre, endnu ikke afgjorte områder. I dag foretog han endnu en positiv gestus over for Beijing ved at udnævne guvernøren for Iowa, Terry Branstad, som den næste ambassadør til Kina. Branstad er en nær, personlig ven til præsident Xi Jinping, et venskab, der stammer fra Xis mange besøg til Iowa i årenes løb.

✘ LaRouches Fire Love

For virkelig at bringe Amerika ind i en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og Kina, må det transatlantiske banksystems bankerot løses, helst før der indtræffer en ukontrollabel sammenbrudskrise. Dette kræver den omgående genindførelse af Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov og afskrivning af boblen med værdiløse derivater, der er i færd med at drive realøkonomien ad Helvede til. I dag er aktivist-teams fra hele USA's østkyst i Washington, hvor de giver de sædvanligvis totalt idéforladte kongresmedlemmer deres marchordrer om at tilslutte sig den nu på globalt plan gærende revolution, der er i færd med at bringe en afslutning på Det britiske

Imperiums finansdiktatur gennem Glass-Steagall og statslig kredit, der, efter Hamiltons principper, dirigeres til opbygning af industri, landbrug, infrastruktur og satsning på fusionskraft og udforskning af rummet. Magten til og muligheden for at gøre dette ligger i dette øjeblik i vore hænder, et øjeblik, der ligeledes vil »huskes som en skændsel«, hvis vi mislykkes. Som i 1941, har alle patrioter i deres respektive nationer, og alle borgere i verden, muligheden for at ændre historiens gang til det bedre, ved at tilslutte sig denne historiske, internationale kamp for at skabe en civilisation, der er i overensstemmelse med alle menneskers værdighed.

Foto: SAA Tigerstyrker og civile i Aleppo, Syrien, 7. december, 2016.

[1] Sic semper tyrannis er latin og betyder 'således altid for tyranner'. Det blev foreslået af George Manson ved Virginia Konventionen i 1776 og henviste til Marcus Junius Brutus' udtalelse ved mordet på Julius Cæsar. Det bliver undertiden fejltolket som »Død over tyranner«. (*wiki*)

Kan et nul være negativt?

– Ja, når det er sort!

Rusland og Kina satser på kreativitet.

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

3. december, 2016 – At der i dag findes to helt forskellige paradigmer i verden, der bestemmer nationers adfærd, bliver klarere dag for dag. Medens modstanden i den transatlantiske verden mod det mislykkede globaliseringsparadigme bliver stadig stærkere, og etablissementet så meget desto mere sammenbidt søger at fastholde det, så satser de stater, der samarbejder med Den nye Silkevej, stadig tydeligere på deres befolknings kreativitet og samarbejdet om menneskehedens fælles mål.

De vestlige politikere og medier, der er vant til kun at betragte Putin gennem dæmoniseringsbrillerne, ville stå sig vel ved for én gangs skyld at gennemlæse Putins årlige 'Tale til nationen', som han holdt for den russiske Duma, uden fordomme. Efter fravalget af Obama – for det var også, hvad Hillary Clintons nederlag var – og efter Donald Trumps første telefonsamtaler med Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping, har der åbnet sig en reel chance for at normalisere forholdet mellem de tre vigtigste nationer her på Jorden. Og kun en selvmorderisk nar ville ønske at vrage en sådan mulighed.

Når man tager den samlede kronologi for alle Putins tilbud til Vesten i betragtning, indbefattet hans forhåbningsfulde tale til den tyske forbundsdag i 2001 og talen til München-sikkerhedskonferencen i 2007, hvor han gav udtryk for stærk skuffelse, så burde man tage hans ord for pålydende, når han siger: »Vi ønsker ikke konfrontation med nogen. Det har vi lige så lidt, som vore partnere i det globale fællesskab, brug for. I modsætning til vore kolleger i udlandet, der betragter Rusland som en fjende, søger vi ikke, og har heller ikke søgt, modstandere. Vi har brug for venner. Men vi vil ikke tillade, at vore interesser skades eller ignorereres.«

Længere fremme i sin tale understregede Putin, at kravet om viden og moral i undervisningssystemet, som forudsætning for samfundets levedygtighed, var en prioritet. De unge menneskers interesse for den nationale klassiske litteratur, kultur og

historie må vækkes, og skolerne må fremme kreativitet, samtidig med, at børnene lærer at tænke selvstændigt, såvel som også lærer at arbejde både selvstændigt og som en del af et team, løse stillede opgaver og formulere og realisere målsætninger. Godt nok er kravet om begavelse vigtigt, men grundlæggende set må opdragelsen hvile på det princip, at alle børn og teenagere er begavede og i stand til at opnå resultater inden for videnskab, de kreative områder samt i livet. Det er statens opgave at fremme disse talenter.

Putin understregede også den fundamentale betydning af grundforskning, som basis for økonomisk vækst og sociale fremskridt. Over 200 laboratorier er allerede etableret, som, takket være de store statstilskud, de modtager, må blive i stand til at operere på globalt niveau, og som vil blive ledet af videnskabsfolk, der er med til at bestemme retningen af den globale, videnskabelige udvikling. Det er i denne sammenhæng også vigtigt at overvinde de i Rusland siden zartiden eksisterende flaskehalse for, at disse forskningsresultater også kan komme produktionen af forbrugsvarer til gode.

De mennesker, der aktivt dæmoniserer Putin, burde også studere den tale, som Putin holdt den foregående dag ved Det internationale Forum for Primakov-forelæsninger til ære for den tidligere statsminister og 'store tænker', Jevgenij Primakov, der døde for 18 måneder siden.

Også her stod de amerikansk-russiske relationer højt på dagsordenen. Putin henviste til Primakovs overbevisning om, at, »uden et oprigtigt partnerskab mellem Rusland og USA«, ville det blive vanskeligt at klare de »store udfordringer« i verden – især i kampen mod terrorismen i Mellemøsten.

Primakov havde, ifølge den russiske præsident, haft en »virkeligt strategisk vision«, der havde gjort det muligt for ham »at kigge ud i fremtiden og se, hvor uholdbar og ensidig« modellen om en unipolær verden var. Det var Primakov, der som den første gik ind for et trilateralt samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien, og ud fra hvilket BRIKS, »der nu vinder indflydelse og betydning i verden«, har udviklet sig. Primakovs holden fast ved de tætte relationer med partnerne i

Fællesskabet af Uafhængige Stater (CIS) »er rygraden i vores integrationspolitik i Eurasien ... Vi håber, at dialog med vore partnere, indbefattet en dialog om sammenkoblingen med Kinas projekt om det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, vil sætte os i stand til at opbygge et stort, eurasiske partnerskab«.

Den umistelige ret til udvikling

Et andet dokument, som de vestlige politikere og medier, med deres geopolitiske tankegang, burde studere, er en ny hvidbog fra den kinesiske regering om »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«, hvor det bekræftes, at der findes en »umistelig rettighed« for alle lande og folkeslag til at udvikle sig. »Retten til udvikling må tilhøre og være fælles for alle folk. Det er alle landes ansvar at virkeliggøre retten til udvikling, og det er ligeledes det internationale fællesskabs pligt«, står der i dokumentet. »Det forpligter regeringerne i alle lande til at formulere udviklingsstrategier og forholdsregler, der passer til deres egen virkelighed, og det fordrer det internationale samfunds koncentrerede anstrengelser som helhed. Kina opfordrer alle lande til at stræbe efter en ligeværdig, åben, omfattende og innovativ, fælles udvikling, og hvidbogen kræver en fælles udvikling og at der skabes betingelser for, at alle folkeslag kan tage del i retten til udvikling.«

Hvidbogen beskriver imidlertid meget mere – nemlig, at Kinas udviklingsmodel og Kinas politiske og sociale struktur har været en udelte succes. Og, alt imens denne model fortsat udvikler sig, så foregår det i et tempo og på en måde, der bestemmes af det kinesiske folk selv. Det påpeges, at Kina allerede har løftet 700 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom, og at i dag kun 5,7 % af befolkningen lever under fattigdomsgrænsen – hvilket gør Kina til den første nation, som det er lykkedes at nå FN's Millennium-mål for fattigdomsbekæmpelse. Kina er endda fast besluttet på helt at overvinde fattigdom. I marts 2016 offentliggjordes »udkast til den 13. femårsplan for Folkerepublikken Kinas nationale,

økonomiske og sociale udvikling«, hvor regeringen fremlægger en strategi for helt at udrydde fattigdom blandt landbefolkningen allerede i år 2020.

