

**»Indvielse af et Nyt
Paradigme:
En dialog mellem
civilisationer«
Helga Zépp-LaRouches
hovedtale på
Schiller Instituttets
konference i New York City,
14. januar, 2017**

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

absolut at forsvinde; og vi vil få en rig, universel kultur, der består af mange, nationale udtryk og traditioner. Men som stadig er forenet af universelle principper for kunst og videnskab.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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 unexpecting 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 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 immediate 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 Paolo, 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 Ehricke, 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 Ehricke 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]

Helga Zepp-LaRouche løfter tilhørere til sublime højder, på Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i Stockholm. Uddrag på dansk af Helgas tale

12. jan., 2017 – Sublimt er det eneste, passende ord til at beskrive Helga Zepp-LaRouches intense og smukke præsentation og den atmosfære, hun skabte hos tilhørerne, med 60 deltagere (lokalet var helt fyldt) på Schiller Institutets/EIR's seminar, der blev afholdt i Stockholm den 11. januar, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Helga Zepp-LaRouches optræden var ikke annonceret på forhånd, og hun skabte en stor succes for hele anledningen med arrangementet. Hendes tale bevægede tilhørerne til at

adressere den grundlæggende, epistemologiske – erkendelsesteoretiske – dybere mening med Den Nye Silkevej, og meningen med menneskehedens udvikling i universet. Denne dybere mening rørte endda de tilstede værende diplomater. En ambassadør fra et betydningsfuldt, asiatisk land indledte under diskussionsperioden en diskussion om netop nødvendigheden af at adressere disse bredere kulturelle og menneskelige implikationer.

Alt i alt var sytten diplomater til stede, heriblandt syv ambassadører! (Dette har intet fortilfælde i LaRouche-bevægelsens historie i Sverige.) Fire europæiske lande var repræsenteret, ni lande fra Asien og fire lande fra Afrika. En kinesisk reporter kom til sit andet seminar, talte med Helga og tog billeder. Blandt de øvrige deltagere var kontakter fra forskellige svenske sammenslutninger, der arbejder for venskab med Rusland, Ukraine, Syrien, Yemen, Somalia, området omkring Det baltiske Hav (Østersøen) og en anden gruppe, der arbejder for at forlade EU, så vel som også tre kontakter fra erhvervslivet og mangeårige aktivister i den svenske LaRouche-bevægelse.

Formanden for Schiller Instituttet i Sverige, Hussein Askary, præsiderede seminaret og bød deltagerne velkommen. Dernæst holdt Helga Zepp-LaRouche hovedtalen, der havde en håbefuld vision for verden. Hun gav en vurdering af de aftrædende neokonservatives og etablerede mediers igangværende kamp for at afvise berettigelsen af valget af Donald Trump. Hun påpegede den brede reaktion på den af de neoliberaler anstiftede katastrofe, som værende det reelle grundlag for valget af Trump, så vel som også andre lignende reaktioner i hele verden, og sagde, at det er dér, man skal lede efter grunden til, at Trump blev valgt, og ikke i nogen computerhacking. Eftersom tilhørerne for det meste bestod af nye folk, fremlagde hun Schiller Institutets historie, der samtidig er historien om politikken med Den Nye Silkevej. Hun beskrev processen med, at økonomien udvikler sig fra en

platform til en anden og påpegede den kinesiske politik for at satse på den næste, økonomiske platform gennem en Månebaseret industriel udvikling, for menneskehedens videre udvikling som en art, der ikke er bundet til planeten Jord. Kinesernes motivering for deres globale politik kom frem under diskussionsperioden, i sammenhæng med Afrika. Helga understregede her, på basis af sin baggrund med mangeårige studier af Kinas historie og konfuciansk tankegang, at hendes konklusion er, at Kina virkelig forfølger en »win-win«-politik baseret på det konfucianske begreb om at tilstræbe visdom og harmoni. Hun understregede nødvendigheden af en klassisk renæssance for, at det Nye Paradigme kan blive en succes, og at dette ikke er et punkt, vi kan overlade til Donald Trump.

Efter Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale gav Hussein Askary en kort gennemgang af perspektivet for Sydvestasien og Afrika. Dernæst holdt man en pause, hvor man nød kaffe og wienerbrød, der var doneret af en kontakt. Mange af deltagerne brugte lejligheden til at få taget deres foto sammen med Helga, og til at samtale med hende. To ambassadører, én fra Sydøstasien og én fra Sydvestasien, opsøgte Helga for at give udtryk for deres dybeste påskønnelse af hendes præsentation og skønheden i hendes tankegang.

Denne begivenhed var et sandt gennembrud for vores organisering i Sverige, med en kvalitet og intensitet, der vil bevæge vores politiske arbejde i dette land ind i nye dimensioner.

Uddrag af Helga Zepp LaRouches tale ved Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i Stockholm, 11. januar, 2017

Lad mig begynde med valget af Trump. Jeg har aldrig, i hele mit politiske liv, der er temmelig langt, flere årtier – jeg har aldrig i hele mit politiske liv set et sådant hysteri på

vegne af de neokonservative, på vegne af etablissementets politikere, på vegne af de liberale medier, som med hensyn til Trump. Det skal indrømmes, at Trump ikke opfylder Baron von Knigges regler for god opførsel – han var en tysker, der i det 18. århundrede udviklede reglerne for god, diplomatisk opførsel. Men årsagen til [fremkomsten af] Trump er, at han simpelt hen lovede en afslutning af det politiske paradigme, der lå til grund for otte år med George W. Bush og otte år med Barack Obama, og som var en direkte fortsættelse af Bush-Cheney-politikken.

Og det var en god ting, for det var helt tydeligt, hvis Hillary Clinton havde vundet valget i USA, at alle de politikker, hun forfulgte, inklusive en flyveforbudszone over Syrien og en ekstremt krigerisk politik over for Rusland og Kina, ville have betydet, at vi ville have været på en direkte kurs til Tredje Verdenskrig. Hvis I har nogen tvivl om dette spørgsmål, vil jeg med glæde besvare jeres spørgsmål under spørgsmål & svar perioden.

Så den kendsgerning, at Hillary ikke vandt valget, var ekstremt vigtigt for bevarelse af verdensfreden. Jeg mener, at, af alle de løfter, Trump hidtil har afgivet, så er den kendsgerning, at han sagde – og gennem udnævnelsen af disse forskellige medlemmer af kabinetet, hvis de alle sammen kommer igennem nomineringsprocessen i Senatet – at han vil normalisere relationerne mellem USA og Rusland, efter min mening *det vigtigste skridt*. For, hvis relationen mellem USA og Rusland er ordentlig og baseret på tillid og samarbejde, så mener jeg, der er et grundlag for at løse alle andre problemer i verden. Hvis denne relation er som modstandere, så er verdensfreden i ekstrem fare.

Så efter min mening er der grund til at tro på, at dette vil ske. Den russiske reaktion har været meget moderat, men optimistisk omkring, at dette kan ske. Ser man på udnævnelserne, så er der flere kabinet-medlemmer og andre personer på andre høje poster, der også går ind for at

forbedre relationen med Rusland, såsom Tillerson, der angiveligt skal være udenrigsminister; general Flynn, der er en konservativ militærmand, men også går ind for normalisering med Rusland, og mange andre, så jeg mener, det er et godt tegn.

Hvis man ser på reaktionen fra den neokonservatives/neoliberale side på begge sider af Atlanten, på dette valg af Trump, så kan det kun beskrives som fuldstændig hysterisk. *Washington Post* har en artikel i dag, »Hvordan man fjerner Trump fra embedet«, og kalder ham en løgner, og enhver nedsættende ting, man kan forestille sig, fuldstændig utroligt; reaktionen i Tyskland var – [forsvarsminister Ursula] von der Leyen sagde morgenen efter valget, at hun var »dybt chokeret«, dette var »forfærdeligt«, dette var en katastrofe, og sådan bliver det ved. Så de er endnu ikke kommet sig.

Og så er der naturligvis rapporterne fra de forskellige amerikanske efterretningstjenester, Clapper, Brennan, Comey fra FBI, og de offentliggjorde alle sammen den kendsgerning, at det var russisk hacking af e-mails fra DNC og Podesta, der skulle have stjålet valget, fordi de angiveligt skulle have ændret amerikanernes mening til at stemme på Trump.

Jeg mener, at dette er latterligt. Ikke alene har mange cybereksperter i Europa, og også i USA, allerede sagt, at alle tegnene tyder på, at der ikke var nogen hacking, men at et insider-læk, der røbede denne information, er mere sandsynligt, og der findes absolut *ingen* beviser på, at det skulle være russisk hacking. Det, der selvfølgelig bliver mørklagt med denne historie, er, hvad handlede »hackingen« om? Det var »hacking« af e-mails, der beviste, at Hillary Clinton manipulerede valget imod Bernie Sanders! Det taler man ikke længere om; men hvis der var nogen tænkning, ville jeg sige, hør her – og der er mange mennesker, der indser, f.eks. en meget betydningsfuld fransk efterretningsmand, Eric Danécé, der er en tæketank-person på højeste niveau i Frankrig, og

som sagde: Det er helt klart, hvorfor de udgav denne historie, for de neokonservative måtte forvente den store udrensning, og mange af dem ville miste deres position, og det er grunden til, at de alle blev enige om denne historie og ændrede narrativen.

Den virkelige narrativ er, at det var det neoliberaler globaliseringssystems uretfærdighed, der simpelt hen krænkede flertallet af befolkningens interesser, især i »rustbältet«. I valgkampen var Hillary Clinton så arrogant, at hun ikke engang tog til Ohio eller nogle af de andre stater, der tidligere var industrialiserede. Man må indse, at dér – at USA, i modsætning til, hvad man for det meste rapporterer i de vestlige medier i Europa, befinner sig i en tilstand af økonomisk kollaps. De har for første gang [nogensinde] en faldende forventet levealder; der er én indikator, der viser, om det går et samfund godt eller skidt, og det er, at den forventede levealder stiger eller falder. I USA falder den for både mænd og kvinder. I den 16 år lange periode med Bush-Cheney og Obama, som man kan tage som en samlet pakke, er selvmordsraten firdoblet i alle aldersgrupper; årsagerne er alkoholisme, narkoafhængighed, håbløshed, depression pga. arbejdsløshed. Der er omkring 94 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der ikke engang er talt med i statistikken, fordi de har opgivet ethvert håb om nogensinde igen at finde et job. Hvis man for nylig har rejst i USA, så er USA virkelig i en forfærdelig forfatning; infrastrukturen er i en forfærdelig tilstand, og folk er simpelt hen ikke glade.

Så valget, og narrativen var derfor årsagen til, at Hillary blev stemt ude, fordi hun blev opfattet som den direkte fortsættelse af disse 16 år, og forsøget på at ændre denne narrativ ved at sige, at det var »russisk hacking«, er temmelig åbenlys.

Men nu er der 10 eller 9 dage tilbage, til den nye præsident indsættes. Og det er ikke en periode for afslapning, for igen, Obamas gamle team forsøger på en måde, der ikke har

fortilfælde, at skabe omstændigheder for den tiltrædende præsident Trump for at tvinge ham til at fortsætte Obamas kurs. For kun et par dage siden begyndte de f.eks. en deployering af amerikanske tropper og NATO-tropper, der skal deployeres ved den russiske grænse i De baltiske Lande, i Polen og Rumænien, via den tyske by Bremerhaven, hvor 6.000 tropper landede med tungt militærudstyr; f.eks. amerikanske Abrams tanks, Paladin artilleri, Bradley kampvogne, 2.800 stk. militært isenkram, 50 Black Hawk helikoptere, som involverer 1.800 stk. personel; 400 tropper, der skal tilknyttes de 24 Apache-helikoptere.

Denne deployering skal selvfølgelig være en provokation mod Rusland, og det er meningen, at det skal gøre det meget vanskeligt for Trump at begynde at forbedre relationerne.

Et andet område, hvor man kan se dette forsøg på at tvinge Trump, er med spørgsmålet om THAAD-missilerne i Korea, hvor Nordkorea nu har hævdet, at de kan lancere deres ICBM'er overalt, til enhver tid; og iflg. kinesiske eksperter er USA alene ansvarlig for, at Nordkorea opfører sig på denne måde.

Sydkorea med den fratrædende præsident Park Geun-hye, der muligvis snart bliver afsat ved en rigsretssag, måske inden for få dage eller uger; hun gik med til at få en specialbrigade med en 1.000-2.000 mand stor specialenhed, der i tilfælde af krig angiveligt skal eliminere Pyongyang-kommandoen, inkl. Kim Jong-un; og dette forværre situationen, for i betragtning af sådanne tings historie, kan man ikke vide, hvornår øjeblikket til sådanne handlinger kommer.

For det tredje ses det af deployeringen af det amerikanske hangarskib *USS Carl Vinson* til Asien, i nærheden af Kina. Dette hangarskib er et atomdrevet skib af Nimitz-klassen, og det vil ankomme præcis den 20. januar, den dag, Trump overtager embedet. *Global Times*, den officielle kinesiske avis, sagde, at denne deployering har til hensigt at ødelægge potentielle forhandlinger med Kina og andre lande i området;

det skal selvfølgelig også slå en sur tone an i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer.

Der er andre bestræbelser på at ændre og bestemme narrativen i perioden efter Obama. Ash Carter, USA's forsvarsminister, har netop holdt en pressekonference, hvor han sagde, at det kun var USA, der bekæmpede ISIS i Syrien. Der skal en solid portion frækhed til at sige dette, for alle i hele verden ved, at, uden præsident Putins beslutning om at intervenere militært i Syrien, med start i september 2015, og med enorm støtte fra russiske luftstyrker til de syriske troppers kamp, ville denne militære situation i Syrien aldrig have udviklet sig. Og det var tværtimod USA's meget tvivlsomme opførsel, hvor de støttede diverse terroristgrupper, der forlængede denne proces og forsinkede den.

Men også som et forsøg på at tvinge narrativen var selvfølgelig John Kerry, der for en uge eller så siden holdt en tale, hvor han sagde, at det var det Britiske Parlament, der skulle have forhindret den amerikanske militærintervention i Syrien. Alle disse mennesker må tro, at hele verden har en meget kort hukommelse, for jeg husker ganske tydeligt, at det var general Michael Flynn, der i sin egenskab af leder af DIA [Defense Intelligence Agency] offentligt udtalte, at det var Obama-administrationens plan at opbygge et kalifat i området med det formål at få et regimeskifte imod Assad, og han blev dernæst fyret af [DNI] Clapper. Og der ligger en vis ironi i det faktum, at her sidste fredag mødtes Trump med Clapper, Brennan og Comey i Trump Tower, hvor disse tre herrer ville imponere Trump med deres historie om den russiske hacking; den anden person, der var sammen med Trump, var general Flynn, der nu sidder i førersædet [til at blive national sikkerhedsrådgiver]. Så man kan forvente, at sandheden ikke bliver undertrykt i al evighed. Det var faktisk kort før den amerikanske militære intervention i 2013, den amerikanske militære aktion var planlagt til at skulle finde sted om søndagen; det havde vi fra velunderrettede kilder i

Washington, og i sidste øjeblik tog formanden for generalstabscheferne, general Martin Dempsey, hen til Obama og sagde, »De bør ikke starte en krig, når De ikke ved, hvordan den vil ende. Og hvis De ikke spørger Kongressen, bliver De stillet for, eller risikerer at blive stillet for en rigsret.« Kun pga. dette spurgte Obama den amerikanske Kongres, og Kongressen stemte nej, og den amerikanske intervention blev forhindret.