»En ny bølge af velstand«

Hvis man ikke ønsker at lytte til Putin eller Kina, kan man også studere en ny hvidbog fra bygge- og anlægsmaskineproducenten Caterpillar om betydningen af »Bælt-og-Vej«-initiativet. Det vil udløse »en ny bølge af velstand« for Kina og den øvrige verden, står der i den. Opbygningen af et infrastrukturnet, som er en prioritet i initiativet, vil muliggøre en fri strøm og en mere effektiv udnyttelse af resurserne, integration af markederne og koordinering af nationernes økonomiske politik.

Opbygningen af infrastruktur vil være med til at sænke transportomkostningerne, øge udviklingslandenes konkurrenceevne og reducere ubalancen landene imellem. Caterpillar betragter »Bælt-og-Vej«-initiativet som en »åben og medinddragende« ramme, der gør det muligt for alle landene langs ruten at tage del i opbygningen af projektet. »Dette bør og kan ikke være en bestræbelse alene fra Kinas side«, står der i dokumentet.

Virksomheden påskønner de forretningsmuligheder, som dette initiativ åbner op for, og håber at kunne deltage endnu mere i projekter langs ruten, forklarede Chen Qihua, vicepræsident for Caterpillar og direktør for Caterpillar Kina.

Og endelig burde de vestlige politikere og medier gøre sig klart, at der i befolkningen er bred opbakning til det internationale samarbejde, netop på områderne for videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt. Den europæiske rumfartsorganisation ESA's borgerdialog i organisationens 22 lande fastslog, at 88 % af de adspurgte understøttede ledelsens rumprogram, og 96 % følte sig overbeviste om, at verdensrummet frembyder muligheder, der ikke forefindes på Jorden, men som bør udforskes.

I sin rapport om meningsmålingen ved flyvestationen Upjever i

Friesland sagde den tidligere ESA-astronaut Thomas Reiter, der nu er ESA's hovedkoordinator for den internationale rumstations anliggender, at der er grund til optimisme – på trods af den endeløse strid om budgettet på europæisk niveau. De €8 mia., der er blevet brugt i de sidste 5 år, har skabt økonomiske værdier for €14,5 mia. for Europa og dets borgere. »Det drejer sig også om det politiske aspekt af samarbejdet: Dette fungerer ganske godt, trods konflikterne på Jorden«, sagde Reiter. 95 stater deltager i ISS' forskningsarbejde, »hvor man deroppe forfølger mål til gavn for alle mennesker«. Reiter udtalte sig også optimistisk om udsigterne for udforskningen af Månen, især Månens bagside. Herfra vil man senere også kunne udsende missioner til den videre udforskning af verdensaltet.


Bernhard von Weyhe, leder af kommunikationsafdelingen i kontrolcentret (ESOC) i ESA-centeret i Darmstadt, talte i et interview med avisen *Allgemeine Zeitung* om den »brofunktion«, som rumforskningen har for menneskeheden. »Den fælles bemandede rumfart kræver samarbejde, og gjorde det også under koldkrigstiden. Rumfart har altid været et område, hvor man har haft et intensivt internationalt samarbejde, og brofunktionen består stadig. Rumfart er pr. definition et samarbejdsprojekt.«

Fællesnævneren for alle disse udtalelser er: Menneskehedens fremtid ligger i samarbejdet mellem nationerne om økonomisk udvikling af alle verdens lande og om samarbejdet om menneskehedens fælles mål, især om udviklingen af teknologi og videnskab og menneskenes skabende evner. Det lønner sig stærkt at investere i dette samarbejde. Den, der ikke fatter dette og i stedet blot stræber mod et »sort nul«, kommer i sidste ende til at stå tilbage med tomme hænder.


Foto: I september 2015 blev astronaut Andreas Mogensen den første dansker i rummet, hvor han deltog i forskningsopgaver om bord på den Internationale Rumstation, ISS.

USA har brug for en massebevægelse for udvikling NU!

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 2. december, 2016; Leder

Matthew Ogden: Både Diane Sare og Kesha Rogers har skrevet  en artikel i denne uges *The Hamiltonian*; jeg mener, deres artikler meget fint tjener til at skabe en ramme omkring aftenens diskussion. Diane Sares artikel hedder "President Putin's Purloined Letter; the Poetic Principle in Political Affairs" (Præsident Putins stjålne brev; det poetiske princip i politiske affærer) – jeg kan godt lide bogstavrimet her. Kesha Rogers skrev en artikel, "Mankind Is Taking a Leap! You Should Ask 'How High?'" (Menneskeheden foretager et spring! Man bør spørge, 'Hvor højt?')")

Begge disse artikler tjener virkelig til at definere det, som hr. LaRouche pointerede mht. den nødvendige tankegang, når vi går frem i den nuværende situation i verden. Man må ikke blive fanget i lokal tankegang; man bør ikke tænke ud fra den laveste fællesnævner, eller tænke på alle de forskellige politiske taktikker, der plaskes ud over forsiden af *New York Times* eller *Washington Post* og de forskellige nyhedsmedier. Man må i stedet tænke som en leder; og man må tænke ud fra standpunktet om, hvad der er drivkraften bag den hastigt skiftende dynamik i globale anliggender.

Ganske kort: vi så dette meget direkte i denne uge fra et  par forskellige standpunkter. For det første, så var der en aktionsdag fra LaRouchePAC-aktivister i Washington, D.C. i onsdags. Jeg havde den store glæde at deltage. Vi havde aktivister, der kom fra hele østkysten, inkl. fra 'Manhattan-projektet' i New York City; og vi var dér for at sætte hr. LaRouches principper, i form af de **Fire Økonomiske Love**, på dagsordenen. At der ikke er noget alternativ til en omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og en omgående renæssance af Alexander Hamiltons principper. Disse er: et nationalbanksystem; direkte kredit til forøget energigennemstrømningstæthed og produktivitet i arbejdsstyrken; og princippet om videnskab som [økonomisk] drivkraft, som Kesha Rogers diskuterer i sin artikel i *The Hamiltonian*. Et aggressivt program for udforskning og udvikling af rummet, og for at opnå fusionskraft og en højere energigennemstrømningstæthed i produktionsprocessen.

Og jeg mener, dette kan ses meget klart ud fra det, der finder sted internationalt, og som hovedsagligt kommer fra Rusland og Kina. Der var for det første et meget vigtigt dokument, som netop er blevet offentliggjort, fra Kina, som vi kan diskutere lidt mere omkring. Dette dokument hedder »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«. Denne hvidbog erklærer, at udvikling er den fundamentale, uomstøttelige rettighed. Og for det andet, så er der nu en ny, strategisk doktrin fra Rusland, som blev annonceret i summarisk form af den russiske præsident Putin i sin årlige 'Tale til nationen', hvor han sagde, at verdensdynamikken nu er forandret. Vi er nu villige til at samarbejde med USA som ligeværdige partnere omkring fælles interesser – inklusive endelig at besejre de falske, konstruerede fjender, som vi har hørt om fra Obama-administrationen gennem de seneste otte år.

Så med denne form for geometrisk strategi har vi et meget rigt felt, vi kan intervenere i, og en meget rig mulighed.

Så der er mange detaljer, som jeg gerne vil have, vi kommer

ind på under diskussionen af alle disse spørgsmål. Lad det være nok som introduktion, og lad os høre Kesha og Diane.