Så det forholdt sig altså helt anderledes. Og dette forsøg på at fikse narrativen vil ikke lykkes.

Jeg kan ikke sige, hvordan denne Trump-administration vil blive. Jeg nævnte vist det ene punkt, jeg er sikker på: Jeg tror, vi sandsynligvis først i februar eller endda hen i marts får at se, hvem, der faktisk vil være i hans regering, hvem, der vil blive godkendt af Senatet. Men der er andre interessante elementer: Trump havde f.eks. i sin valgkampagne lovet at investere \$1 billion i fornyelse af infrastrukturen i USA. Det er virkelig godt, som jeg sagde, for USA har et presserende behov for at blive udbedret. Det vil imidlertid kun virke, hvis et andet af Trumps løfter, som han lovede i oktober i North Carolina, om, at han ville indføre det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov, bliver ført ud i livet, for det transatlantiske finanssystem er stadig på randen af bankerot. Vi kunne få en gentagelse af det finansielle sammenbrud i 2007-08, hvad øjeblik, det skal være; og *kun*, hvis vi får en Glass/Steagall-lov i Franklin D. Roosevelt's tradition, det, som Roosevelt gjorde i 1933 ved at opdele bankerne, ved at fjerne det kriminelle element i banksystemet, og dernæst erstatte det med en [statslig] kreditpolitik i Alexander Hamiltons tradition, kan man råde bod på denne situation. I modsat fald kan man ikke finansiere \$1 billion til infrastruktur.

Helgas tale kan ses her:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdl0Hxg_Ubc

Engelsk udskrift af hele talen kan læses [her](#):

Det afgørende punkt er, at menneskehedens fælles interesse er dens fremskridt.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 13. januar, 2017; Leder

Vores udsendelse i aften falder i tre dele. De tre dele er naturligvis indbyrdes forbundne, men første del er et klip fra et interview, som vores ven og kollega Jason Ross lavede med Ray McGovern, en CIA-veteran, der har været analytiker i 30 år, og som nu er medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.

Udsendelsens anden del er et klip fra en præsentation af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der var et gennembrud i Stockholm, Sverige, i går (11. jan.), for et publikum, der bl.a. bestod af et bredt udsnit af det internationale diplomatiske samfund.

Og det tredje indslag i aften forfølger vores igangværende understregning af en intensivering af forståelsen af Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske opdagelser; og det vil omfatte en gennemgang ved Rachel Brown af en artikel, som hr. LaRouche offentliggjorde for nogen tid siden, med titlen, »In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton«

(http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/2017_01-09/2017-02/pdf/32-42_4402.pdf) , som hun komplementerer med en gennemgang af noget af materialet fra hr. LaRouches opgradering og fordybelse af ideen om, ikke infrastruktur (i sig selv), men om økonomiske platforme. Disse tre dele vil udgøre vores udsendelse for i aften.

For at indlede vores første del, kan vi referere til et indslag på LaRouchePAC's webside i dag. Titlen er, »The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia« (indholdet er dækket i Tom Gillesbergs indledning til Nyhedsorientering januar, læs: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17270>), og det handler direkte om de efterretninger, som vi vil få klarhed over i aften. At de, som virkelig intervenerer i amerikansk politik, ikke er de russiske efterretningstjenester, men snarere direkte er britisk efterretningstjeneste. Det 35 sider lange – hvad man vel må kalde et falsk dossier – om Trumps angivelige forbindelser med Rusland, og som blev citeret af CNN tidligere på ugen i en nyhedshistorie; og som dernæst blev offentliggjort eller løkket af Buzzfeed. Det afsløres nu, at dette blev forfattet af en fremtrædende, angiveligt pensioneret MI-6-efterretningsmand ved navn Christopher Steele; han blev først hyret af operatører fra det Republikanske Parti, der var modstandere af Trump i primærvalgene, og som dernæst blev hyret af Hillary Clintons kampagne for at udføre politisk kontra-research om Donald Trump. Det skulle bruges, ikke som en efterretningsfil, men til at tilsværte Trump under valget. Så dette er slet ikke en efterretningsrapport, som den blev præsenteret for at være af visse amerikanske medier, der løkkede den; men den var snarere blot en politisk misinformationsfil, der, som vi ser, kommer direkte fra britiske efterretningsoperatører. Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump brugte igen her til morgen twitter til at udfordre dette. Han sagde: »Det viser sig nu, at de falske anklager imod mig blev sammensat af mine politiske modstandere og en mislykket spion, der er bange for at blive sagsøgt.

Totalt fabrikerede fakta fra foragtelige politiske operatører, både Demokrater og Republikanere. Falske nyheder. Rusland siger, at der intet findes; det er sandsynligvis udgivet af 'etterretningsstjenester', vel vidende, at der intet bevis findes, og aldrig vil findes.«

Det, der står klart, er, at efterretningssamfundet har erklæret krig mod USA's nyvalgte præsident, der vil blive indsat om under en uge fra i dag. Dette er en situation uden fortilfælde; og briternes rolle er klar, som det ses af denne mand, Christopher Steele. Som jeg sagde, så, på trods af den narrativ, at det skulle være russerne, der kører en eller anden enorm indflydelses-kampagne for at forsøge at intervenere i og influere de amerikanske valg, så begynder det at se ud som om, at den virkelig misdæder her, var briterne.

Med denne indledning vil jeg nu gerne vise et klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern. Som sagt har han 30 år som CIA-veterananalytiker bag sig; han var i sin tid ekspert i Rusland eller Sovjetunionen, da han var dér. Han var ansvarlig for at udarbejde nationale efterretningsestimater, og en daglig brief til præsidenten. Efter sin tid i CIA blev han medstifter af en organisation ved navn Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, der nu har omkring 50 medlemmer, pensionerede efterretningsekspertter, der for nylig udstedte en erklæring, der satte seriøse spørgsmålstege ved den narrativ, der blev offentliggjort om russisk indflydelse og russisk hacking. Hele interviewet vil være tilgængeligt fra søndag (15. jan.), på LaRouchePAC websiden og LaRouchePAC YouTube kanalen; og vi har udlagt andre uddrag af dette interview hen over de seneste par dage. Det uddrag, vi bringer her, er begyndelsen af interviewet, der blev udført af Jason Ross, med hr. Ray McGovern.

Jason Ross: Det er den 10. januar, 2017; jeg er Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC. Vi er meget glade for i dag at have Ray McGovern med os i studiet, en veteran, der har været i CIA i årtier, og som i 2003 var medstifter af Veteran Intelligence

Professionals for Sanity. Mange tak for at være med os i dag, Ray.

Ray McGovern: I er meget velkomne. Jeg er glad for at være her.

Ross: Lad os springe direkte til ét af de store spørgsmål, vi hører så meget om i medierne i øjeblikket – spørgsmålet om den angivelige russiske hacking af de amerikanske valg. Jeres gruppe, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, udstedte en pressemeldelse den 12. december, der sagde, at alle beviser pegede på en læk snarere end et hack. Siden da er to rapporter kommet frem; en fra DHS (Department of Homeland Security) og en, der hovedsagligt er forfattet af ODNI, Director of National Intelligence, og som siger, at her er beviset. Vi ved, Rusland gjorde det. Det var tvivlsomt, hvor brugbar denne rapport var. Og for et par dage siden var du så medforfatter af en kronik i *Baltimore Sun* sammen med William Binney, hvor du gentog dit standpunkt; at alle beviser peger på, at dette er en læk snarere end et hack, og under alle omstændigheder er der ikke blevet fremlagt nogen beviser for, at det skulle være et hack. Hvorfor har du dette standpunkt?

McGovern: Først må jeg sige noget om Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Vi oprettede vores organisation, da vi så, at vore kolleger – de kolleger, vi havde arbejdet sammen med – havde ladet sig forlede til at skabe, til at fabrikere efterretninger med det overlagte formål at franarre vore valgte repræsentanter deres forfatningsmæssige, særlige rettigheder til at erklære eller på anden vis bemyndige krig. Det var før Irak; og det kan ikke blive værre.

Bush, Cheney og de andre sagde alle sammen, »Åh, det var en frygtelig fejltagelse.« Det var ikke nogen fejltagelse; det var slet og ret bedrag. Da vi så dette finde sted, dannede vi en lille gruppe – vi var fem til at begynde med – og vi begyndte at gå offentligt. Vi udgav tre memoranda før krigen, hvor vi advarede præsidenten. Vores første memorandum blev

udgivet samme dag, som Colin Powell (udenrigsminister 2001 – 2005) holdt sin tale – den 5. februar, 2003 – og vi gav ham et C- for indhold. Og vi advarede præsidenten (George W. Bush), »Efterretningerne bliver manipuleret, og de bør virkelig udvide kredsen af Deres rådgivere«, sagde vi mod slutningen, »til at omfatte andre end dem, der tydeligvis er opsat på at få en krig, for hvilken vi ikke kan se, der skulle være nogen tvingende grund, og de utilsigtede konsekvenserne af hvilken sandsynligvis vil blive katastrofale.« Den kendsgerning, at vi havde ret, fryder os ikke; der var et par andre personer, der sagde det samme, men der var ingen, der kom igennem til de etablerede medier.

Hvis vi spoler lidt frem, så ser vi, at de daværende NSA-folk ikke alene var rystede over, hvor mange penge, der blev smidt ind i programmer, som de vidste, aldrig ville virke; men de var også oprørte over et billigere program, som de selv havde udarbejdet – som blot kostede \$330 mio. at indføre. Det andet program, som general Hayden støttede, kostede \$3 mia. med et 'b'; så der var ingen sammenligning. Bortset fra, at det ene ikke fungerede; det gjorde dette her. Grunde til, at jeg nævner dette, er, at dette havde masser af beviser for, hvad der ville ske under 11. september; det lå i det. De gik tilbage og så efter; de lukkede dette hovedprogram ned, og da Tom Drake, som stadig var ansat der, gik ind og så efter, så fandt han masser af beviser, der ville have – hvis det var blevet omdelt – forhindret 11. september. Så man var dobbelt oprørt, og Bill Binney havde været teknisk direktør i NSA før han trådte af kort tid efter 11. september. Han tilsluttede sig så os, som så mange andre vidunderlige folk har gjort; og da dette kom på nettet online, dette her med den russiske hacking, så var det mest naturlige for mig at sige, »Hej, Bill. Vi har brug for et memo fra dig; vi har brug for, at du laver et udkast. For du designede de fleste af disse systemer, og du ved, hvad Ed Snowden har afsløret. Disse billeder? De ser virkelig interessante ud for os, men vi har brug for nogen, der kan gennemgå dem for os.« Så sagde han, »Helt i

orden«. Så gav han os et udkast, og det, vi typisk gør, er, at vi cirkulerer det blandt de fem, seks eller syv personer, der har særlig interesse i det, eller særlig erfaring; og mellem os fandt vi ud af det rigtige. Vi var én af de første, der kom ud af starthullerne og sagde, »Jo, dette er en spand (lort)! Hvorfor? Af tekniske grunde.« Der var masser af andre grunde, men nogle folk – til deres ære, mener jeg – de er teknisk orienteret, og de vil vide, »Er dette muligt? Kunne russerne have gjort dette?« Svaret er, »Ja, men NSA ville have vidst besked med det.«

Det er chokerende, Jason, det er chokerende. Men NSA sporer alle e-mails på denne planet. Hvis disse går til udlandet, så har de samarbejdende tjenester og regeringer. Ikke blot seks, men de har 13 af dem. Hvis de går igennem USA, så får de dem; hvis de kommer udefra, får de dem alle. Og de kan spore dem; de har disse her små sporingsmekanismer forskellige steder i netværket. Så de ved, hvor hver eneste e-mail kommer fra, og hvor den ender.

Føj hertil den jernovervågning de har af den ecuadorianske ambassade i London, hvor Julian Assange er; og jeg er sikker på, at de overvåger hans kolleger også, uanset, hvor de er. Lad os nu sige, de russiske hack, og de fik det frem til Julian, og til en af hans medarbejdere. »OK, russere er virkelig dårlige mennesker«, siger folk; »Vis os meddelelserne.« »Åh, det kan vi ikke; vi har ikke meddelelserne. Men vi kigger på det.« De fik så præsidenten til, før han tog på ferie på Hawaii, at pålægge sanktioner, baseret på disse flygtige beviser, som de ikke kan vise os. Disse memoer – min første reaktion var at le ad dem, men det er meget sørgeligt at se, hvad efterretningssamfundet er blevet til; meget, meget sørgeligt. For dette er et vigtigt spørgsmål.

Hvad gjorde præsidenten så? Han slog ned på sanktioner; han smed 35 diplomater ud. Alt sammen ud fra hvis udsagn? John Brennans. Hvordan fik så *New York Times* al denne information?

John Brennan. Det ved vi, fordi *Wall Street Journal* blev lidt sur over det, og de siger, »Ja, det er John Brennan, der taler med de andre fyre; han taler ikke med *Wall Street Journal*.« Hvad har vi så? Vi har en præsident, der tager en chance på lemfældigt grundlag og forårsager en endnu større fare, mere aggressiv kritik, flere spændinger i vores relationer med Rusland. På baggrund af hvad? Lad mig sige det sådan; jeg vil måske sige det sådan: Jeg sad og så på nogle YouTube-klip; og jeg faldt over et af Christiane Amanpour, der sendte fra London. Hun er i færd med at interviewe Lukyanov, en af de russiske guruer. Hun siger, »Hr. Lukyanov [imiterer Amanpours stemme] De siger, at der absolut *ingen* beviser er, *ingen*, siger De. Jamen, når der ikke findes beviser, hvorfor har USA's præsident så smidt sanktioner på Rusland?«

Ross: Den er god.

McGovern: Jeg husker, at jeg fik stillet det samme spørgsmål omkring masseødelæggelsesvåben. [Imiterer igen Amanpours stemme] »Hr. McGovern, hvis De siger, at der ikke findes beviser for masseødelæggelsesvåben, hvorfor startede Bush og Cheney så en krig mod Irak?« Tja, svaret er det samme, det samme! Det er virkelig et dårligt flashback, for det, de må gøre, er at komme frem med beviserne. Det er min stærke opfattelse, at det vil de ikke gøre; ikke pga. kilder og metoder, men fordi, der ikke findes nogen.

(Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet):

The Crucial Point Is that Our Common Interest As Mankind Is Man's Progress

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast January 13, 2017

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's January 13, 2017.

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our regular Friday evening webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the

studio today by Megan Beets from the LaRouche PAC Science Team; and via video by two members of our LaRouche PAC Policy Committee – Michael Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California; and Rachel Brown, joining us from Boston, Massachusetts.

We have a three-part show for you today. The three segments

will obviously be interrelated, but they will feature first a clip from a feature interview that our friend and colleague Jason

Ross did with Ray McGovern, a veteran CIA professional analyst for 30 years, and now the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. We have a second segment which features a clip from a breakthrough presentation that Helga Zepp-LaRouche made in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday to an audience comprised of a large cross section of the international

diplomatic community. And then a third segment tonight which pursues our ongoing emphasis on deepening the understanding of Lyndon LaRouche's economic discoveries; and that will include a

review by Rachel Brown of a paper that Mr. LaRouche published a

while ago, called "In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton", complemented by a review of some of the material from

the last few years of Mr. LaRouche's upgrading and deepening of

the idea of not infrastructure, but economic platforms. So, that

will be our three part show from this evening.

To begin our first part, I think that we can refer to an item that's posted on the LaRouche PAC website today. The title

of that is, "The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia"; and this goes directly to the intelligence that we're getting clarity on today. That the ones who are in fact interfering in US politics, are not the Russian intelligence services, but rather, directly, British intelligence. The

35-page – I guess you could call it dodgy dossier – on Trump's supposed connections with Russia that was cited by CNN earlier this week in a news story; and then published or leaked by Buzzfeed. This is now being exposed as being authored by a prominent supposedly-retired MI-6 officer, a man named Christopher Steele; who was hired first by Republican Party operatives who were opposing Donald Trump in the primaries, and

then was rehired by Hillary Clinton's campaign to do political opposition research on Donald Trump. To be used not as an intelligence brief, but to politically smear Trump in the election. So again, this is not an intelligence report at all,

as it was represented by certain US media outlets that leaked it;

but rather merely a political disinformation brief, coming directly from, as we see, British intelligence operatives. President-elect Donald Trump took to twitter again this morning

to call this out. He said, "It now turns out that the phony allegations against me were put together by my political opponents and a failed spy afraid of being sued. Totally made-up

facts by sleaze-bag political operatives, both Democrats and Republicans. Fake news. Russia says nothing exists; probably released by 'intelligence', even knowing there is no proof and never will be."

What is clear is that the intelligence community has declared war on the President-elect of the United States, who is due to be inaugurated in less than one week from the present

moment. This is an unprecedented situation; and the role of the

British in this is clear, as can be seen by the role of this character Christopher Steele. As I said, despite the narrative

that the Russians were running some huge influence campaign to try to interfere and influence the American election, it's beginning to look like the real culprit here was the British.

With that said as a matter of introduction, I'd like to play

a clip of this interview that we did with Ray McGovern. As I said, he's a 30-year veteran analyst with the CIA; he was a Russia or Soviet Union specialist at the time he was there.

He's

responsible for preparing national intelligence estimates and the

Presidential daily brief. Now, since his time at the CIA, he has

become the co-founder of an organization called the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, which now has about 50 members, retired intelligence specialists who recently put out a

statement seriously calling into question the narrative being put

out about Russian influence and Russian hacking. The full interview will be available beginning on Sunday on the LaRouche

PAC website and the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and we have released other excerpts of this interview over the past few days.

This excerpt you're about to see is the very beginning of the interview, which was conducted by Jason Ross, with Mr. Ray McGovern.

JASON ROSS: Hi! Thanks for joining us. It's January 10,

2017; I'm Jason Ross here at LaRouche PAC. We are very happy

to have in the studio today Ray McGovern, multi-decade veteran of the CIA and the co-founder in 2003 of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Thanks very much for coming today, Ray.

RAY McGOVERN: You're most welcome; I'm glad to be with you.

ROSS: So, let's jump right into one of the big issues that we're hearing about so much in the media today – the issue of purported Russian hacking of the US elections. Now your group, the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity released a press statement on December 12th, saying that all evidence pointed towards a leak rather than a hack. Since then, two reports have come out; one from the DHS and one primarily authored by the ODNI, the Director of National Intelligence, saying here's the proof. We know Russia did it. The report was of questionable usefulness. Then just a few days ago, you co-authored an op-ed in the {Baltimore Sun} with William Binney, where you restated your position; that all evidence points toward this being leak rather than a hack, and in any case, evidence of a hack is not been presented. Why do you take that position?

McGOVERN: Well, I need to tell you something about Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity first. We established ourselves when we saw that our colleagues – the colleagues with whom we had worked – had let themselves be suborned into creating, into fabricating intelligence for the express purpose

of deceiving our elected representatives out of their Constitutional prerogatives to declare or otherwise authorize war. That was before Iraq; and that's as bad as it gets.

Bush, Cheney, and the others all said, "Oh, it was a terrible mistake." It was not a mistake; it was out and out fraud. When we saw that happening, we formed a little group – there were five of us in the beginning – and we started publishing. We published three memoranda before the war, warning

the President. Our first one was on the day of Colin Powell's speech – the 5th of February, 2003 – and we gave him a C- for content. And we warned the President, "The intelligence is being

manipulated and you really should widen the circle of your advisors," we said at the end, "beyond those who are clearly bent

on a war for which we see no compelling reason, and from which,

we believe the unintended consequences are likely to be catastrophic." We take no delight in the fact that we happened

to be right on that; there were a couple of other people saying

that, but nobody got into the mainstream media.

So, if you fast forward now, you see that the NSA people who

were in place at the time, not only were appalled at how much money was being thrown at programs that they knew would never work; but were outraged when they found out that a cheaper program that they devised themselves – which only cost \$330 million to emplace. The other one that General Hayden went for,

cost \$3 billion with a "b"; so no comparison. Except that one didn't work; this one did. The reason I mention that, is this had plenty of evidence what was going to happen in 9/11; it was

in there. They went back and they looked; they closed that

main program down, and when Tom Drake, who was still employed there, went in and looked, he found plenty of evidence that would have – had it been shared – prevented 9/11. So, double outrage here, and Bill Binney had been the technical director at NSA before he left shortly after 9/11. So, he joined us, like so many other wonderful people have; and when this went viral, this business about Russian hacking, it was the most natural thing for me to do to say, "Hey, Bill. We need a memo from you; we need you to do a draft. Because you know, you designed most of these systems, and you know what Ed Snowden has revealed. Those slides? They look really interesting to us, but we need somebody to take us through them." So, he said, "Sure." So, he gave us a draft, and what we typically do is, we circulate it around the five or six or seven people who have special interests in that, or special experience; and we got it right together. We were one of the first ones off the block saying "Yeah, this is a crock! Why? For technical reasons." There were plenty of other reasons, but some people – and I think it's to their credit – they're technically oriented, and they want to know, "Is this possible? Could the Russians have done this?" Well, the answer is "Yes, but NSA would know about it."

Now, it boggles the mind, Jason, it boggles the mind. But NSA traces {all emails on this planet}. If they go abroad, they have cooperating agencies and cooperating governments. Not

only six, they have about 13 of them. If they go through the United States, they get them; if they come from outside, they get them all. And they can trace them; they have these little trace mechanisms at various points in the network. So, they know where each and every email originates and where it ends up.

Now, add to that the ironclad coverage they have of the Ecuadoran embassy in London, where Julian Assange is; and I'm sure that they monitor his colleagues as well wherever they happen to be. So, let's say the Russians hack, and they got it to Julian, they got it to one of his associates. "Well, OK, Russians are really bad people," people say; "Show us the messages." "Oh, we can't; we don't have the messages. But we'll look at it." Now, they got the President, before he went on vacation to Hawaii, to impose sanctions based on this elusive evidence that they can't show us. These memos – my first reaction was to laugh at them, but this a very sad thing to see what the intelligence community has become; very, very sad. Because this is an important issue.

So, what did the President do? He slapped on sanctions; threw out 35 diplomats. All on whose say-so? John Brennan's. Now, how did the {New York Times} get all this information? John Brennan. We know that because the {Wall Street Journal} was a little ticked off about it, and they said, "Yeah, it's Brennan that's talking to these other guys; he's not talking to the {Wall Street Journal}." So, what do we have here? We have the President going out on a limb, causing even more danger, more

flak, more tensions in our relationship with Russia. On the basis of what? Well, let me just say this; maybe I'll put it this way: I was looking at some YouTube clips; and I happened upon one of Christiane Amanpour, broadcasting from London. She's

interviewing Lukyanov, one of the Russian gurus. She says, "Mr.

Lukyanov, [imitating Amanpour's voice] you say there's {zero} evidence, you say {zero}. Well, if there's zero evidence, why is

it that the President of the United States has slapped sanctions

on Russia?"

ROSS: That's good.

McGOVERN: I remember being asked that question about weapons of mass destruction. [Again imitating Amanpour's voice]

"Mr. McGovern, if you say there's no evidence of weapons of mass

destruction, why did Bush and Cheney start a war on Iraq?" Well,

same answer; same answer! It's a really bad flashback, because

what they need to do, is come up with the evidence. My strong view is that they're not going to do that; not because of sources

and methods, but because there isn't any.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, that's part of a much longer interview, and part of it has already been posted on YouTube under the title "Sources and Methods Versus National Interests";

and you can expect the full interview to be posted and available

coming Sunday, the day after tomorrow.

But I would like to just use that to invite the other

members of the broadcast here today to just open up a bit of a discussion on this subject.

MICHAEL STEGER: In all of this discussion, apparently some

people are not pulling back over so-called "Trump's ties to Russia." What this whole situation now makes clear, is that the

entire attack on the Trump campaign and the President-elect's policy towards Russia, has been the target explicitly of British

Intelligence the entire time. The report that was released, this

35-page dodgy dossier, starts in June once Trump consolidates the

nomination, essentially, for the Republican Party, and doesn't stop until mid-December of this just past year. And so, it's clear that British Intelligence were the ones pushing this the entire time. It's clear that Christopher Steele was close friends

with now-head of MI-6, Alex Younger. The British media are panicking. A former Secretary General of the NAT0, a British Lord, came out and said this is a total panic. We could be sleepwalking into a complete catastrophe.

It's clear the British had an explicit intent to manipulate

the U.S. elections, to fabricate false intelligence on a major candidate, to drum up a conspiracy – so-called "hacking" by the

Russians to disrupt U.S. foreign policy and U.S. interests – against the welfare of the American people. To those who know history, and know Mr. LaRouche's role in the last 40-50 years of

American politics, this role of British Intelligence, includes people who represented British outlooks, like Henry Kissinger, a

public advocate of British foreign policy against the American outlook; the British hand, not just in an attempt to destroy

and manipulate the Presidential election and alter U.S. foreign policy changes, but the direct role of the British in support of the terrorists in Syria, via Saudi Arabia, and other nations; the direct role of the British, such as David Cameron, who just high-tailed it out of Downing Street and the British Parliament, because he was directly exposed in a fraudulent-led campaign against Libya; the false intelligence of Tony Blair on the Iraq war, which Ray McGovern was just referring to.

Besides that, you've got then the international drug trade, which we documented beginning in the 1970s, with {Dope, Inc.}, and the international drug trade run by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth. Who, by the way, could be on her death-bed; and that wouldn't necessarily be a bad thing.

You've got an international drug trade, and international war program, international terrorism, and, of course, the Wall-Street/London nexus of international finance, which has run this absolute cult of financial policy for decades, for centuries, in essence. This is the same institution which was responsible for the assassination of Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, the attempted assassination of FDR, the backing of Hitler. By the way, I think the Russian Embassy in London made it clear that it was the Brits, such as the Cliveden set, who were responsible for backing Hitler. That they're coming out now and targeting the potential policy changes in the United States, one towards Russia, potentially towards

China – to end the threat of nuclear world war.

They're also attempting to disrupt what could be a very important – as I think we'll see from Helga Zepp LaRouche's clip – relationship between the U.S., China, and Russia, on an economic policy; and, as we know it to be very important that we'll get to later as well, a fundamental change in U.S. financial policy. This British nexus is targeting the Trump campaign and targeting this entire change in U.S. policy. This is British imperial tactics. This is what they do; they are at the source of it. If there's going to be a Congressional investigation of any foreign nations' or foreign agents' involvement to manipulate U.S. democracy, I think first and foremost, it has to be the United Kingdom.

RACHEL BRINKLEY: The fact that on page 15 of these 35 pages, it attacks LaRouche by name, saying that there were Trump factions travelling to meet with Putin factions, as part of this alliance in the summer of 2016. They cite LaRouche directly in this report as having representatives that went to Russia as part of this discussion; which did not happen. As this was authored by the British, this is just the British Empire freaked out about LaRouche's policies taking over, and the potential of a United States/Russia/China alliance, especially the Russia/U.S. cooperation.

I think it is notable that if you have the United States, Russia, and China working together, there's no problem on the planet that can't be solved. That's an unstoppable alliance. I

think the British are desperate, and that's what we're seeing.

OGDEN: That's exactly what Helga LaRouche presented at this conference that happened in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday. This was an extraordinary conference, and I'm going to play a clip of her opening speech to you right now. This was a standing-room-only capacity audience that included 17 diplomats, a cross-section of the entire planet, including seven ambassadors. She delivers her analysis of what we've really seen behind this showdown, as we've been discussing, of the British and American intelligence establishment vs. the incoming President-elect. She highlights, towards the end of these excerpted remarks – and again, this is only an excerpt, in bits and pieces – the whole speech contains a lot more substance in terms of what you just said, Rachel.

The motivation behind ending this confrontational policy towards Russia and towards China, is that if Russia, China, and the United States were to join, in a grand alliance, around what is now a concrete policy initiative coming out of China – the One Belt, One Road, or New Silk Road project – to bring development to the interior of not only Eurasia, but also Africa and the North and South America landmass, and were to reorganize our relations around what's now being called the "win-win" paradigm among nations – then everything is possible. She explores a lot of these questions in the {full} speech, which will be available in video form in just a few hours.

In what you're about to hear, she touches on what must be

done, both strategically and economically, to shape the policy of this incoming new Presidency. I apologize for the quality of the audio. It was not the best audio recording, but again, in just a few hours, we will have the full video that will be available. This is just a taste:

HELGA ZEPP LAROUCHE (Audio excerpt): ... 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.... 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.

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 ... 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 moderate, 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 on and on unbelievable....

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, 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, which 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 what 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....

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the neoliberal system of globalization which has 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 were formerly industrialized. You have to see that the United States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western media in Europe, is in a state of economic collapse....

[T]here 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, was that 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....

I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about.... 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....

OGDEN: Now, Helga continues from there to give a very inspiring overview of the development projects from the last three years that have been sparked by the initiative from China

on the One Belt, One Road or the New Silk Road initiative.