(Herefter følger udskrift af diskussionen på engelsk.)

DIANE SARE: OK, I'll just go ahead. I'm really glad with what you said, Matt; because there really is a transformation, and I think we tend to miss it. Or you catch a glimmer of it like the real joy that I certainly felt watching all the vote totals come in; and these poor silly reporters not having a clue what had hit them. But then, you get bombarded with the real fake news, which is what comes from the so-called mainstream news media; which has absolutely zero about developments in the world which are being created by billions of people. So, you have the most extraordinary, most gigantic Earth-changing events occurring under the leadership of Vladimir Putin, under the leadership of Xi Jinping, and their collaboration with leaders in South America, leaders in Africa. Not one word of it here, and then we're treated to some miniscule detail of a misplaced wart that a politician has somewhere or whatever. I think we would do well to bear in mind a little bit of what I tried to capture in that article. There is a poetic principle; there is a world revolution underway. These things are not separate, discrete events. The Brexit vote – contrary to the stupid media spin – was not a bunch of white racists who hate immigrants. Maybe there are some of those, but the real factor was that the whole euro system is bankrupt. It didn't work and it wasn't

designed

to work; and people were rejecting it. Similarly, you had these

recent votes: the winner in the French Republican Party nominations, François Fillon, who does not want a war with Russia. I think most people on the planet actually recognize that a nuclear war between superpowers is not a desirable policy

or outcome; and it's not necessary because what President Putin

is doing is leading a fight to eradicate terrorism. He has been

very direct about this; especially after September of 2015, at his speech at the United Nations. He's reiterating again the call for a coalition to wipe out this terrorist scourge. So what

you see in this election process here in the United States, is we

have a potential now to join with the New Paradigm.

Therefore, the most significant aspect of what we know about

the incoming administration perhaps, are the two phone calls that

Trump had with Xi Jinping and with President Vladimir Putin; and

this is absolutely not missed by people of the world. I just wanted to give a little bit of a report on an event last night at

New York University with this extraordinary woman, who is the second only I think woman in history to be the chairwoman of the

Foreign Relations committee in the Chinese national assembly. Her name is Madame Fu Ying; she is extraordinarily dignified, calm and very confident. She began her remarks at this forum at

New York University by referring to the phone call between Xi Jinping and Trump. She made a point of saying the Chinese are

always being accused of not contributing to good in the world, of not working with the world. So, we figured when we started the Belt and Road and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, that the United States – which is always accusing us of not wanting to work with anyone else – would have been the first in line to join. Instead, our invitation to participate in these extraordinary projects was rejected. Now, clearly there is a potential for this opportunity to be taken.

This is really very big. Similarly, the decision that Trump has made to have retired General Michael Flynn as one of his advisors; who has called for collaboration with Russia in Syria.

And Trump's reiterations of the necessity of that kind of collaboration – these things are very important. And the fact that Flynn has come out calling for a Marshall Plan for the region; which is similar to the Chinese; Xi Jinping made a tour of several of those nations not so long ago. The only way you are going to secure peace is through economic development – not on a low level, not on repairing the decrepit, aging, out-of-date infrastructure we have; but by leaping into a new domain. So, I think I'll stop there for a minute; because I think Kesha probably has a lot to add in that regard.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. Just taking from that, we really have to advance mankind; we really have to have a leap forward for mankind. This is what Mr. LaRouche is committed to; this is what

you see Russia and China committed to. I was greatly inspired by the discussion and some of the developments that came out of the President of Russia; President Putin's State of the Union address. The leap for mankind really requires putting the commitment to the future. This was really expressed very beautifully in his remarks, which captured in essence the conception that the responsibility of the nation is to foster creativity in science, and foster creativity in the youth of your nation. The best expression to doing this, in terms of scientific and technological development. In his speech he says, "Our schools must promote creativity, but children must learn to think independently, work both on their own and as part of a team, address usual tasks and formulate and achieve goals; which will help them have an interesting and prosperous life. You must promote the culture of research and engineering work. The number of cutting edge science parks for children will increase to 40 within two years; they will serve as the basis for development of a network of technical project groups across the country. Companies, universities, and research institutes would contribute to this, so our children will see clearly that all of them have equal opportunity and an equal start in life. That Russia needs their ideas and knowledge and they can prove their mettle in Russian companies and laboratories..." And he goes to say, "Our education system must be based on the principle that all

children

and teenagers are gifted and can succeed in science, in creative areas, in sports, in career, and in life."

That should be the model for every single nation.

That is

the model for our space program, and it really starts with the question of what is human nature? If we're going to advance mankind and have leaps forward? As a part of this paper that Matt mentioned, from China they're expressing the same expression

for their nation; and for mankind as a whole. It's not just "our

nation is better than yours, and we're going to have our people

pulled out of poverty and your people can stay in poverty.

They're not thinking like imperialists or wanting to keep nations

backwards; they want nations to move forward. So, China has pulled 700 million people out of poverty; you can't do that by taking baby steps and going with a few infrastructure projects.

You have to have creative leaps. This has really been expressed

for their Silk Road development offer of win-win cooperation and

their commitment to space and space as the potential for opening

for mankind across the planet and across the galaxy.

I think if people look at the very exciting developments

that we're seeing coming from Russia and China, that has to be the model. We have that potential right now, because I think what Diane pointed out – that when President-elect Trump was elected, this was a mandate. This was a repudiation of the Bush/Obama destruction of this type of potential for a future;

a

repudiation of Hillary Clinton's commitment to continuing war. The American people said, we're not going to condone this any longer.

The question is, what is the positive aspect that you're going to fight for? We've put that on the table with LaRouche's Four Laws and our commitment to a future perspective for mankind, based on this very identity that has been clearly laid out by what we could be doing if we decide to make the commitment and collaborate on the basis that Russia and China have laid out.

OGDEN: Yeah, China really is an inspiration in that regard. Let me just read a very quick quote from that paper that you referenced, Kesha. The title of this white paper, again, is "The Right to Development: China's Philosophy, Practice and Contribution"; and they start by saying, "The right to development must be enjoyed and shared by all peoples. Realizing the right to development is the responsibility of all countries and also the obligation of the international community." If you just juxtapose that to the Malthusian philosophy of the British Royal Family and others in the so-called "West" today, where they say, "Well, no, you know, the right to development – it's not a right. All peoples do not have an equal right to the same living standard, and, plus, if we were to pursue that – as Obama said when he went to Africa – 'the planet would boil over.'" I mean,

give me a break!

So, China's white paper is laying out the *opposite* philosophy, view, of man. I think, in accordance with what Putin said in that State of the Union, that, yes, every human being is a creative human being. That is the fundamental right of every human being – is to develop that creativity and to contribute it to his or her nation and to the future of mankind.

In the China white paper, they go on to state some really stunning statistics. You, Kesha, cited the lifting 700 million people out of poverty; which is just an incredible achievement in and of itself. Now only a little bit under 6%, 5.7% of the population of China, are officially under the poverty line. And in the white paper they were very proud to point out that China was actually the first to achieve this UN Millennium goal – which is a goal to lift such and such a percentage of people out of poverty. But they refuse to stop there! They say, "That's not enough. We have a goal, that we are going to eliminate poverty altogether!"

The statistics are amazing. If you compare China in 1949 to China in 2015, only a 70-year difference, the average longevity in China in 1949 was 35 years. Today it's 76 years. The enrollment of school-age children in school in 1949 was 20%. Today it's almost 100%; 99.8% of all school-age children are enrolled in schools in China. The difference between 1978 and 2015: the GDP was at RMB767 billion in 1978. Today their GDP is

RMB68,000 billion! So, that growth is unbelievable. And then there's, obviously, much less tangible things that you can measure, but which are clear to see, including the spread of art, classical culture, classical musical training among the children of China. So this is really a model for the rest of the world, an inspiration. As Xi Jinping has said, "We invite the United States, we invite the West to become a part of the New Silk Road, and to become a part of the One Belt, One Road initiative."