But

she also gives an incredible history of the founding of the Schiller Institute and the role and she and Lyndon LaRouche have

played over the last 30-40 years in the fight for a new, just, international economic and strategic order. A fight which is now

coming to a certain point of culmination at least internationally; but the urgency of winning this fight here in the United States is something that she continued to emphasize,

and it's exactly what she ended with there in that excerpt.

Right now, we must have the most urgent mobilization; there are no excuses for delay from {any} elected representative for an immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall. We have now launched and are in the midst of a national mobilization; we've talked about this on previous broadcasts. But as you can see on the screen right now, we're circulating a petition which is collecting signatures; it needs to more rapidly accrue signatures. But it's accessible at lpac.co/trumpsotu; and again, this is a petition which originated from some citizen-activists in Ohio, who are associated with the "Our Revolution" movement, people who had been associated with the Bernie Sanders campaign during the primaries. But who have now taken it upon themselves to rally behind the initiative that LaRouche PAC has led; that we must have Glass-Steagall, and we must hold Trump to his word, when he called for a 21st Century Glass-Steagall at that speech in Charlotte, North Carolina. As I said, this has bipartisan support, and there are no excuses for delay. The only way this is going to happen, is if citizens across the United States decide to participate in this LaRouche PAC campaign and sign your name onto this petition: lpac.co/trumpsotu – State of the Union.

Now, we did have a day of action in Washington this week. The Congress is now officially back in session; they've been sworn in and business is underway. There was participation from

many states up and down the East Coast in person. Representatives coming in from Virginia, from Maryland, from Pennsylvania, from Connecticut, from New Jersey, from New York.

But there was also a lot of other participation from across the country in terms of pressure being put on representatives to meet

with members of the LaRouche PAC. There was a unique representative from the Manhattan Project, Mr. John Sigerson, who's the director of the Schiller Institute Chorus in New York

City; who's been participating in some of the recent choral activities there, including the memorial at the Bayonne, New Jersey 9/11 Teardrop Memorial, where members of the Schiller Institute Chorus were joined by the PDNY Honor Guard and the Honor Guard from Bayonne, New Jersey to honor the tragic loss of

the Alexandrov Choral Ensemble from Russia. This is just one example of the kind of power that the music program from the Manhattan Project, from New York City, has been able to play to

shape the political dialogue in the United States and also across

countries. In this case, the potential for a far-improved relationship between the United States and Russia. So again, this was a day of action in Washington, DC, but the mobilization

has to continue. We are in a countdown; it's now a 7-day countdown until the inauguration. Then shortly after that, we will have the State of the Union; and again, this petition is to

insist that Trump put a premium on highlighting the necessity for

a return to the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act during that State

of the Union. This has to be one of the number one agenda

items
of the first 100 days.

But, let's discuss a little bit more broadly what Helga LaRouche brought up at the end of that discussion; that Glass-Steagall is only the first step, and there's a much more far-reaching and profound approach to a revolution in the economic policy of the United States that's necessary and which has been framed by Mr. LaRouche.

STEGER: Well Matt, I think it's important to start with how

Mr. LaRouche initially responded immediately after the Trump election. His response was that this was global; and I think that really does capture this. The political process that is shaping the United States in contradiction to this British intelligence operation to destroy the United States, is really a

global phenomenon; and I'll get to that in a second. But what Mrs. LaRouche then touched on in her speech is something that most Americans are experiencing, but because of that British intelligence operation, because of this mass-lie campaign that the American people have been living under; the official lie, in

essence, Orwellian policy that even the Russian Foreign Ministry

now refers to, that Americans have been living in since 9/11. This has kept them from identifying what is now physically identified; that the actual quality of life is collapsing at such rates that life expectancy is now beginning to collapse.

We have officially, you might say, entered into a Dark Age; a mini-Dark Age has begun in the United States. Now, this can be reversed. But the level of drug addiction has more than

tripled under Obama's Presidency; the level of opiate addiction, the abuse of drugs like marijuana has skyrocketed under an Obama-supported legalization campaign. Which is of course, backed by the same drug cartels which are providing the financial backing to the banking institutions. This was Obama's program.

You've seen a massive level of homicides and crime and murder rates escalating in severely impoverished areas, including Obama's so-called "own neighborhood" of the South Side of Chicago. This level of breakdown has never been seen in the history of the United States; and it is only characteristic of societies which are beginning to utterly break down. Long-term

survival is not even a question; what's at immediate risk for an

increasing majority of Americans is short-term survival. That's

what you see when you have decreasing life expectancy rates, increasing numbers of people are dying faster and faster; largely

from things like alcohol addiction, drug addiction, diseases related to despair, suicide and so on.

That's where Glass-Steagall comes in; and this is what really has to be captured. And why it's not simply Glass-Steagall, but the full Four Laws. I think Megan and Rachel

can say more, because we're currently working on a project to make this clear. But the role of fusion and the space program really captivate the fourth law in what direction our country has

to take to reawaken a sense of optimism, a sense of development

within the American culture. To break out, not just of disrepair

– breaking down of bridges, bad roads – we all know the bad

roads and highways, especially on the East Coast. But that's not what we have to emerge from. Building better roads isn't escaping from the clutches of a Dark Age; something greater has to capture the real spirit of human identity and creativity.

Now, this is why it's so important to identify this global phenomenon; because the steps of the Four Laws: Glass-Steagall immediately; shut down this Wall Street banking cartel and basically a drug operation. The second is the public credit of a national banking system, which Paul Gallagher elaborated last night; we could say more on. To consolidate, aggregate the US debt that exists, as well as other financial resources towards the most important projects of development for the country; the most advanced levels of infrastructure, or the broader physical platform of industry and production. And of course most importantly, the fusion and space program.

This phenomenon globally is just somewhat breathtaking; and Mrs. LaRouche touches on it directly. The Transqua project in Africa is something that we've been promoting for decades; this is something which begins to take the sub-Saharan area of Africa from the great lakes near the eastern part of Africa towards West Africa and Nigeria, up into the southern border of the Sahara Desert. It begins to look at how we use major infrastructure projects of water transportation, the refilling of Lake Chad, and the development of this central African area. There's also a

major rail line, which is not initiated – it's been inaugurated;

it's now running from Ethiopia to the coastline of Djibouti.

This rail line is one of the key continental rail passages that

the Schiller Institute and {EIR} have been fighting for, for decades; to begin to integrate the full potential of Africa's people and its resources and its industrial capacities into an integrated economic breakthrough. A real shift in the productivity and lifestyle and scientific potential of Africa. Those things are now unfolding; these are coming from largely Chinese investments, Chinese engineering companies are directly onboard.

The same is true from another project, and I think it's

worth just highlighting, because we have gotten reports recently

that it's practically shovel-ready. This is Kra Canal. All this

contention over the South China Sea that everyone's heard about;

and the Americans remain, I'm sure, still somewhat confused.

What's the big deal about a couple of islands in the South China

Sea? As the President of the Philippines said, we're not going

to eliminate humanity over a couple of fishing spots in the South

China Sea. The real question is the Kra Canal; this is something

explicitly that the British Empire has prevented by diktat, to shut down. Matt, you and others have been involved in video production specifically on this project and the role of the British to shut this down over centuries to eliminate this project. The Chinese have said that they are ready to begin the

development of the Kra Canal. The Thai government, with a new king, seems favorable; the military, the prime minister seem favorable. The question of Japan's collaboration is something that goes back to the 1980s; with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche directly

involved in this project. The people we worked with then, in Thailand, are again promoting and advocating for its initial construction today.

So, these projects are transformative. We've gone through

more on that; I'm not going to give the layout of these projects.

But there are major development orientations taking place that are gripping mankind. There was an offer today, apparently, in

the {Hindu Times} in India from a Chinese journalist, which said

"Will Donald Trump Participate in the Silk Road Conference in China?" I think that really is the potential which we've got today.

So, the Glass-Steagall fight, this question of the United

States deciding that we're going to build our nation again, we're

going to shut down this Wall Street racket and take on this kind

of potential; that's really what has to be ignited. And there's

no reason Donald Trump should not take that up at the inauguration and the State of the Union.

BRINKLEY: Right! And on this question of the murder policy

of Obama, there's an attempt now to cover it up and make him the

cute President and Joe Biden getting an award. No, this is flat-out murder, and if this mass movement across the world is

properly educated, it won't be stopped.

So, there was discussion recently around infrastructure, as

Helga brought up, from Trump. It's still not to the level of LaRouche's conception of infrastructure. For example, here's what Speaker Paul Ryan said about infrastructure: "In the spring

budget, we believe we will be able to address the infrastructure

issue." The chairman of the Republican study committee, Mark Walker, says "I don't know that we've settled on \$1 trillion. If

it's \$1 trillion in infrastructure, that is something we'd have

to say, 'There's a portion of this that we're not comfortable with and come back to the table.' |" And then Sam Graves, the head of the Transportation Subcommittee, says "We just simply can't afford it," adding that "It can't all be done through public-private partnerships as the President-elect is talking about."

They're still looking at this as an issue. LaRouche developed this concept. Helga LaRouche made the point that 2017

should be the year of the rejuvenation or flourishing of LaRouche's ideas. He wrote a paper in 2010 called, "What Your Accountant Never Understood; the Secret Economy". He goes through a universal history of the greater concept of infrastructure. He starts with the question of transoceanic travel; navigation across the oceans. He says, "For example, look back to the approximately hundred-centuries of the Earth's

last great glaciation. While some part of the human population

had remained mired in the habits of life of some fixed, relatively narrow regions free of glaciation, great transoceanic

maritime cultures were also developed. The requirement of a

stellar mapping for navigation for the existence of maritime cultures, gave us the stellar notion of the efficient existence of a functional form of an ontologically-actual universe; as echoed by such great residual artifacts as the Great Pyramid of Giza, and by the physical science of spherics. Now, into this so-called Platonic long cycle, into the Pythagorean predecessors of Plato."

So, you have the concept of how to travel on an ocean. How do you navigate? By the stars. How do you map the stars? On a flat plane? No, you find you have to use a spherical map; so the beginning of this spherical foundation of a physical science of the Universe was discovered. This was applied to navigate the oceans. He says from there it goes on to the idea of inland travel, not just oceanic, but inland via internal waterways. He says this you saw developed with Charlemagne first. He says, "Charlemagne's reforms served as a precedent for the development and role of the great internal system of rivers and canals, which provided the crucial steps toward modern European economy, and the application of the same reform within our United States. Those inland waterways prepared the leap toward the revolutionary US trans-continental railway systems. First, inside the United States; and in turn, the trans-continental rail systems of Eurasia." So, this was John Quincy Adams uniting the country with waterways and with the rail systems. He was the first to fully unite the United States as a single territory. This was

followed by Bismarck in Germany and Mendeleev in Russia. That was the next advancement.

Then he says, "Now, the prospect of the combined effect of magnetic levitation mass transport systems and rail, which will connect the principal continents of the world, would render most ocean transport of freight technologically obsolete; because the modern successor of ordinary internal rail transport will have rendered much of ocean freight technologically, and therefore economically, obsolete." We are starting to see the beginnings of this with things like the North-South transport corridor from India to Iran to Russia; which cuts off the maritime route by making it 40% shorter. There are also new rail lines developing between China and Europe. The first train of which, for example, just went from Beijing to London, starting January 1, 2017; the first time ever in history. There are 39 various routes now between China and Europe; inland rail following the route of the old Silk Road, but with modern rail. As LaRouche says, if you have high-speed magnetic levitation rail, that would be even a further advancement.

Next, he says, "Changes such as those, illustrate a general principle which will be expressed in certain nearby Solar System locations. Now, we're going to go to the next step, such as our Moon and Mars, when they will have come to be considered

later,
as within the bounds of our presently still-young, new century's
plausible instances of work and habitation. Typical problems to
be overcome for the purpose of human transport and dwelling in nearby solar space, and later beyond, must look to such future developments already foreseeable for later in the present century. We should then recognize that the development of basic economic infrastructure had always been a needed creation of what is required as a habitable development of a synthetic, rather than a presumably natural, environment for the enhancement or even the possibility of human life and practice at some time in the existence of our human species."

So, he's bring up, one, this long-term conception; he says later, three generations – 75 years – should be our orientation for space. We have the questions of habitation and transport as fundamental challenges; and this is the idea of the next phase. But in general, also this last question of synthetic versus natural; that these various new modes of habitation and travel were based off of new discoveries that created a whole new platform of existence, of habitation, of travel, where mankind could reach through these advances. And those were all creations of the human mind in the likeness of the Creator. Infrastructure is not just making a bridge or something to get from here to there; it's the question of a new advancement, of a new principle that is applied throughout your entire society. So, it's not

an add-on to your economic policy as Paul Ryan was saying.
"We'll get to that; we'll figure out how to fit it in the budget."
It's the beginning of your notion of economy.

MEGAN BEETS: Yeah Rachel, I think what you just put forward here from Mr. LaRouche's overview and what you were just saying, it's a way of thinking that most Americans have forgotten about. People have lost touch with the kind of big thinking about long sweeps of human history, and I think that that way of thinking – the idea that we can consider 50-100-year cycles of human progress in general – flies in the face of the biggest British Empire lie which has dominated for some time. The idea that human growth is bad; human progress is bad; population growth destroys the Earth and it's bad. We have to hold back technological progress; we have to go backwards. Instead of towards nuclear power, we have to go backwards towards solar power, wind power; and reduce our impact and our presence on the Earth. That lie is exactly what's being threatened with both the rise of the New Paradigm being led from Eurasia and the potentiality of Mr. LaRouche's ideas; which are really the most advanced version of the American System ideas of Hamilton, Franklin Roosevelt, and Lincoln, of putting the creative power and really the responsibility of the creative human mind to change nature. To alter nature to better support human life; alter the biosphere to higher levels of productivity, as we do by

improving agriculture, for example.

I just think that what you're bringing up here really is the crucial point; that our common interest as mankind is man's progress. That right now dictates that we can't accept anything lower than a long-term dedication to the highest forms of technological advance and growth; which is nuclear fusion power and its companion, a space program. The colonization of the Moon and eventual colonization of Mars. That would really be a beautiful renaissance expression of the American people working with the rest of the world towards the uplifting of humanity toward our real, true potential.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, we are going to continue the discussion of the substance – this was, I think, crucial Rachel; because it's exactly what you're saying. This insight into the real meaning of something which has become banalized – infrastructure; that's the key to all of economic science. If humanity is going to make the shift into the next phase of our global existence as a species, it's only going to be possible if we have a flourishing of this kind of philosophical understanding of the science behind real, true economics. It's a critical ingredient of the ability of humanity to move forward. So, I think we're going to continue this; and there are a lot of interrelated works that Mr. LaRouche authored over the last several years which explore this concept of the real meaning of infrastructure, the idea of the economic platform, and the role

that Hamiltonian credit should play in facilitating all of that.