One event that was happening in Washington, D.C., simultaneously with this Day of Action that the LaRouche PAC activists had on Capitol Hill, was really an unprecedented event that was sponsored by the Asia Society. It was an all-day event that was hosted by a scholar named Dr. Patrick Ho, who's the Secretary General of the China Energy Fund Committee. One of my colleagues who was there, said about the event that "This was one of those days in Washington, D.C. when all of the principles that you've been talking about as a LaRouche PAC activist for years and years and years, all of a sudden are being echoed by the person standing at the podium." We've had those experiences periodically, but this *entire* event was about the right to development, the One Belt, One Road Initiative, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the World Land-Bridge, the New Paradigm, win-win cooperation, the United States joining the Silk Road – quite literally, in those terms.

Dr. Ho actually laid out five points of advice to the new incoming [Trump] administration on how to integrate the United States into the One Belt, One Road program. His five steps are

as
follows:

1) Consider One Belt, One Road a platform to spearhead initiatives and programs to bring closer cooperation between the United States and China;

2) Realign trade agreements with Asia-Pacific nations to accommodate the One Belt, One Road;

3) Adjust the U.S. posture towards the international development banks – that's the AIIB, the New Silk Road Fund, the New Development Bank of the BRICS, and so forth – and promote their capacity to assist in support for infrastructure development;

4) Help secure security along the One Belt, One Road;

5) Get the international institutions to work with the One Belt, One Road.

So, I think that's actually a very clearly stated way to, as we say in this pamphlet that we've published from LaRouche PAC, have the United States join this new Silk Road.

These ideas, as Diane was saying, this is an active principle, this is the dynamic {elsewhere}, and our responsibility is to ensure that {this} is the dynamic shaping policy in the United States.

SARE: Along these lines – because I know there's discussion and there's an article about Sen. Schumer saying he will work with Trump on a \$1 trillion infrastructure package (something like that) – I think the idea of Hamilton and the ideas of people like Krafft Ehrlicke and what China is doing, really need to be understood by our activists, so that people can reflect.

For example, there's discussion about one of the things that was promoted in the *New York Times* for Trump to do with his infrastructures, that there should be a tunnel under the Hudson River, from New Jersey to New York. Right now I think the trains go, I don't know, every 90 seconds, or every three minutes, or something like that. There's an enormous amount of traffic. The Port Authority Bus Terminal is very old and decrepit. It's going to have to be rebuilt and relocated. The tunnels are very old.

So, this is something that has needed to be done for a long time. As everyone might imagine, there's an absolutely enormous amount of traffic between Manhattan and New Jersey across the Hudson River. So, you say, "What's wrong with a new tunnel between New Jersey and New York?" Well, in a sense, if you were to do that, it would be a sin of omission. Obviously we need a tunnel, but if the idea were to connect this tunnel to a tunnel under the Bering Strait, so that you could travel from Manhattan to Moscow, that would be a completely different idea. And I think what...

OGDEN: [cross talk] ...Manhattan to Jersey City; that's for sure! [both laugh]

SARE: Yeah! Or even, you know, for people who don't want to go to Moscow, for whatever reason. They could go to Paris, but

they could travel through Siberia. All kinds of exotic, really wonderful places. It would be quite a ride. Although, I suppose, if we get the magnetically-levitated vacuum trains, you wouldn't really get to see much. On the other hand, you'd arrive at your destination *before you left*, by the clock.

Anyway, all of these things would *completely* transform the way we think of *everything*. If you could take a train from New Jersey to San Francisco. Supposing even that it wasn't three hours – it was a normal high-speed train – so you got there in a day-and-a-half, that's a completely different phenomenon. It changes the United States: what you can ship; whom you can work with; the exchange of ideas; the exchange of goods. The ability for people to find the very most brilliant individual, whether they're in China or Somalia or India, who has expertise in a particular area, and you want to bring them in to collaborate with a team of scientists in your local laboratory. All these things become thinkable.

So, when Mr. LaRouche a few years ago had made the point that he doesn't like the term "infrastructure" anymore, because it doesn't really get at what is actually necessary; which is the question of how do you increase the productivity of every person. And that requires thinking in terms of a *platform*. The difference between not having electricity, for example, and having electricity, is not simply night and day. You just can't even compare it. It's *incommensurate*. Therefore, I think we have to be both open-minded, but we also have to set {really

high} standards for what we think we should be doing. It would be absolutely criminal, even if it did employ millions of people, to fill in every pothole in every major city in the United States. That would not lift the standard of living or the productivity of the nation as a whole; whereas a high-speed rail link that went from Manhattan to Moscow would actually have a completely transformative effect.

OGDEN: Yeah, it's these {leaps} in progress that are unquantifiable, because it's a completely different measuring rod, from one leap to the next. Last week on the webcast here on Friday night, Ben Deniston gave an excellent presentation on what's necessary for a real space colonization and exploration program. I thought one example that he used during that presentation, was really interesting. Just think about what's the difference between Lewis and Clark's Expedition to explore the Louisiana Purchase Territory and to cross the continental United States vs. what we were able to do with the trans-continental railroad. That's a different universe vs. what we would be able to do with what you're talking about, Diane, with a magnetically-levitated train that goes from New York, to Los Angeles, all the way up to Anchorage, Alaska, and across the Bering Strait, into the Eurasian landmass. Those are just quantifiably and qualitatively different modes of action. And so, yes, it's "setting the bar" incredibly high.

Kesha, in your article, you said, "You should ask: How high?"

We should leap, we should jump. Mankind should take a leap.

How

high?" It's these kinds of insights that Krafft Ehrlicke, that others, were able to discuss from the terms that now Mr. LaRouche

has {scientifically} defined, in terms of energy-flux density, how much more productivity are you able to achieve, with less effort, with less energy applied, because of these qualitative leaps in technology and in the principle that you're employing.

Before we get into a little bit more of that, I do want to

bring up, though, because you mentioned it, Diane, this article,

this interview with Sen. Chuck Schumer. Mr. LaRouche was told about this earlier today when we had a discussion with him. He placed some importance on it and said, "You know, Chuck Schumer

does play a significant role in the Democratic Party." He is now

Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, and, very significantly, led

the fight against Obama's veto of the JASTA bill; very publicly

broke with the Obama administration, in favor of the 9/11 families, in overturning the Obama veto of the JASTA bill. I'd like to say something about that later.

This article is an interview that's published on syracuse.com. It starts by saying, "U.S. Senator Chuck Schumer said Wednesday that he's optimistic Congress will strike a deal

with President-elect Donald Trump, to pass a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill within the first 100 days of the administration." However, he warned, "the bill cannot rely on what he called 'gimmicks' or tax breaks." He said "any infrastructure bill must be paid for through substantial and direct federal funding." He said, "The bill needs to be

stronger

and bolder than ever before. Simple tax credits will not work."

He also said that the so-called public-private partnership that

Trump's infrastructure plan and other incentives to build projects that would be privately owned, would not function. He said that he had personally told Trump in a private meeting, that

such a plan would lead to investment only in the most profitable

projects – people who are just trying to make a buck; and could

lead to significantly higher tolls on privately owned roads and

bridges. Instead, Schumer said, "The \$1 trillion could flow into

the U.S. Treasury to be used for rebuilding the nation's infrastructure." So, this is a direct Federal financing, not a

scheme, not a gimmick, not tax breaks, not PPPs [public-private

partnerships]. That is a significant development.

I do not think it is a coincidence that that interview comes

directly in the wake of a two-week mobilization by LaRouche PAC

activists on Capitol Hill to force the issue of Hamiltonian national banking, direct Federal credit. I know that there were

countless meetings from activists; there were several dozen meetings that Paul Gallagher personally had with staffers and Congress people on Capitol Hill to discuss the details of what Hamiltonian economics and Hamiltonian national banking actually

means. If you haven't seen it yet, I would highly recommend going back and listening to the recorded Fireside Chat that

Paul

Gallagher did last night; that was on this question of what Hamiltonian national banking really means.

So this is significant; but, indeed, we have to have the view that {we} are setting the agenda. This nation and the leadership of the country need a very intensive course in what Hamiltonian economics really means.

ROGERS: Yes, and I think that the title of our publication which we are continuing to get out *en masse*, *The Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance* is absolutely imperative to be understood as just that. We're not just talking about developing infrastructure or increasing manufacturing; because that's not what Hamilton understood in the increasing of the productivity of society. It was starting with advancing the creative powers of mankind; and Lyndon LaRouche has taken that to a very high level and conception, as you said. His work over the past 40-50 years looking at this conception of leaps in productivity of society based on this conception of the potential for mankind to advance in ways that had not been thought of before; to advance in ways where the creative leaps in mankind take the development scientifically and technologically to higher and higher states. Mr. LaRouche's understanding of this and Krafft Ehrlicke's were very synonymous; they worked hand-in-hand together. The German space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – the rejection of his ideas by the "limits to growth" imperialist budget-cutters, who didn't want to see mankind advance in this way, was as direct as the opposition to Lyndon LaRouche. If Mr. LaRouche's policies had been put through – along with Krafft

Ehrlicke's – on the development of LaRouche's perspective in the '80s for a vibrant space program, setting the agenda of the space program to heights that had not been thought of up until that point, and continuing what John F Kennedy had laid out as a national mission for advancing not just in the moment for space development; but looking far into the future. It's interesting to go back and look at what the vision was at that time, and how far we have been set back because we've had people who decided that it's not the place of human beings to develop.

Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have continued to say, represented a quality of genius. It wasn't just that he understood aeronautics and was one of the best in terms of field of technology. He was a real philosopher; his conception of space development started from the standpoint of the development of mankind as a whole. That we on this planet, have a responsibility for the development of each and every human being on the planet; but the way we're going to achieve is – as he said on many occasions – that you have to leave the confines of one small planet. The idea that there are only limited resources here for a limited number of people is not true. There's a very beautiful conception of that drawn out by Krafft Ehrlicke in a very short writing that he wrote called "The Extra-Terrestrial Imperative; Growth and Life"; that's the model that he worked on.

I just want to read something quickly from that, because I

think

it's very indicative of what we're talking about here. People have to get these ideas in a very advanced understanding of it when we're going into Congress right now. It's not just about getting them to pass a piece of legislation. It has to be, and

we're seeing, a total shift in the thinking of the population. He says:

"There was a time when the human mind was slow to accept growing evidence that Earth is not a flat center of the universe.

Now the concept of a closed, isolated world must be overcome. Viewing our Earth from space should make it obvious that the world into which we now can grow is no longer closed. By ignoring this new reality, current predictive world dynamic models fail. Adhering to an obsolete, closed worldview, they despair of the future growth prospects. The extra-terrestrial imperative enjoins us to grow and live through open world development which contains all the futures the human mind can hold."

So, that's what we're talking about. How far can the human mind advance? How far can the human mind see into the future? That's what we're talking about right now, and we have a potential to really bring that perspective into focus if we have a revolutionary change in the way we think about society, and we think about the responsibility of the growth in society which we have to now bring on, because it's long overdue. LaRouche's solutions really put forth exactly how we bring that into being.

OGDEN: This the moment of opportunity. If you look at, as

Diane covered in the beginning of our discussion, this wave of unexpected and completely dramatic electoral results and otherwise; from Brexit to the Presidential election. We've got the Italian referendum coming up this weekend; we could see some very dramatic results out of there. Hollande has now declared that he will not be running for President of France. This is a very dramatic and uncharted period; and the potential is there, the doors are wide open. I think we have repeatedly gone back to this point, but I think we should return to it again. It should have been seen that this was not business as usual at the point that the entirety of the United States Senate and a vast majority of the U.S. House – not along party lines – rejected Obama's treasonous veto of the JASTA bill. That was in no small part the result of the activation and the leadership of the LaRouche Political Action Committee in the United States. I think we who are on this discussion right now, can say that we know directly that the role that LaRouche PAC played was central and primary in leading that fight for years. Direct collaboration with the 9/11 Families; direct collaboration with the members of the U.S. House and Senate in forcing this through. That was not something that Obama – despite all of his bluster – and the Saudi government – despite all of their millions of dollars; they just could

not

handle that. That was something that overcame everything that they tried to throw up against it.

Now you have a pathetic effort by McCain and by Lindsey Graham to try and gut the JASTA bill in the last days of the lame duck session; but this is not going anywhere. There was a very

good statement put out by Terry Strada and the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, where they said in their press release, "We wish to state our firm opposition to the proposed legislative language offered by U.S. Senators Lindsey Graham and John McCain that would effectively gut the JASTA bill;

which was overwhelmingly passed by Congress in September." Later

they say, "Notably, Graham's and McCain's efforts come in the wake of a massive lobbying campaign by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which is now employing roughly a dozen lobbying firms at

a cost of more than \$1.3 million per month." And then Terry Strada herself is quoted saying "In April of this year, Senator

Graham met with 9/11 family members and told them that he supported our cause 100%. Senator Graham is now stabbing the 9/11 Families in the back. He and Senator McCain are seeking to

torpedo JASTA by imposing changes demanded by Saudi Arabia's lobbyists. We have reviewed the language, and it is an absolute

betrayal." She says, "We, the 9/11 Families, are fortunate to have Senators John Cornyn and Chuck Schumer to block this action

in the Senate." I can tell you that Senator Schumer told me personally on Wednesday night that this effort is going nowhere;

this thing is not going to fly. So, they are holding the line very firmly. But really, they have no choice; because this victory on the JASTA bill and then everything that has come since

then, including this Presidential election, was a statement that

this is not business as usual among the American people anymore.

There is a mood of revolt among the American people.

I just want to read one very short excerpt from an article

in *The Hill* which I think excellently gets to that very point and I think is more generally applicable. The article was titled, "Note to Allies: Don't Underestimate Overwhelming Popular

Support for JASTA." The author, Alexander Nicholson, says in this article, "[O]n this particular issue..., no amount of money or insider Washington connections will be able to overturn the overwhelming will of the American people. Indeed," he says, "the

highly unexpected but highly populist-inspired election of Donald

Trump to the White House should serve as an indicator that no amount of inside-the-beltway inside baseball can achieve results

when it comes to certain issues at certain times. And this, too,

is one of those issues and times." And then he concludes the article, "The current arguments are as ineffective as the synthetic inside-the-beltway strategy it has thus far employed.

But the new era of empowerment of the American electorate is not

to be underestimated." So, I think that is absolutely the case;

and people should take heart to that. This is, indeed, a new political era for the United States; it's the "empowerment of

the

American electorate."

Now's the time to take that empowerment and just keep the momentum going; but it has to be from the standpoint of educating ourselves, as Kesha said, on the principles of Alexander Hamilton and the principles of the science of physical economy, and saying, "We now are committing ourselves to what the Chinese have called 'the inalienable right to development'; and we will not let go of our demand for that inalienable right."