So, that said, that's the crucial insight and understanding

that you need to fight with us right now for the necessary policy

revolution here in the United States. This all revolves around

the initiation of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws.

Michael

went through them, but it's Glass-Steagall, number one. We need

to return to Hamiltonian national banking, number two. We need

an initiation as Franklin Roosevelt did it, of Federal credit using that Hamiltonian national banking system to raise the productive powers of labor of the workforce as a whole. And this

all has to be driven by a dedication to the breakthroughs in science; most especially right fusion and space exploration.

So, there are two things that you need to do before this

program ends tonight. Number one, you need to immediately sign

the petition that's being circulated by LaRouche PAC. Again, the

address is: lpac.co/trumpsotu – all one word – trumpsotu for State of the Union. If you've already signed this, then it's a

great opportunity for you to spread it to your entire network and

help us reach the goal. We've set the goal of 10,000 signatures

on this petition. We are increasing the number of signatures, but it has to increase at a much more rapid rate. It's a perfect

opportunity to help us increase the outreach of the LaRouche

Political Action Committee. Then, number two; immediately subscribe, if you haven't already, to the LaRouche PAC daily email list. For two reasons: 1. in the 7-day countdown between

now and the inauguration, you need to have the daily marching orders and the daily updates. This is a very fast moving situation, as you can see from the intelligence situation that we

presented at the beginning of this show. Then after that, in the

critical first days of the new Presidency, as things change very

rapidly, you need to have the insight that only LaRouche PAC can

uniquely provide you. And then, another reason is, as we develop

more crucial and unique, exclusive content like what you got a taste of here today, especially this interview with Ray McGovern,

the veteran CIA intelligence analyst and the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, you will receive a

notice in your email inbox and this is material that you can't afford to miss. You really need to know as soon as we publish it

and as soon as we make it available. So again, you can look for

the full interview that Jason Ross did with Ray McGovern to be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and our YouTube channel on Sunday, the day after tomorrow. And you can also look forward to

the full speech that Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered at this very

important, breakthrough diplomatic seminar in Stockholm, Sweden.

So, thank you very much for tuning in tonight. I think this

was a successful broadcast, and I'd like to thank Megan, Rachel, and Michael for joining me in the discussion. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com and good night.

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

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

Arrangementet blev indledt med fremførelsen af en kendt traditionel kinesisk sang, Kāngdīng Qínggē (Kangding Kærlighedssang), af Feride Istogu Gillesberg (sopran) og Michelle Rasmussen (klaver). Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som på smukkeste og mest optimistiske vis førte

publikken igennem en tour-de-force af den nuværende politiske situation med såvel befolkningens afvisning af det nuværende paradigme gennem Brexit, Hillary Clintons valgnederlag til Donald Trump og det italienske "Nej", som et forsøg på at skabe kaos (og krig) inden Donald Trumps indsættelse den 20. januar. Dertil kom en fremstilling af det nye globale paradigme, som allerede er ved at overtage verden, illustreret ved Kinas politik for Den Nye Silkevej – som den kommende amerikanske administration skal finde sin plads i – og den videre udvikling, der er nødvendig, hvis menneskeheden skal finde sin sande identitet. Hele talen og den efterfølgende diskussion kan ses, høres og læses på: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16773.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

»Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme« (DANSK) Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale

ved **Schiller**
Instituttet/EIR's seminar

i København, 12. dec., 2016.

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og

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

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

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på Schiller Institutets 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 Institutts stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

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

kampen for det nye paradigme.

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

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

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

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

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

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

English: Introductory article

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

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

various Danish and international institutions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion:

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

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

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO₂ emission trade, you have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing,

because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, "Against the Stream," is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

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

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

But then China, with Deng Xiaoping, started to recognize that that is the wrong way. So China is now on a completely different track. They are putting the maximum emphasis on science and technology, the increase of excellence. Last year, they produced 1 million scientists. That's double of what the U.S. produced. Obviously China is a larger country, but still. What will finally be decisive is the number of people who are

creative. And that is why China, right now, has the best education system, because they have understood that the source of wealth is not raw materials. Is not trade conditions. It is the creativity of their own people. And that it a good thing. If we go to a system where we have a certain amount of protectionism, to protect the development of the domestic market, it is a good thing.

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

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

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

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

So, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of the Europeans who react this way to the defeat of Hillary, are obeying another power in their head, and that power I call The British Empire, which is still in place, and it dominates Europe, and that is why they feel – I was asking myself, how come all of

these politicians are so arrogant towards the new president of the U.S.? Because they were the boot-lickers of Washington until yesterday, and they would immediately do everything Washington would say and do, so I asked myself, 'Where is this sudden self-assertedness coming from?' And the only explanation I came up with, was to say, they must have an idea that there is another power which is more powerful than Trump, otherwise, they wouldn't have this sudden arrogance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

It's the same idea that Friedrich Schiller had in Wilhelm Tell. This is a play he wrote, which takes place in Switzerland. There, the Hapsburg oligarch is also trampling on

the rights of the Swiss people, then they unite with the Rütli Oath. There is this beautiful formulation which says, ‘When the rights of people are trampled upon, they have the right to reach out to the stars, and take from the stars those rights which are eternally embedded in these stars. (I am not saying it as beautifully as Schiller does.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: I cannot explain that, for the same reason that I cannot explain why the NSA is surveilling everyone, all their phones, their communications, worldwide. They can observe all of these

things, but they don't know about terrorism. They don't know about drug trafficking. They don't know about money laundering. Either their system is not so good, or they are looking in the wrong direction. I can't answer your question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

I do not think that this EU bureaucracy is capable of reform, because by their self-understanding, they are the local pro-consuls of this empire, and I think that it would be much better if Germany, France, and other countries have individual relations. And I don't think that – this whole idea that you need a European Empire to compete with Russia and China and other emerging countries – The EU, by definition, is an empire. They have said it themselves. Robert Cooper, who has some kind of advisory function [currently serving as EU Special Advisor with regard to Myanmar], he said that the EU is the fastest expanding empire in history. It's a bad idea. And the Russians for – I noticed this since the beginning of the year 2000, that the Russians did not make a difference anymore between the EU and NATO. They said that it's the same thing. And it is the same thing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And the Confucian idea of man is lifelong learning, lifelong perfection, that everyone should be a Jinzi, a wise man, a noble man, and Confucius said, if the government is bad, then the Jinzi, these wise people, should replace the government.

Also the idea that you have to have an harmonious development, starting with the family, continuing in the nation, and then, larger, among the nations.

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

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

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

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

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey democracy,' and do nothing.

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

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

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

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

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

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

modern interpretation. I put Harley Davidson's into Shakespeare, and it doesn't matter.' And that is not art. And I think the question is, 'What do you do with your life?' That is really the question. Are you becoming a creative person, devoted to that with your life, you contribute to enable mankind to move on a little step further, and become better.

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

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

And then we win.

End of discussion

I Hamiltons fodspor: »LaRouches Fire Love for global, økonomisk genrejsning og civilisationens vækst«

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche; Tale til Schiller Instituttets konference den 29. okt. i Manhattan, New York

Men det andet område må komme fra en bevidst beslutning om, at verden behøver et nyt paradigme; at, hvis vi forbliver inden for rammerne af det nuværende paradigmets aksiomer, med geopolitik og globalisering, så mener jeg ikke, at vi kan løse det. Det, vi må gøre, er at skabe en renæssance, en kulturel renæssance, der udgår fra den idé, at mennesket ikke er et dyr, og at, selv om mange mennesker i øjeblikket opfører sig på en dyrisk måde, så er mennesket den eneste skabning, eller den eneste art, der er i stand til at overvinde enhver begrænsning af sit eget intellekt og af teknologiske vanskeligheder. Hvis som helst, menneskeheden ønsker at takle, kan den gøre.

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

»Lad os bygge det Eurasiske Tog for Fred imod truslen om en Ny Verdenskrig«

Erklæring af Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Jacques Cheminade, 21. oktober, 2016

Som patrioter og verdensborgere i traditionen efter de Gaulles og Adenauers Fædrelandenes og projekternes Europa, appellerer vi til vore regeringer om omgående at tilslutte sig disse fremvoksende magters indsats, og at kræve af USA og Storbritannien, at de begraver Imperiets stridsøkse.

Vi bør omgående positivt respondere til tre store projekter, der foreslås, og som alle befinner sig inden for vor rækkevidde og direkte vedrører vore nationale interesser:

(På sidelinjen af Schiller Institutets konference i Essen, Tyskland, den 21. oktober, 2016, om de fremtidsudsigter for Europa, som Kinas politik for den Nye Silkevej tilbyder, udstedte Helga Zepp-LaRouche, præsident for Schiller Institutet, og Jacques Cheminade, fransk præsidentkandidat, følgende erklæring:)

På intet tidspunkt siden 1945 har verden været så tæt på en ny verdenskrig, der i dag ville blive en atomkrig. Men samtidig har mulighederne for at grundlægge en ny verdensorden for fred og udvikling imidlertid aldrig været så store.

Faren for krig kommer fra et forsøg fra de vestlige magters side på, for enhver pris at opretholde deres eneherredømme over verden, på trods af den kendsgerning, at de ikke har andet at tilbyde end krige og finansiel udplynning. Det store håb kommer fra en fremvoksende gruppe af lande, Rusland, Kina, Indien og BRIKS, der kæmper for en verden, hvor alle har ret til fremskridt gennem udvikling inden for videnskab, avanceret teknologi og industri; en verden med fred og stabilitet, baseret på organisationen for international lov, der voksede frem af sejren over nazismen, og som er inkorporeret i FN's

Charter.

Det eneste alternativ til politikken med Washington-konsensus, der har ført os frem til den nuværende krise, er Kinas forslag om projektet for den Nye Silkevej, som en politik for fred og samarbejde i hele verden. Dette projekt, som allerede er en realitet for de 70 lande, der er med i det, er det største projekt for industriel, økonomisk genrejsning, der nogensinde har eksisteret på planeten, og som mobiliserer tæt ved \$1 billion til videnskabelig forskning og store infrastrukturprojekter i Eurasien, Latinamerika og Afrika.

Som patrioter og verdensborgere i traditionen efter de Gaulles og Adenauers Fædrelandenes og projekternes Europa, appellerer vi til vores regeringer om omgående at tilslutte sig disse fremvoksende magters indsats, og at kræve af USA og Storbritannien, at de begraver Imperiets stridsøkse.

Vi bør omgående positivt respondere til tre store projekter, der foreslås, og som alle befinner sig inden for vor rækkevidde og direkte vedrører vores nationale interesser:

1. Frankrig og Tyskland må, sammen med Kina, påbegynde konstruktionen af Silkevejens godstog for fremtiden, der kommer fra Kina og forgrener sig ud til forskellige lande i Europa. Der eksisterer allerede konvojer, men de har store vanskeligheder med at krydse alle grænser. Vi må nu forudse et Silkevejstog, der kører i et eurasisk kontinent, der 30 år frem i tiden vil være lige så udviklet, som Kina er i dag. Denne jernbanelinje, der kører på enkeltstandard-enhedsspor, og som møder minimale grænsekontroller, må, i traditionen efter Lincolns Transkontinentale Jernbane og den Transsibiriske Jernbane, være en trans-eurasisk jernbane, bygget af Fædrelandenes og projekternes Europa. Det vil blive nødvendigt, at Kina, Rusland og alle de andre lande, som toget kører igennem, indgår en aftale.

2. Frankrig og Tyskland må respondere til Kinas og Ruslands indsats for at bringe de mellemøstlige ødelæggelseskrige, der er anstiftet af de vestlige magter, til en afslutning, og for at påbegynde genopbygningen. Denne politik er ikke alene den eneste, humane respons til ikke alene den forfatning, disse lande befinder sig i, men også til den stadigt voksende strøm af immigranter til vore lande.
3. Frankrig og Tyskland må arbejde hen imod store fællesprojekter med Kina og Afrika. En fælles rammeaftale til dette formål blev allerede underskrevet af Frankrig og Kina den 30. juni, 2015. Prioriteringen må være infrastrukturprojekter i stor skala: dæmninger, jernbaner og energi, inklusive kernekraft.

Når de vestlige eliter ikke har nogen anden politik end den, at gennemtvinge brutale nedskæringer over befolkninger for at redde en finansverden, der har været død siden krisen i 2008; når den eneste måde, hvorpå vesten kan opretholde sit eneherredømme, er gennem deployering eller tolerance af blodige nazister i Ukraine og grusomme jihadister i Mellemøsten, kan vi med Kina klart sige, at, dersom Vesten ønsker at bevare Himlens mandat til at regere, må den forandre sig.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Foto: Tysklands Conrad Adenauer og Frankrigs Charles de Gaulle mødes i Paris i september, 1963.

»Tysklands potentielle rolle i udviklingen af Verdenslandbroen« Hovedtale af Helga Zepp- LaRouche, Schiller Institutets konference i Essen, 21. okt., 2016

Kan menneskeheden, konfronteret med alle de kriser, vi ser for vore øjne, etablere et verdenssystem, i hvilket folkene kan leve sammen i fred? Er menneskeheden i stand til at definere et højere fornuftsniveau, eller er vi tvunget til – ved at holde os til de vante, og veltrampede, stier – at ramle ind i en stenmur og muligvis miste civilisationen for altid?

Jeg er overbevist om, at det er muligt at finde dette højere fornuftsniveau, og at gøre det til virkelighed. Ligesom den gamle Silkevej, under Han-dynastiet for hen ved 2.000 år siden, ikke blot var et middel til vareudveksling, men også til udveksling af teknologi, kultur og filosofi – og således førte til en enorm forbedring af levestandarden i alle de nationer og regioner, der deltog – således er jeg også overbevist om, at det er muligt at sætte en Ny Silkevej, en ny politik for at knytte nationer sammen, på dagsordenen i dag.

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

Schiller Instituttet i Sverige afholdt seminar i Stockholm:

»Den Nye Silkevej for fred og udvikling som alternativ til fortsat geopolitisk kaos«

Den 27. september, 2016, holdt Schiller Instituttet og *EIR* et meget vellykket seminar i Stockholm, om »Den Nye Silkevej for fred og udvikling som alternativ til fortsat geopolitisk kaos«. Dianne Sare, der leder LaRouchePAC i New York/New Jersey og er ansvarlig for den særlige indsats i Manhattan-projektet, var hædersgæst. Dianne har startet og leder det store kor, der tidligere i september måned gav fire koncerter for i alt 3000 tilhørere under mindedagene 15 år efter terrorangrebet på World Trade Center.