SARE: Just on that, I think on the one hand it's sort of obvious; although I guess it shouldn't be, because we've tolerated such criminality for the last 16 years since 9/11 occurred. Droning people, torture, and so on. The NSA spying on every detail of everything of everyone. But there's a certain limit where people just said, "No, we're not intimidated." We saw that particularly strongly in Manhattan among first responders and others who died, who are still dying as after-effects, or who had loved ones who died, or colleagues who died. There's a certain sort of sacred commitment that "We are not going back on this," and they're not afraid. The challenge now again is to raise the standard; in other words, can we fight with the same fearless passion for those things that are necessary for mankind to progress? Could we get a situation where the population just says, "Absolutely not! We're not shutting down our nuclear power plants. Are you crazy? This is

unacceptable. You're saying we're not going to go back to the Moon and build the means to get onto Mars from the Moon? This is crazy!" Where no one even gives it a second thought that it's so obvious. I think that is where the two areas which Einstein excelled in both: the music – his violin as a certain source of inspiration and thought; and the science come together. When one is conscious of what it means to be truly human and creative, then anything on a lower standard than that, is the same kind of affront as the Saudi Foreign Minister traipsing through the halls of Congress in his robes lined with money. You just say, "Oh, this is beneath us." We saw that effect here when the Schiller Institute Community Chorus participated in this series of performances of the Mozart *Requiem*; and there's more music coming up – again sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture – on December 17th in Brooklyn. A unity concert with the conception of, what does it mean: to be human? Because human beings are not animals, no matter how many environmentalist barbarians want to try and impose that on us. When you've located your identity in a realm which is truly beautiful, then a lot of these things that seem so difficult now – like the difficulty of these politicians standing up to Wall Street on Glass-Steagall. Why are they afraid? Why do they find that difficult? Because their own identities are right now on too low of a level; but if they began to look at the world from a higher standpoint – which is I'm convinced where people like

this woman from China, the Vice Foreign Minister Fu Ying – you just get a sense among some of these people that where they're coming from is a much higher level and that such a thing would be

beneath them. I imagine this was the effect of someone like President Abraham Lincoln, who was described when he was seen visiting the soldiers; because his identity was placed in a different location in a higher realm. Therefore, it wasn't just

that he was fighting against fear; there wasn't fear because there was such a firm commitment to what is right.

So, I think the next phase in this process is to have a similar, almost ease; a soaring quality of mankind, even in the United States, to get ourselves into the realm where we actually should be living.

ROGERS: Diane, you keep getting them to sing; bringing more inspiration and optimism. So, we can get more singing and get more space development, then we can really succeed.

OGDEN: President Modi of India called it a mass movement for development; and I know Helga LaRouche has echoed that call repeatedly since he said that. And we really do see a mass movement for development among some of these Eurasian countries especially, but also with them reaching out to African and South and Central American countries, you have a majority of the world's population now getting in on this mass movement for development. But that's what we need demanded from the American

people right now; and I think we can turn this new era of empowerment of the American electorate into a mass movement for development. But we have to do it from the standpoint of a Hamiltonian renaissance in the United States. We have the materials for that, as we've said before. The new book, *Hamilton's Vision* is available on Amazon; and people can read those four reports that he wrote to the United States Congress as Treasury Security. We also have the Four Laws from Mr. LaRouche which are available on the LaRouche PAC website, and the related pamphlet, "The United States Joins the New Silk Road."

So, I implore people to become as active as you can. If you haven't yet become an activist with the LaRouche PAC, now is the time to take that step. Support us in every way you can, and make yourself into a world historical individual by acting on this current, very brief window of opportunity for mankind. You can sign up on the LaRouche PAC website; you can subscribe to our YouTube channel; you can become an activist through the LaRouche PAC Action Center; and you can share this video as widely as you possibly can. Let's make this a mass movement for development!

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Thank you to both Kesha and to Diane. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

At komme op af kviksandet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 1. december, 2016 – Kinas Xi Jinping og Ruslands Vladimir Putin fortsætter med at komme med tilbud efter tilbud til USA – og andre nationer, der stadig sidder fast i det transatlantiske systems dødbringende kviksand – om at gå med i opbygningen af det nye, globale paradigme, der er i færd med at erstatte geopolitiske krige og fascistiske nulsumsspil-økonomier, med den Nye Silkevejspolitik's win-win-resultater.

Den kinesiske regering har netop udgivet en hvidbog, »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«, som dokumenterer det forbløffende fremskridt, Kina har præsteret i løbet af de seneste årtier inden for områderne fattigdomsreduktion, levetid, uddannelse og så videre, og dernæst fortsætter med at forklare, at deres Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ har til formål at hjælpe andre nationer med at opnå lignende resultater. Retten til udvikling, proklamerer hvidbogen, *er hele menneskehedens umistelige rettighed.*

Den russiske præsident Putin gentog i sin »Tale til nationen« for den russiske Duma, det føderale parlament, at han var indstillet på at samarbejde med den tiltrædende Trump-administration i USA for at »sikre international stabilitet og sikkerhed«. Putin gjorde det ligeledes til fulde klart, at Ruslands fremtid ligger i at nære kreativitet, videnskab og evnen til at løse problemer hos den unge generation: »Vore skoler må fremme kreativitet ... Vore børn vil klart se, at Rusland har brug for deres ideer og viden.«

Dette er præcis den form for tankegang, som engang dominerede Franklin Roosevelts, og endda John Kennedys, USA, men det er blevet næsten uforståeligt for de fleste amerikanere i dag, i

et USA, der er blevet transformeret af de seneste 16 års mareridt med Bush og Obama.

Og dog, så er genopvækkelsen af denne ånd selve nøglen til en strategisk sejr imod det døende, Britiske Imperium. For at opnå dette kræver det, at vi lever op til udfordringen med at få den amerikanske befolkning, og dens repræsentanter i Washington, til at tænke på det højere niveau, som er det sande potentiale, der er fremlagt for os, og ikke på niveauet for de kontrollerede 'trivielle selskabslege', som karakteriserer politikken i Washington og i lokale anliggender.

I en diskussion tidligere på dagen med medlemmer af LPAC's Politiske Komite og Videnskabsteam, samt Helga Zepp-LaRouche, understregede Lyndon LaRouche den afgørende rolle, som et fornyet rumprogram spiller for atter at tænde gnisten for optimisme og inspiration omkring spørgsmålet om, hvad menneskets formål i universet er. Den store, tyske rumforsker Krafft Ehrlicke er en vigtig prøvesten i denne bestræbelse, sagde LaRouche, for kampen for at bringe fremskridt inden for videnskab, kultur og økonomi tilbage, som en forenet, indbyrdes forbundet præstation.

»Hele formålet er at forstå, hvad fremtiden bringer, eller *kan* bringe, og fastholde udviklingen på denne basis«, sagde Larouche. »Det er ligesom hele tiden at holde trit; hele tiden forsøge at gøre noget, der er vigtigere, at opnå det, og dernæst nyde det ... Der må være et element af overraskelse, et element af denne form for udtryk. Det er det, der får det til at virke. Det er ikke noget tomt; det er noget, man skal *få til* at virke.«

LaRouche fortsatte: »Vi lever i vort intellekt. Hvis vi kan tænke kvalificeret, så opererer vi i rummet. Vi bør håbe, at vi vil frigøre os og således bringe menneskeheden til et nyt niveau af præstationer.«

Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping mødes med Ruslands præsident Putin, Chiles præsident Bachelet, Indiens præsident Modi og Kasahkstans præsident Nazarbayev i sine bestræbelser på at rekruttere nationer til den Nye Silkevejs økonomiske politik.

Ligesom Knud den Store kan oligarkerne heller ikke standse tidevandet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 29. november, 2016 – De revolutionære forandringer, der fejer hen over de vestlige nationer, fremprovokerer hysteri blandt de afdankede, miskrediterede nationale ledere i Europa og USA. Brexit, valgnederlaget for Obamas og Hillarys plan for krig med Rusland og Kina, Filippinernes oprør mod Obama, og den ene europæiske nation efter den anden, der afviser de anti-russiske sanktioner og dæmoniseringen af Putin – disse ting og mere endnu repræsenterer en erkendelse i hele Vesten af, at deres lederskab har været kontrolleret af finansoligarker og krigsgale neokonservative, som ikke længere kan tolereres. Imperiet er i færd med at smuldre – men 'the Lords' vil gå til yderligheder, selv til atomkrig, for at redde Imperiet, med mindre de erstattes, før det kommer dertil.

Det kommer ikke som nogen overraskelse, at briterne rejser sig til forsvar for Imperiet på den mest åbenlyse og frastødende facon. Tony Blair har, efter at Englands egen Chilcot-undersøgelse har afsløret hans ulovlige aggressionskrig i Irak, baseret på løgne, meddelt, at han vender tilbage til politik for at redde sin døende race. En amerikansk officer,

der skriver på oberst Pat Langs Sic Semper Tyrannus-blog, indfanger måske ironien bedst: »Jeg bemærker også, at, i UK har Tony Blair lettet på sit kistelåg og hjem søger atter Londons gader med den hensigt at omstøde Brexit. Ser vi et mønster her? Internationale eliter, der ikke er tilfredse med bønder på begge sider af Atlanten, der gør oprør?«

På onsdag vil det britiske parlament debattere Tony Blairs forbrydelser, en debat, som har gjort Blair-tilhængere i Labour-partiet hektiske over den yderligere afsløring af deres medskyldighed i ødelæggelsen af Sydvestasien og Europa.

Ligeledes fra UK ser tidligere, konservative regeringsminister Ken Clark hen til den ynkværdige Angela Merkel som det sidste 'store hvide håb' for Det britiske Imperium: Merkel er, skriver han, nu, da USA er blevet »tabt« til Trump, »den eneste politiker, for hvem det lykkes at holde traditionen med vestligt, liberalt demokrati i live«. Hvis det, der er sket med Vesten, skal være »vestligt, liberalt demokrati«, så er folk tydeligvis parat til at dumpe det.

Dette hysteri går så langt som til den uddøende races respons på det nederlag for terrorisme, der finder sted i Aleppo. I takt med, at Rusland og Syrien tilsammen demonstrerer, at terrorisme rent faktisk kan besejres og befolkningen befries fra barbari, reagerer de vestlige medier med rædsel og insisterer på, at Rusland og Syrien er problemet, og ikke terroristerne. Frankrig har, under det til undergang dømte Hollande-regime, endda indkaldt til et hastemøde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, for at fordømme Syrien.

Men tidevandet kan ikke standses. Bag bølgen af fornuftig tankegang i Vesten ligger der en voksende erkendelse af, at Rusland og Kina har indført et nyt paradigme, baseret på win-win-samarbejde omkring den fysiske udvikling af nationer og områder i hele verden. På alle kontinenter afholdes der konferencer om den Nye Silkevej, som Xi Jinping har igangsat, og som analyserer den eksisterende og potentielle

infrastrukturudvikling, der forbinder nationer gennem fælles fremskridt og gennem at udveksle og være fælles om de bedste og mest kreative traditioner i deres respektive kulturer.

LaRouche-organisationen har initieret og ført kampagne for disse ideer i et halvt århundrede. Nogle mennesker godtager det pessimistiske og løgagtige synspunkt, at en relativt lille organisation ikke kan have været ansvarlig for sådanne globale forandringer – men disse mennesker forstår ikke den kraft til at ændre historiens gang, som ideer er i besiddelse af, og som er langt større end »forbindelser« til folk ved magten.[1] Sandheden afsløres gennem historiens lange buer, og verden oplever nu den tordnende lyd fra en historisk tidevandsbølge. Hvilken retning, den efterfølgende opvågning vil tage, afhænger af kraften i kreativiteten og den klassiske kultur, som verdens befolkning, og især USA's befolkning, vedtager.

Som Friedrich Schiller, frihedens digter, skrev: »Menneskeværdet er i dine hænder lagt; dets vogter vær. Med dig det synker, med dig det løftes.«

»Knud irettesætter sine hoffolk ved bølgerne«, af Alphonse-Marie-Adolphe de Neuville.

[1] »Lad alle mænd vide, hvor tom og værdiløs kongers magt er. For der er ingen anden, der er navnet værdigt, end Gud, som himmel, jord og hav adlyder.«


Således skal ifølge legenden Knud den Store have sagt, da han, for at modbevise sine smigrende hofmænds udtalelse om, at han var »så mægtig, at han kunne befale havets bølger at trække sig tilbage«, fik sin trone båret ud til havets kyst og siddende på den befalede bølgerne at trække sig tilbage, da tidevandet kom ind. Hvad de naturligvis ikke gjorde.

Tysklands fremtid ligger i den Nye Silkevej!

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Tyskland må forpligte sig til denne politik for fred i det 21. århundrede, et totalt nyt paradigme, der erstatter geopolitik med menneskehedens fælles interesse, og Tyskland må aktivt blive en del af et reelt »fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«, som Xi Jinping udtrykker det.

Tyskland må også yde et vigtigt bidrag til en dialog mellem kulturer, der må ledsage denne nye, økonomiske verdensorden, hvis vore bestræbelser skal krones med held. Vi har i Tyskland en rig arv af humanistisk filosofi og klassisk kultur, som på forunderlig vis finder genklang i andre kulturers højdepunkter. Kun, hvis vi genopliver alle nationers bedste, kulturelle udtryk og bringer hinanden ind i en levende dialog, vil vi være i stand til at overvinde den nuværende civilisationskrise.

Leder fra BüSo, 26. nov., 2016 – Heinrich Heines berømte  overvejelse springer i erindring: 'Når jeg tænker på Tyskland om natten ... ' I sandhed, hvilken retning har kursen i Tyskland, eller rettere sagt: Hvor er Tyskland ved at drive hen? Det faktum, at Angela Merkel stiller op til en fjerde embedsperiode, er ikke betryggende. I modsætning til det indtryk, hun forsøger at skabe, er yderligere fire år med en Merkel-regering ikke et løfte om stabilitet, men om det modsatte.

Både Brexit i Storbritannien og valget af Donald Trump i USA er udtryk for en afvisning af hele paradigmet med neoliberal

»globalisering«, der blot er et synonym for det anglo-amerikanske imperium. Denne 'globalisering' har ført til forarmelse af voksende dele af befolkningen til fordel for finansoligarkiet, i alle lande, der har været underkastet reglerne for neoliberal monetarisme. Denne 'globalisering' – dvs., City of Londons og Wall Streets krav om unipolær overhøjhed over verden – er ansvarlig for en hel række krige, baseret på løgne, fra Afghanistan til Irak, Libyen, Syrien og Yemen, og som har forårsaget flygtningekatastrofen. 'Globalisering' betyder også farvede revolutioner, som er en politik for regimeskift mod demokratisk valgte regeringer, såsom i Ukraine; det betyder en NATO- og EU-politik for udvidelse mod øst og inddæmning, og det ville sandsynligvis, snarere før end siden, have bragt os ind i en global konfrontation med Rusland og Kina under en Hillary Clinton-administration.

Kansler Merkel og den chokerede [forsvarsminister] Ursula von der Leyen repræsenterer dette taber-paradigme, og tanken om endnu fire år – uden en ny politik og absolut uden nogen som helst vision for fremtiden – betyder ikke stabilitet, men derimod voksende politisk splittelse i Tyskland og disintegrationen af et EU i oprør. Med den næste, finansielle krise, der med sikkerhed vil komme, vil Merkel-Schäuble-regeringen med sikkerhed atter engang påtvinge borgerne omkostningerne herfor, og, ved at gøre dette, risikere kaos. Skrøbeligheden i den afskyelige flygtningeaftale med Tyrkiets Erdogan og diverse regeringer i Afrika er et løfte om, at det kun er et spørgsmål om tid, før denne krise atter eksploderer.

Merkel repræsenterer dette paradigme, der uafvendeligt er i færd med at synke. Præcis ligesom 304 medlemmer af det Europæiske Parlament, som netop har vedtaget en resolution, der anklager Rusland for at føre massiv anti-europæisk propaganda, så støtter hun en EU- og NATO-politik, som gør netop det, de anklager Rusland for at gøre. Vi må én gang for alle sætte en stopper for den Kolde Krigs tankegang.

Den næste amerikanske præsident har allerede sagt, at han ønsker at forbedre relationerne med Rusland og Kina og har i denne hensigt allerede ført samtaler med den russiske præsident Putin og den kinesiske præsident Xi. Trump har endda signaleret, at USA gerne vil være med i AIIB og samarbejde med Kinas Silkevejspolitik.