På seminaret i Stockholm talte Dianne om, hvordan situationen kan forandres i USA gennem modstanden mod Obama og hans controllers på Wall Street og de britiske geopolitikere. Hun angreb generelt Obama og Bush/Cheney-regeringen før ham. Hun fortalte, hvordan Lyndon LaRouche, med det samme, Bush var tiltrådt, havde advaret om et terrorattentat i lighed med »Rigsdagsbranden i Berlin 1933«, som blev udført med fuldt overlæg for at muliggøre et styre under love for undtagelsestilstand. Dianne ville ikke gå ind på den katastrofale amerikanske valgbevægelse, men fortalte derimod om den enorme mobilisering for JASTA-loven, og imod Obamas veto.

Formanden for det svenske Schiller Institut, Hussein Askary, åbnede seminaret med en tale, der fokuserede på det nye paradigme, som er i færd med at vokse frem i verdensøkonomien og i relationerne mellem nationer, noget, der drives frem af Kinas initiativ med byggeriet af den Nye Silkevej, sammen med BRIKS og en striben nye finansinstitutioner, såsom Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB). Han fortalte, hvordan Schiller Instituttet har arbejdet for dette, siden Helga Zepp-LaRouche foreslog det i 1991, og som hun atter tog op i sin Appel til FN's generalforsamling, fra hvilken Hussein oplæste første afsnit. Hussein præsenterede ligeledes nogle af de bøger/rapporter, som *EIR* i løbet af denne årelange kampagne har udgivet, og især den seneste rapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen».

Ulf Sandmark fulgte op på Dianes tale om de nye muligheder for at forandre USA, med mulighederne for at få Nordeuropa med på strategien for den Nye Silkevej for fred og udvikling. Den Nye Silkevej er allerede nået frem til de forskellige lande, der grænser op til Norden. Efter en gennemgang af disse projekter, og hvorledes nabolandene allerede er i gang med samarbejdet, påpegede Sandmark det sorte hul i midten af Norden, der domineres af »politikken for et budget, der balancerer». I dette 'sorte hul' sker der ingenting, til trods for, at forskellige organisationer fra erhvervslivet, fagforeninger og regioner kræver en satsning på investeringer i infrastruktur. Det store samarbejde med Kina finder derfor ikke sted med regeringens hjælp, med derimod gennem industrien, og Sandmark fremhævede Volvo Cars som et paradeeksempel på næste trin af højteknologisk win-win-samarbejde inden for det nye paradigme.

Et meget specielt indslag i dette seminar var, at, blandt de mange forsamlende diplomater, rejste lederen af den Syriske Ambassade i Stockholm, Abir Jarf, sig op og berettede om, hvordan Syrien var et gammelt centrum for Silkevejen, og at den syriske regering nu kæmper mod terroristerne, der har

invaderet landet, for at kunne være med i den store satsning på den Nye Silkevej. Efter hende kom også den etiopiske ambassadør med et indlæg til støtte for denne kamp og fortalte om de enorme fremskridt, som Etiopien har gjort med at bygge nye jernbaner, dæmninger og ledninger til energi for, i den Nye Silkevejs ånd, at samarbejde med nabolandene. Disse to indlæg forenede talere og tilhørere, så seminaret gjorde et stærkt indtryk på alle deltagerne fra forskellige ambassader, medier, svenske institutioner og andre.

Om aftenen blev der afholdt en reception for Dianne Sare på kontoret, hvor venner til Schiller Instituttet kunne komme og høre hende.

Foto: Dianne Sare har startet og leder det store kor i New York-området; her fra korprøve i december, 2014.

»Potentialet for Frankrig og hele Europa i opbygningen af Verdenslandbroen« Tale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche til Schiller Institut-konference

i Lyon, Frankrig

»Hvad skulle således holde Europa tilbage fra fuldt ud at tage imod Kinas tilbud om »win-win-samarbejde« om at forlænge den Nye Silkevej til Øst- og Centraleuropa, Balkanlandene, Sydeuropa og, frem for alt, om at genopbygge det krigshærgede Mellemøsten og om at påbegynde den presserende nødvendige industrialisering af Afrika, og således virkeligøre den eneste politik, der kan forhindre et endnu mere rædselsfuldt forløb af flygtningekrisen?«

Svaret er indlysende. Den amerikanske administration og Storbritannien insisterer på ideen om en unipolær verden, som i denne form allerede er ophørt med at eksistere. Den transatlantiske verden står umiddelbart for, med fuld kraft at bræse lige lukt ind i Thukydid-fælden[1], som den tidligere, amerikanske formand for generalstabscheferne, Martin Dempsey, gentagne gange har advaret om. Og Europa har hidtil været fanget i det gamle paradigme, hvor det tilpasser sig et Washington-konsensus uden at stille mange spørgsmål.«

[1] Gr. Historiker, ca. 460-400 f.Kr.; advarede Republikken Athen, der var blevet et Imperium, om, at det ville forårsage sin egen undergang ved at indlede imperie-krige.

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

Obama er færdig – Det eneste,

han kan gøre, er at starte en verdenskrig

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 23. oktober, 2016 – Søndag fremkom Kina med den samme mening, som LaRouche i månedsvise har fremført – nemlig, at Obama er så afsløret og isoleret internationalt, at han er færdig politisk, men derfor også endnu mere farlig, idet hans eneste valgmulighed (bortset fra at træde tilbage) er at lancere en krig mod Rusland og Kina, en krig, som med sikkerhed ville betyde en atomar udslettelse af en stor del af menneskeslægten.

China Daily, som er det kinesiske lederskabs hovedmedie, havde søndag en leder om »sejladsfriheds«-provokationen fredag, hvor Obama og forsvarsminister Ash Carter sendte et krigsskib med styrede missiler gennem kinesiske vande, uden forudgående avis, i nærheden af Kinas Xisha-øer (Paraceløer) i det Sydkinesiske Hav. Lederartiklen bemærker, at Filippinerne, under deres modige nye præsident Duterte, har afvist Obamas krigspolitik til fordel for samarbejde om udvikling med Kina. Ved at deployere krigsskibet, fortsætter lederartiklen, og hermed overtræde både kinesisk og international lov, »siger Obama til verden, at USA hverken kan tolerere et fredfyldt Sydkinesisk Hav, eller et fredeligt og stabilt asiatiske Stillehavsområde. Da USA ikke længere kan finde en marionettballademager, er det rasende Washington nødsaget til selv at skabe en forstyrrelse.«

Alt imens Kina fokuserer på de strategiske fiaskoer af Obamas krigspolitik, så udgør det økonomiske kollaps, skabt af Obamas mislykkede politik med at yde Wall Street kunstig støtte, i stedet for at opbygge realøkonomien, den anden gren af Obamas, samt af hans klon Hillarys Clintons, uafvendelige politiske undergang. Administrationen forsøger hektisk at udsætte det vestlige finanssystems krak til efter valget, ved at ignorere Deutsche Banks død, opløsningen af det italienske banksystem,

virkningen af Brexit-valget og den »smitteeffekt«, som disse og andre krisepunkter har på Wall Street- og Londonbankerne. Men, hvad der er mere ildevarslende, så arbejder Obama på at starte en krig, før han forlader embedet, eller endda før valgdagen den 9. november – en krig over Syrien, Ukraine eller muligvis Korea; og en hvilken som helst af disse muligheder vil betyde krig med Rusland og Kina.

Krigens mål er ikke Ruslands eller Kinas mytiske »aggression«, men derimod det stik modsatte – nemlig den udviklingsproces, som allerede er sat i gang af Kina og Rusland, og som direkte bringer nationer i hele udviklingssektoren ind i et samarbejde omkring Kinas win-win Silkevejsudvikling, og som endda når helt ind i Europa, hvor det tilbyder de europiske nationer et alternativ til NATO's krige og deres økonomiers disintegration. For at fremme denne samarbejdsproces afholdt Schiller Instituttet i sidste weekend to konferencer, én i **Essen, Tyskland**, og én i Lyon, Frankrig. Formålet med de to konferencer, der begge adresseredes af Schiller Institutets stifter, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, er at bringe Tyskland og Frankrig tilbage til de Gaulle/Adenauer-traditionen, gennem samarbejde med Rusland og Kina. Essen og Lyon er europæiske hovedpunkter på Kinas Silkevejs-jernbanelinjer, som nu tjener til at udvide øst-vest handel og samarbejde. Konferencen bød på talere fra Kina, Mellemøsten og Europa, inklusive repræsentanter for institutioner fra industri, videnskab og ingeniørvidenskab, omhandlende det presserende behov for globalt samarbejde for at genrejse Europas og verdens økonomi. Kinesiske sange og Schuberts Lieder, der begge blev sunget af en kinesisk bel canto-sanger, og begge akkompagneret af klassiske, kinesiske instrumenter, anslog tonen for udveksling af kultur gennem Silkevejsprocessen.

Den samme proces finder sted i Manhattan, gennem Lyndon LaRouches Manhattan-projekt, som bringer nationer sammen for sammen at konfrontere den verdenshistoriske opgave, som menneskeheden i dag står overfor – enten et samarbejde om at

opbygge verden og knuse terroristsvøben, eller også et fald ned i global krig under Jordens aspirerende, nye imperieherrer. Obama og hans controllers er svage og afslørede – tiden er inde til at skubbe dem ud.

Foto: Krigsskibet USS Momsen, med styrede missiler, på afstand, det Sydkinesiske Hav, juli 2016. (Foto: Den amerikanske Flåde.)

Schiller Institut-symposium i Tyskland kræver, at Tyskland tilslutter sig den Nye Silkevej

Fredag, den 21. oktober, 2016, afholdt Schiller Instituttet et heldags-symposium i Essen, Tyskland, om Tysklands prospekter i den Nye Silkevej. Ved begivenheden, med 120 deltagere fra det videnskabelige, industrielle og diplomatiske samfund, var der talere fra Tyskland, Frankrig, Kina og Etiopien, som alle fokuserede på mulighederne for økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt, baseret på deltagelse i Kinas program for Ét bælte, én vej (OBOR), som blev initieret af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, og ligeledes baseret på årtiers indsats fra Schiller Institutets stifter, Helga Zepp-LaRouche og hendes mand, den amerikanske, politiske økonom og statsmand,

Lyndon LaRouche, for at promovere et nyt paradigme for relationer imellem nationalstater på hele planeten, baseret på menneskehedens fælles mål, inklusive fremskridt inden for alle pioner-områder inden for videnskab.

Konferencens hovedtale blev holdt af Schiller Instituttets stifter og præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der fokuserede på det presserende nødvendige i, at Tyskland bliver fuldt ud engageret i projekter i Ét bælte, én vej, som allerede har transformeret Eurasiens økonomiske og politiske landskab. Hun understregede, at fordelene for Tyskland og Europa ville gå langt videre end til den åbenlyse økonomiske fremgang og også et langt stykke hen ad vejen ville nedkæmpe det fremstød for krig med Rusland og Kina, som for nylig har nået et farepunkt ud over noget som helst, vi har set siden Cubakrisen i 1962.

Så længe, Obama-administrationen fortsat er ved magten i Washington, vil fremstødet for en strategisk konfrontation med Rusland og Kina imidlertid eskalere, og kunne overskride tærsklen til en »varm« krig – endda til en atomkrig, med udslettelse til følge. Det faktum, at EU-statslederne, der mødtes i Bruxelles i sidste uge, ikke kunne nå til enighed om nye sanktioner mod Rusland, er et fingerpeg om den voksende frygt for, at udbruddet af en strategisk konfrontation er umiddelbart forestående.

Zepp-LaRouche præsenterede en detaljeret gennemgang af fremskridtene mht. gennemførelsen af den Nye silkevej og den Maritime Silkevej, de to hjørnesten i OBOR-projektet.

- ☒ Flere af de andre prestigiøse personer fra det diplomatiske og videnskabelige samfund holdt også taler under panelsessionerne. Talerne inkluderede to kinesiske regeringsfolk, inkl. Zhang Junhui, som repræsenterede den Kinesiske Ambassade i Tyskland; og professor Shi Ze fra Kinesisk Institut for Internationale Studier, der også er direktør for Kinesisk Center for Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisations-studier. M.M. Haile, Etiopiens

generalkonsul i Frankfurt, holdt en tale, så vel som også den franske præsidentkandidat, Jaques Cheminade fra partiet Solidarité & Progrès. Flere prominente tyske videnskabsfolk og industrifolk talte ligeledes under panelerne, inkl. prof. dr. Reinhold Meisinger, professor i mekanisk ingeniørvidenskab ved Nürnbergsg Universitet og en verdensførende ekspert i maglev højhastigheds-transportsystem (maglev: *magnetic levitation*: 'svævetog', -red.); Willi Pusch, der er en førende fortaler for et Bonn-Rhin-Mainz-tunnelprojekt; Dieter Ameling, tidligere præsident for Tysk Stål forbund og formand for Stål instituttet VDEh (ty: Stahl Institut VDEh); samt prof., dr. Reinhart Poprawe fra Fraunhofer Institut for Laserteknologi i Frankfurt.

Konferencen, i hvilken også den amerikanske økonom og statsmand Lyndon Larouche deltog, blev animeret af en dyb følelse af optimisme mht. Tysklands og Eurasiens fremtidsudsigter, hvis Forbundsrepublikken (Tyskland) bliver fuldt ud integreret i visionen for Ét bælte, én vej. Under panelet med prof., dr. Poprawe fik man en lang dialog om forholdet mellem klassisk musik og klassisk kultur og promoveringen af videnskabelig opdagelse og innovation.

Foto: Stifter og præsident for Schiller Institututtet, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, holder hovedtalen i Essen.

Mobilisér for LaRouches Fire Love

– Mobilsér for menneskehedens

fremtid

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 9. oktober, 2016 – Vi balancerer på spidsen af en dobbelt, dødbringende krise, der umiddelbart konfronterer menneskeheden. En total nedsmelting af det derivatgennemblødte transatlantiske system kunne indtræffe på et hvilket som helst tidspunkt i løbet af oktober måned, i løbet af denne uge, eller endda så tidligt som førstkommende mandag, den 10. oktober. Der skal ikke meget til, før det, der svarer til en termonuklear kædereaktion inden for det finansielle område udløses. Så langt ude er systemet – som enhver informeret bankier ved, men som stort set ingen er rede til at indrømme højt.

Og så er der fremstødet for at lancere krig – atomkrig – imod Rusland, som promoveres af en overvundet og desperat Barack Obama på vegne af hans britiske controllers. Højplacerede amerikanske efterretningsfolk fordømmer åbenlyst dette som værende »ekstraordinært provokerende og farligt« og advarer om, at »der er nærmest et kollektivt vanvid, der har grebet mange amerikanere ... fra Barack Obama og nedefter.«

»Bliver det civilisationen, eller bliver det bankierernes kartel, der kommer ud af denne krise som sejrherre?«, spurgte Helga Zepp-LaRouche søndag under diskussionen med LaRouche-bevægelsens aktivister. »Vi må absolut sætte ind for Glass-Steagall, for, sammen med LaRouches Fire Love, er det den eneste kur imod faren for systemets nedsmelting.«

Under samme diskussion understregede Lyndon LaRouche, at en sejr kan opnås. »Det nuværende system har nået sin udløbsdato. Men pointen er, at der også vil være reserver, der kunne udvikles, dvs., gennem et aggressivt udviklingsprogram.« LaRouche understregede fremgangsmåden efter Hamiltons principper, som LaRouches Fire Love leverer, og som alene kan standse og vende den sammenbrudskrise omkring, som truer planeten. Han understregede, at det enorme nederlag, som det

amerikanske folk gav Obama, med Kongressens underkendelse af hans JASTA-veto, viser, hvad man kan gøre.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche forklarede:

»Denne situation er alvorligere end JASTA-loven, fordi der står meget, meget mere på spil. Så mobilisér de netværk, der gennemførte JASTA-loven, og, som ét af 11/9-familiemedlemmerne sagde: Denne mobiliserings formål er ikke blot det, der skete i fortiden, men derimod, at juridisk retfærdighed også må gennemføres for de fremtidige generationer.«

»Vi må fremkalde den samme, ophøjede ånd, som koncerterne fremkaldte; **Mozarts Rekviem, de afroamerikanske spirituals** og den kraft, der formåede at bevæge folk under vores mobilisering. For, hvis USA går hen og implementerer Glass-Steagall og Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, så kan verden reddes. Og vi må lægge os denne mission på sinde.«

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler om nødvendigheden af at gøre en ende på geopolitik og vedtage projektet om Verdenslandbroen, på Schiller Institutets 30-års jubilæumskonference i Tyskland, oktober, 2014.

Nutiden har ingen præcedens

18. august 2016 (Leder) – Den nutidige historiske periode er fuldstændig ny i sine karakteristika; den kan ikke sammenlignes med noget andet i menneskehedens hidtidige historie. Af denne grund er det kun nogle få personer, der har været i stand til, i deres intellekt, at frembringe et begreb om, hvad karakteristika er for denne epoke, der intet fortilfælde har: personer som Albert Einstein, Krafft Ehricke og Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Fordi det store flertal af

almindelige dødelige mennesker ikke i deres erfaringsmateriale har noget sammenligneligt, og intet, som de har hørt eller læst om, har de ingen kriterier, ud fra hvilke de kan bedømme eller forstå det; de er på herrens mark. Af denne grund kan grupper, bestående af så få personer som i Lyndon LaRouches Manhattan-projekt, få en afgørende indflydelse netop på dette tidspunkt. Alene de kan se vejen frem, om end denne vej undertiden kan synes utydelig, og de må famle sig frem. De øvrige går i blinde, eller, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche ofte siger, »har ikke den fjernehste idé«.

I 2018 vil en kinesisk mission nå Månen bagfra – under forudsætning af, at det inden da lykkes os at besejre Det britiske Imperiums kaosmagter. Denne mission vil blive en del af et helt, generelt program for at opdage og udforske de endnu ikke virkeliggjorte implikationer af Einsteins fundamentale opdagelser, som Lyndon LaRouche har påpeget. Og, som rumforskningsgeniet Krafft Ehricke – sammen med LaRouche – forudså, så vil den aktuelle energiennemstrømningstæthed, der for tiden står til menneskehedens disposition, være en forløber for fusionskraft, og herfra føre til stof-antistofreaktioner, og herfra atter videre frem til niveauer, som vi i dag ikke engang kan give et navn.

Under forudsætning af, at vi overvinder de aktuelle forhindringer, som repræsenteres af Obama og det Britiske Imperium, så er vi i færd med at glide ind i det, Helga Zepp-LaRouche har kaldt »en æra, i hvilken vi bliver ægte menneskelige«.

På lignende måde er det, man måske kunne have kaldt det »system af allianceer«, der nu spænder over og gennemkrydser Eurasien og breder sig ud herfra, i realiteten slet ikke et »system af allianceer« i den betydning, vi har kendt til fra fortiden. Det er i realiteten snarere en projekton tilbage i tiden og ind i nutiden, fra det fremtidige univers, der inkorporerer de fremtidige opdagelser, der bringes tilbage fra Månen bagfra. Putin har, sammen med Kina, inkorporeret

principperne fra Den Westfalske Fred, men de er gået langt, langt videre end det. Begynd blot med den ekstraordinære relation, der er opnået mellem Rusland og Kina. Er man klar over, at vi taler om nationer, der så sent som i 1969 udkæmpede en syv måneder lang, ikke-erklæret krig over Ussuri-floden? Nu har de ikke alene regelmæssige topmøder mellem præsidenterne, og regelmæssige topmøder mellem premierministrene; det er det mindste af det. Der er ikke mindre end tretten mellemregerings-kommissioner, der hele tiden er i kontinuerlig kontakt med hinanden. Alle de mange meningsforskelle og uoverensstemmelser – og der er mange – bliver kontinuerligt løst på et både bredt og dybt plan i begge regeringer.

»Og vi finder altid frem til løsninger«, føjede Putin til denne beskrivelse.

Processen med at fuldbyrde denne ekstraordinære relation har været genstand for en dybtgående undersøgelse af Kinas dr. Ren Lin, der talte på Schiller Institutets konference i Berlin i juni måned, og af mange andre kinesiske og russiske, akademiske lærde.

Fuldbrydelsen af en sådan relation udgør hjertet af BRIKS-processen og udviklingen af Den nye Silkevej. Det var kernen i Putins forgænger, nu afdøde russiske premierminister Jevgenij Primakovs idé om Den russisk-indisk-kinesiske Strategiske Trekant. Skabelsen heraf går tilbage til ikke alene Lyndon og Helga LaRouches idé om Den produktive Trekant og Den eurasiske Landbro, men endnu længere tilbage, til LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ[1], der havde en formativ indflydelse på Rusland til trods for, at Ruslands daværende leder, Juri Andropov, havde afvist initiativet på vegne af sine britiske herrer.

Dette nye system med fremtidens relationer mellem nationalstater, der går ud over nationalstatsbegrebet, som LaRouche længe har forudsagt, går med syvmileskridt hastigt

frem hen over hele det eurasiske kontinent og mere generelt på et tidspunkt, hvor vi nærmer os det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok den 2. – 3. september, FN's Generalforsamling, der begynder den 13. september, og BRIKS-topmødet i Goa, Indien, den 15. – 16. oktober.

Foto: Portræt af Einstein i 1905, da han offentliggjorde sin opdagelse af den specielle relativitetsteori.[2].

[1] SE: LaRouches Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ: En amerikansk-sovjetisk aftale for fred og udvikling, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=6976>

[2] Den specielle relativitetsteori er en fysisk teori, publiceret af Albert Einstein. Den erstattede den Newtonske opfattelse af tid og rum ved at gøre brug af det faktum, at lysens hastighed er konstant (Teorien kaldes desuden for 'speciel', fordi den er et specialtilfælde af den mere generelle relativitetsteori; således ses der bort fra tyngdekraften). Ti år senere publicerede Einstein den generelle relativitetsteori, som medinddrager tyngdekraften. (-red.)

Video: En musikalisk dialog mellem kulturer: Koncert i forbindelse med

Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Berlin den 25. – 26. juni 2016

Koncert med Schiller Instituttets europæiske kor, et russisk børnekor og et kinesisk kor, samt et italiensk kammerensemble.

[Klik her](#)

**Verden efter den britiske
Chilcot-rapport om Irak-
krigen;
samtidig foredrag om Albert
Einstein og kreativitetens
nødvendighed,
v/ Phil Rubinstein,
LaRouchePAC, USA.**

Video og lyd; uddrag på dansk

Video 2. del:

Lyd:

Følgende er et dansk uddrag, let redigeret, af den første del af indlægget:

Phil Rubinstein, (en leder af LaRouchePAC i USA): Det, jeg vil forsøge at gøre, er, at jeg vil begynde med lidt politisk baggrund; men i dag drejer det sig ikke om at give en briefing, og så fortsætte med et emne. Der er et par ting, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har talt om i de seneste år, og faktisk i løbet af de seneste par uger; og der er to ting, som jeg vil komme ind på. Det første er, at Helga, under denne nylige konference i Berlin, har udsendt en appel om en dialog mellem civilisationer; men hvad der er vigtigere, så har Helga understreget den pointe, at vi må have et skifte i kulturen, den globale kultur. En del af at få ændret den globale kultur er at få en relation imellem de eksisterende nationer, der bedst kan bygges på hver enkelets civilisations højdepunkter – den renæssance, der har fundet sted i de forskellige civilisationer, f.eks. den storståede renæssance i Kina, Tong-dynastiet og andre perioder; Konfucius. I Indien var der Gupta-perioden med store udviklinger inden for klassisk kunst og videnskab, og naturligvis også den græske renæssance, den italienske renæssance, og mange tilfælde, som vi ikke ved ret meget om. Men, at bringe disse sammen, og det var især det, der fandt sted ved koncerten lørdag aften – jeg kan kun opfordre folk til at gå til websiden og se det, hvis man ikke selv var til stede. Og dette er, hvad Helga har stillet krav om som en politisk nødvendighed i dag, nu. Intet mindre kan gøre det. Politik har ændret sig over de seneste 10, 20, 30 eller 40 år, for man kan sige, at, for fyrre år siden var behovet for en sådan total forandring i det kulturelle syn ikke så påkrævet, og vi ville måske have kunnet gennemføre et

par reformer, der kunne have fået os igennem krisen. Det er ikke længere tilfældet. I dag står vi, 25 år efter Sovjetunionens fald. Og på det tidspunkt sagde LaRouchebevægelsen og Schiller Instituttet, at dette ikke betød Vestens sejr over Østen, men at det vestlige system sådan, som det var i færd med at udvikle sig på det tidspunkt, også gik sit sammenbrud i møde. Og dét, som Helga og Lyn sagde på det tidspunkt, var, at den eneste måde at undgå dette på, var at åbne op for den fulde udvikling af den eurasiske landmasse. Så langt tilbage går vores fremgangsmåde, med den Eurasiske Landbro, mindst tilbage til 1989-90. I modsat fald ville der komme et sammenbrud i den globale kultur. Hvis vi forsøgte at udbrede den eksisterende London/Wall Street-akse, det såkaldte Washington-konsensus efter ordre fra Storbritannien; fra selve Monarkiet, og det vil jeg gerne understrege, for folk mener, at det er absurd, selv i Europa, selv i USA, mener folk, at det er absurd. Men det er i realiteten dér, vi står. Lyndon LaRouche er kommet med et specifikt udtryk for dette, som går ud på, at spørgsmålet her først og fremmest drejer sig om kreativitet. Spørgsmålet for de fleste af os er: Hvad betyder dette? Hvad er kreativitet? Og Lyn(don) siger, at det er kreativitet i sig selv. Det er simpelt hen kreativitet, og hvis vi forstår det som et faktisk princip om menneskelig udvikling og vores forhold til universet som helhed. Her på det seneste har Lyndon sagt, tænk som Einstein. Og det morsomme er, at for år tilbage – jeg hader at lyde gammel, men det er jeg, ikke så gammel endda, men det skrider frem; måske er jeg den ældste person i lokalet? – Nå, men for mange år siden havde vi et blad, der hed The Campaigner, som var vores teoretiske magasin, tilbage i slutningen af '70'erne, og vi havde et nummer, der hed: Tænk som Beethoven! Jeg vil gerne fastslå den pointe, at der ikke er den store forskel. For, et af de afgørende punkter i at tænke som Einstein er klassisk musik. Det kommer jeg tilbage til, når jeg kommer til Einstein, men blot for nu at giver jer en smagsprøve på, hvad det er, Lyn talte om. For det drejer sig ikke bare om, at Einstein var et videnskabeligt geni, og

det var han – vi kommer ikke på den særlige relativitetsteori, men jeg vil komme ind på nogle af de kontroversielle elementer af det – men han var, i hele sin personlighed, som person, et geni. Han havde den rigtige opfattelse af stort set alle spørgsmål, som han blev involveret i, inkl. nogle kontroversielle videnskabelige spørgsmål, hvor mange mennesker mente, at han havde uret. Og jeg taler ikke om de specifikke resultater, men om hans tilgang, fremgangsmåde, selv nu her 100 år efter, eller omkring 60 år efter hans død, er man nødsaget til at komme tilbage til at diskutere nogle af hans ideer. Videnskaben udvikler sig selvfølgeligt. Som folk måske ved, og det er blot en del af det, f.eks. men videnskabsfolk er nu, efter at have rakket ned på ideen, gået tilbage til begrebet om en helhedsanskuelse af videnskab. Dette må gå langt videre end det, de tænkte, og selv det, Einstein vidste, og Lyn har været en ledende person. For, en del af problemet er denne adskillelse af forskellige discipliner ikke alene en adskillelse fra videnskab, men også en adskillelse inden for de forskellige videnskaber: fysik, biologi osv. Og de er i virkeligheden slet ikke adskilte. Det er ikke blot det, at de ikke udgør adskilte områder, men at det er en fejl at tænke på dem adskilt fra hinanden. De kan ikke eksistere adskilte. En af de ting, jeg gerne vil understrege, er, at, for virkelig at kunne opnå det, som Lyn og Einstein taler om, må vi anskue fysik fra et helt andet synspunkt; ud fra et synspunkt om, ikke alene biologi, men om livet; ting, der ikke er entropiske, men, hvad der er endnu vigtigere, selve det menneskelige intellekt. Det er altså ikke hjerne, som de fleste mennesker ... jeg så en af disse videnskabsvideoer, og de havde et afsnit om Einstein; Einstein og hans videnskab, Einstein og hans et eller andet; og så Einstein og hans hjerne. Der var en journalist, der stillede spørgsmål til topvidenskabsfolk, hvilket ikke gør det bedre, og hun var fikseret på hjernen! Det var en fyr, der studerede Einsteins (fysiske) hjerne fra noget skört materiale, og hun blev ved med at komme tilbage til, hvor stor var hans hjerne, og hvor mange hjernevindinger var der, det var sindssygt! Så vi taler

altså ikke om hjerne, men om det menneskelige intellekt. (Se også LPAC-videoen: *The Extraordinary genius of Albert Einstein*, med indledning af Phil Rubinstein, -red.)