I løbet af kun tre år er Kinas Silkevejsinitiativ blevet historiens største program for infrastruktur og økonomisk vækst, tolv gange så stort som Marshallplanen, hvis man måler i nutidige dollars. Halvfjerds nationer samarbejder om det, samt flere end 30 internationale institutioner. Kina har alene 1,4 bio. euro i investeringer; 4.4 mia. mennesker har allerede fordel af en utroligt mangefacetteret vifte af dem – højhastighedsjernbaner, skabelse og distribuering af energi, vandstyringsprojekter, nye videnskabsbyer, grundforskning, innovation, fælles rumforskning osv. Xi Jinping har tilbudt samarbejde med den Nye Silkevej til alle lande på Jorden på basis af »win-win«-samarbejde. Flere og flere lande svinger over i dette nye paradigme, der, i stedet for et nulsumsspil, er med til at overvinde fattigdom og underudvikling, til alles fælles fordel.

Slut jer til mig i denne kamp

I mere end 25 år har jeg ført kampagne for programmet med at bygge den Nye Silkevej, et program, som jeg sammen med min mand Lyndon LaRouche for første gang foreslog som respons på [Berlin]Murens fald og Sovjetunionens opløsning. Vi har fremlagt dette koncept på hundreder af konferencer og seminarer i hele verden siden da, og nu er det flertallet af menneskehedens politik. Med jeres hjælp kan vi nu sætte dette program på Tysklands dagsorden – et program, der især ville komme *Mittelstand* (små og mellemstore virksomheder) til gode, og på basis af hvilket mange produktive jobs ville blive skabt.

For at skabe et reelt perspektiv og alternativ for Tyskland, har vi ikke brug for et AfD (partiet Alternativ for Tyskland), som ikke har nogen løsninger at tilbyde; men sammen med mig kan man sætte samarbejde med USA, Rusland og Kina på dagsordenen, et samarbejde omkring byggeriet af den Nye Silkevej. Kun gennem et sådant samarbejde kan vi udvikle Mellemosten og Afrika med en Ny Silkevejs-Marshallplan, og således løse flygtningekrisen på en human måde. Desuden er det netop, hvad general Michael Flynn, Trumps nye nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, allerede i april, 2015, krævede.

Tyskland må forpligte sig til denne politik for fred i det 21. århundrede, et totalt nyt paradigme, der erstatter geopolitik med menneskehedens fælles interesse, og Tyskland må aktivt blive en del af et reelt »fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«, som Xi Jinping udtrykker det.

Tyskland må også yde et vigtigt bidrag til en dialog mellem kulturer, der må ledsage denne nye, økonomiske verdensorden, hvis vore bestræbelser skal krones med held. Vi har i Tyskland en rig arv af humanistisk filosofi og klassisk kultur, som på forunderlig vis finder genklang i andre kulturers højdepunkter. Kun, hvis vi genopliver alle nationers bedste, kulturelle udtryk og bringer hinanden ind i en levende dialog, vil vi være i stand til at overvinde den nuværende civilisationskrise.

Slut jer til mig i kampen for at sikre, at denne ekstraordinære chance gribes i Tyskland, og til fordel for Tyskland – en chance for at samarbejde med den nye, samarbejdsparate administration i USA, og med det økonomiske alternativ, der ligger i dynamikken med den Nye Silkevej. Hvis I gør dette med beslutsomhed, kan Tyskland atter blive 'en nation af digtere, tænkere og opfindere', og de fremtidige generationer vil atter opleve fremgang.

* * *

Jeg støtter denne appel: »Tysklands fremtid ligger i den Nye Silkevej!« med min nedenstående underskrift, og jeg vil hjælpe med at cirkulere den.

Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping (i midten) besøger havnen i Duisburg, Tyskland, 29. maj, 2014. [Photo/Xinhua]

»Ideen om den Nye Silkevej imod det globale finanssystems sammenbrud« Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Hovedtale ved 23. nationalkongres for Sammenslutningen af Økonomer i Peru, 17. november, 2016.

Friedrich Schiller, der er en vidunderlig digter, som Schiller Instituttet er navngivet efter, havde den opfattelse, at der ikke kan være nogen modsigelse mellem at være en patriot, og så at være en verdensborger. Jeg mener, at det er muligt at opnå denne idé i vores tid, for, hvis vi giver hvert barn, hver nyfødt på denne planet, en generel uddannelse, der ikke alene formidler generel historie, geologi, musik, videnskab og de skønne kunster, men også en viden om og kærlighed til de andre kulturers højeste udtryk, den tyske klassik, konfucianisme, Gupta-perioden, Cervantes, Goya, hver eneste kulturs guldalder; så ville disse børn være i stand til at udvikle hele det potentiale, som de hver især kan udfolde, og som kun nogle ganske få undtagelser tidligere kunne udfolde.

Peruvianske økonomers kongres offentliggør konklusion: »Vi deler Helga Zepp-LaRouches perspektiv for global udvikling«

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 25. nov., 2016 – I et dokument, der opsummerer resultaterne af Sammenslutningen af peruvianske økonomers 23. nationalkongres 17.-19. nov., skrev Roberto Vela Tinedo, dekanen for Sammenslutningen af økonomer i Ucayali (der var vært for begivenheden):

»Vi økonomer i Peru, der forsamledes i byen Pucallpa, vil informere den nationale og internationale offentlige mening om vores holdning mht. den nuværende situation i landet og i verden, og erklærer følgende:

1. At efter en analyse af hovedtalen, som dr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche holdt, er vi enige i det perspektiv om global udvikling, som hendes budskab præsenterer, og som kan ses på følgende link: <http://financiardesarrollo.blogspot.pe/2016/11/la-ferrovia-transcontinental-brasil.html> Efter at have understreget dette punkt, fortsatte Vela med sit budskab

– der blev sendt til alle 24 regionale økonomsammenslutninger i Peru, med i alt henved 20.000 medlemmer – med at skrive:

6) For at overvinde denne krise, har BRIKS-landene (Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina og Sydafrika), under ledelse af Kina og Rusland, foreslået og initieret byggeriet af en ny, finansiel arkitektur, der har til formål at udvikle nationers fysiske økonomi, i en suveræn relation, hvor alle vinder ('win-win-strategien [original på engelsk]), der knuser det gamle regimes nulsumsspil, under hvilket nogle vinder og andre taber ... Peru må tilslutte sig denne proces for at kunne opnå vækst.

7) Vi må omstrukturere statens økonomiske politik og erstatte den neoliberale model med en model for udvikling af produktiv transformation med egenkapital ...

8) Vi må anvende videnskab, teknologi og innovation i vores økonomiske udvikling som basis for at være konkurrencedygtige ...

11) Vi må skabe et Ministerium for Strategisk Planlægning, der skal formulere en vision for det land, vi ønsker at være ... og have et nyt Ministerium for Teknologi og Produktion ...

16) Det første, store skridt på vejen til industriel udvikling og promovring af videnskabelige og teknologiske evner, er, at Peru, som et paradigmatiske eksempel på denne nye, suveræne relation, hvor alle vinder ('win-win-strategien'), bør vedtage forslaget fra den Kinesiske Folkerepublik om at bygge en transkontinental jernbaneforbindelse langs den nordlige rute, der ville forbinde havnene Santos i Brasilien og Bayovar i Peru og lægge vægt på udviklingen af hundreder af komplementære projekter, såsom landbrug, agroindustri, varefremstilling, fiskeri, havne, kernekraft, petrokemikalier, videnskabelig og teknologisk innovation, vejinfrastruktur, skabelsen af nye intelligente byer og skabelsen af tusinder af jobs, etc.

Efter fire dages overvejelser har vi aftalt at kræve, at centralregeringen [i Peru] vedtager og promoverer byggeriet af dette storprojekt, i betragtning af, at det i øjeblikket er det eneste, der fokuserer på kontinental integration, og som allerede har et underskrevet Forståelsesmemorandum mellem Kinas, Brasiliens og Perus regeringer.«

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche under en spørgesession på Schiller Instituttets konference i Essen, Tyskland.