Til dels, for at komme derhen, hvorfor taler Lyn og Helga om det på denne måde, at man må have en tilgang ud fra synspunktet om intellektet. På én måde siger man, at intellektet er adskilt fra det fysiske univers, på en anden måde siger man, at intellektet blot er en sen opdagelse, i det mindste her på planeten Jord; vi ved ikke, om der intellekt andetsteds i universet. Så hvorfor begynde dér? Faktisk er det sådan, at det menneskelige intellekt er det, som universet har frembragt. Vi kan bevise en vis relation til dette univers, hvilket er, hvad Einstein arbejdede ud fra. Men hvorfor må vi tage dette udgangspunkt? Vil de fleste mennesker sige. Er det ikke lidt meget; I har måske ret, det kunne muligvis være interessant at tale om dette. Men lad os nu ... som Lyn ynder at sige: Lad os nu være lidt praktiske. Hvad kan vi (rent praktisk) gøre? Kan vi ikke applikere en anden tilgang? Lige nu; lad os få et bedre system i Europa; lad os håndtere euro-spørgsmålet. Lad os forbedre vores relation med Rusland, lad os få en dialog med Rusland. Det er en god ting. Briterne forlod (EU); lad os se, hvad vi kan gøre med det, der er tilbage; vi må på en eller anden måde holde sammen på Europa. Lad os være praktiske! OK, vi må tage os af spørgsmålet om kineserne. Vi må konkurrere med dem, for det handler altid om konkurrence. En nation imod den anden, det er altid geopolitik, det er altid et nulsums-spil; lad os være praktiske.

Det problem, vi står overfor, er, at tingene nu er kommet til det punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen praktiske skridt, der kan tages, *undtagen en form for revolution*. Jeg taler ikke om at kaste med brosten og mursten. Hvis vi ikke gør det rigtige, vil jeg gerne understrege, at det kan komme så vidt nogle steder. Hvis vi ser på Mellemøsten, dér har vi en forfærdelig situation. Men en revolution i kulturen. Den slags ting, der

må udtaenkes, f.eks. har vi med musikken, vi har opført koncerten i Berlin, men mere generelt, så bruger vi udviklingen af musikalske kor til at mobilisere folk. Jeg er sikker på, man har noget lignende i Europa; i USA er der mange unge mennesker, der mener, at Rapp-musik er kreativt. De siger ikke bare, at de kan lide det – det siger nogen måske – men det virkelige argument er, at det er kreativt. Det er poesi. Det er virkelig. Det er gaden. Det er mit liv. De er måden, hvorpå jeg udtrykker mig. Og kendsgerningen er, at, på dette tidspunkt, så, hvis man ikke erkender, at det ødelægger deres intellekt, så kan man ikke organisere det. Men mindre, man i det mindste engagerer sig i denne debat, engagerer sig i ... min hustru er dansk, og Danmark er et vidunderligt land, folk er lykkelige, men jeg har set ungdommen. Og de ligner alt for meget det, vi amerikanere kalder 'Goths', gotere, skinheads osv., med tatoveringer, med alternativ påklædning med kranier og skeletter og 14 nåle igennem næsen, osv. Hvis man har en ungdom, for hvem hæslighed er et højdepunkt af deres kultur, noget, man forsøger at opnå, så har man en ungdom, der har mistet enhver fornemmelse af formål i verden. Mistet enhver fornemmelse af, hvad det vil sige at være menneske. For, at være menneske er ikke hæslighed. Og dette er et virkelig problem, hvor man ser forskellighederne i kulturer. Især Kina har ungdommen tendens til at være optimistiske. De overtager sikkert nok noget af den vesterlandske kultur, det gør de, og det er et problem. Men bortset fra det, så har de en fornemmelse af, at det at være menneske har en egenskab af skønhed, af udvikling, en egenskab af fremskridt og opdagelse og spænding. Det ser man ikke hos ret mange unge i Vesten i dag, generelt, selv om der nok skal være nogen.

Se på, hvad der foregår lige nu. Vi har et sammenbrud af det vestlige finansielle system. Deutsche Bank – 50, 70 billioner i derivater – de siger selvfølgelig, at det vil udligne sig, men det er ikke sandt, sådan sker et krak ikke. De sidder ikke der og udligner det hele, og så bliver det til nul, og slutteligt med 50 billioner i derivater, udveksler man en

dollar frem og tilbage, og så er det hele løst. Siden hvornår har det fungeret sådan? Det er deres argument. Men det fungerer ikke sådan. 50 billioner i Deutsche Bank – der i virkeligheden ikke er en tysk bank, den har grundlæggende set base i New York osv., men altså, hvad er Tysklands totale BNP? Der er på omkring 3 billioner, sådan noget. Det totale BNP i EU er 18 billioner dollars. Så vi taler altså om mellem 3 til 4 gange det totale BNP. Deutsche Bank er bankerot. I USA har vi ikke råd til noget, undtagen bankerne. Jeg har netop set en rapport fra New Jersey, med 8 millioner indbyggere, den tættest eller næst-tættest befolkede delstat, lidt mere som i Europa mht. befolkningstæthed, der ikke ligner noget andet sted i USA. Der har de en idiot som guvernør, der stillede på som præsidentkandidat, og de har netop erklæret, at de vil standse al reparation og vedligeholdelse af veje og motorveje, for budgettet blev ikke vedtaget. Så han prøver at presse folk. I USA har vi, for første gang i vores historie, en stigning i antal dødsfald i aldersgruppen 25 – 54. Med andre ord, så er antallet af dødsfald pr. 1000 mennesker, eller pr. 100.000 mennesker, er i denne aldersgruppe steget under Bush- og Obamapræsidentskaberne. Undersøgelsen spændte over perioden 1999 til 2012/14. Selvmordsraterne er steget. Men den virkelige historie om sundhedsvæsenet i USA, det er forvirrende, jo, vi har da en 5 – 10 hospitaler i USA, der er hospitaler i verdensklasse. Det er ikke sådan, at vi ikke har disse ting. Men, de bliver ikke brugt, med mindre man tilhører de højere samfundslag, eller udvælges til at deltage i et eksperiment; men bortset fra det, så er bundlinjen lige nu, at, hvis du er over 65, må vi lige overveje, om det kan betale sig at tage os af dig. Så de sætter altså indbetalingen for lægebehandling op, osv.

Hvad ser vi? EU falder fra hinanden. Hvad er signalerne? Vi ved ikke helt, hvad det er, der foregår i Storbritannien. Vi forsøger at finde ud af det. Men vi ved, at Europa var chokeret over den idé, at briterne stemte for at forlade EU. Det her har en særlig drejning. Den idé, som briterne har

spillet, og som giver én en idé om deres rolle, er, at de godt kan lide altid at sætte visse ting op på en sådan måde, der giver kontrol; men de bliver aldrig rigtigt selv en del af det, de sætter op. De holder sig altid lidt udenfor. Churchill er et godt eksempel. Churchill gjorde det meget klart, at de ikke ville opgive Imperiet. Det er grunden til, at de kæmpede mod nazisterne; det gjorde de ikke, fordi de ønskede at redde jøderne, glem det. De kæmpede mod nazisterne – efter at de først havde installeret nazisterne – fordi de ikke ville miste en del af deres imperium, og de indså, at det var den vej, det gik. Men ikke desto mindre var deres exit af EU en faktor, der var noget af en overraskelse, især uden for Storbritannien ... igen, hvad det britiske etablissement tænkte, og jeg vil tro, at der var splittelser selv i det britiske etablissement, og det er sandsynligvis grunden til, at det var så tæt løb. Men en overraskelse, de er ude, og den Europæiske Union er død. Der vil fremover ikke findes noget EU. Disse fyre, Juncker og Schultz, der siger, at vi får et nyt Europa, et stærkere Europa, et kerne-Europa, det grundlæggende Europa – glem det. Europa (EU) er fuldstændigt røget. Til dels, fordi hele banksystemet er røget.

Nu har man Chilcot-rapporten. Jeg mener, at dette også vil vise sig at være betydningsfuldt. Tony Blair udgjorde modellen for det seneste amerikanske præsidentskab. Som det fremgår af selve Chilcot-rapporten, så var han bonkammerat med George W. Bush, og den idé, at det skulle have været George Bush, der kommanderede rundt med Tony Blair, er mere end absurd. Som vi plejede at sige, så var George W. Bush ikke i stand til at holde fast i en idé på vej fra den ene ende af lokalet til den anden. Dette var Tony Blairs krig. Dette var briternes imperie-krig. Det var USA under Bush. Obama har ambitioner; han vil gerne være mere ligesom Blair. Han vil ikke indrømme, at han ikke ved, hvad han foretager sig, han er alt for narcissistisk, han modellerer sig efter Blair i mange henseender. Dette er det nye Labourparti, husker man måske. Hvad det havde med arbejde (labour) at gøre, aner jeg ikke.

Det var så nyt, at de slet ikke behøvede at arbejde!

Chilcot-rapporten gør dette klart. Vi vidste dette; vi sagde dette. Der var andre, der også sagde det. Men den kendsgerning, at dette nu kommer ud få dage efter Brexit, som en rapport – og jeg så faktisk Blair, der forsøgte at undskynde, og han var noget rystet. Så vi har altså enden på EU; vi har de kollapsende banker, og dette har naturligvis udløst en virkning, hvor Carney, som er chef for Bank of England ... og nu har vi bare penge, som de pumper ud, så meget, som de kan. I USA kalder vi det 'helikopter-penge'. Der findes ikke engang en mekanisme længere, hvor f.eks. centralbankerne opkøber obligationer ... det gider vi ikke længere, det virker ikke mere, for det giver centralbankerne for meget gæld. Nu siger man bare, kom, vi giver dig penge, hvis du bliver hjemme, kaster vi penge ned over dit hus!

Systemet er totalt færdigt. Og dette finder selvfølgelig sted på et tidspunkt, hvor der er en ny bølge af terrorisme, med Bagdad, Bangladesh og netop i dag har der været en bombe i Taiwan på metroen, hvor 21 mennesker kom til skade. De har ikke erklæret det for en terrorhandling, så jeg ved ikke, hvad det drejede sig om. Men Bagdad, 250 døde, premierministeren har indrømmet, og er under ekstremt pres, og hvad er det, Chilcot-rapporten bekræfter? At alt dette er en konsekvens af især Irakkriegen i 2003. En afgørende faktor for at forstå Blair, mener jeg, og nogle af jer husker måske dette; denne britiske skuespillerinde, Helen Mirren, spillede Dronning Elizabeth II og vandt en Oscar; og selv i filmen – og dette er sandt – så er den person, der redder den britiske kongefamilie fra vanære efter Dianas død, hendes mord, Tony Blair. Han var deres mand; det var ham, der fortalte dem, hvad de skulle gøre, hvad de skulle sige, hvordan de skulle håndtere pressen. De vil måske ofre Tony Blair, og uanset, hvad historien er, så er det ikke let blot at feje ham til side som endnu blot en politiker, vi bare skaffer os af med. Dette er fyren der var gesandt for kvartetten til Mellemøsten.

Jeg vil også gerne sige, og dette er meget vigtigt, at, siden mordet på Gaddafi, og i stigende grad siden Ukraine, har der været en konfrontation med Rusland, og med Kina til en vis grad. NATO er rykket frem mod øst, det er rykket nærmere og nærmere til Ruslands grænse. Lad mig sige én ting: så snart, jeg personligt, i november 2013 hørte, at der var et initiativ for at tage Ukraine ud af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union og ind i den Europæiske Union, og der var nogle demonstrationer – så vidste jeg, at det var dårligt. For Ukraine repræsenterer noget, som er hjertet af Rusland på dette tidspunkt, ikke, fordi det er Rusland, men man må indse, at Anden Verdenskrig for to tredjedeles vedkommende blev udkämpet i det, der nu er Ukraine og dele af Polen; det var her, russerne konfronterede nazisterne. Jo, det kom også til Moskva; men en enorm del af denne kamp blev udkämpet i Donbass, i Ukraine, i de områder af Ukraine, der efter krigen blev en del af Polen osv.

Man har en situation ligesom den, man har i Polen netop nu, hvor man har et sindssyg hørefløjspræsidentskab og -regering, og de vil begynde at tænke på at tage territorium tilbage og konfrontere Rusland. Det er udelukket, at Rusland ikke vil respondere på dette. Man måtte være sindssyg og totalt ude af kontrol. Russerne mistede 27 millioner mennesker i Anden Verdenskrig. Der er en grund til, at de kalder det den store, patriotiske krig. I USA kalder man det Anden Verdenskrig, hvis man kan tælle. Der er ting i USA, der går bedre end det; men blandt de yngre generationer? Man vil få vanskeligheder med at finde en person under tyve, der kan fortælle dig, hvilket år, USA gik ind i Anden Verdenskrig. Jeg tør ikke vædde på, hvilken procentdel, der ville svare rigtigt. Og en af de meget vigtige ting, der har udviklet sig – der er to ting, der gør dette anderledes end blot at være et dystert billede, og det er kineserne. Kineserne repræsenterer nu en økonomisk og politisk fremtid. Og det er ikke blot – de har gjort bemærkelsesværdige ting. 600.000 – 1 million mennesker er blevet løftet ud af fattigdom. Ti tusinder af mil med højhastigheds-jernbaner og andre former for jernbaner, hvor de

nu er ved at bevæge sig ind i det indre af landet. De startede Ét bælte, én vej-politikken, den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank. Deres anskuelse er det, som Xi Jinping kalder win-win-politik; ikke nulsumsspil, ikke geopolitik, men et samarbejde om udvikling af især udviklingslandene. Og det er meget inspirerende for folk, der ser, at, min Gud, de mener det. De spiller ikke bare et spil. Afrikanerne, for det meste. Og jeg siger ikke, at der ikke er problemer, men man har jo en eller anden journalist fra *Washington Post* eller *The Economist*, der rejser ud og siger, føler I ikke, at kineserne kommer og voldtager jer? Og afrikanerne siger 'nej'. De bygger noget. Lad mig give et eksempel. Etiopien. Vi havde en etiopier, der talte ved konferencen (i Berlin), og Etiopien er et meget interessant sted, det er det næststørste land i Afrika, der er omkring 90-95 millioner mennesker. Der var tilsyneladende et tilfælde, hvor en journalist rejste derned og talte med en højtplaceret person i regeringen, og sagde, 'indser I ikke, at I bliver plyndret? Er det ikke det, Kina vil', typisk kolonisherre'. Og fyren svarede, 'nej, det mener jeg ikke; vi har ingen råmaterialer'. Jo, de har kaffe, men kaffe er ikke noget særligt i Kina. De bliver ikke uplyndret. Dette er ikke et kolonialistisk foretagende. Så man har altså rent faktisk en modstand, og udvikling, begge dele. Ikke kun det negative. Vi så i Syrien, at der er modstand. Folk vil kæmpe. I Etiopien falder de ikke bare til patten. Man ser dette i Afrika i stigende grad. Man ser det i hele Asien. Der er en modstand, og en løsning.

Og kendsgerningen er den, at Putin har spillet en meget, meget betydningsfuld rolle. En af de ting, jeg mener, har ændret dynamikken således, at man i Vesten får en Brexit fra befolkningen. Man får endda det kaos, vi har i USA – jeg siger ikke, at kaos er godt; kaos kan føre til helvede. Men hvis man ikke har et reelt lederskab, så vil folk respondere. Man kan ikke sige til folk, 'vær ikke kaotiske'. De vil på et vist tidspunkt sige, ad helvede til med det. Tag USA, med levestandarden, der er ved at bryde sammen, kollapsende

infrastruktur; vi er ikke længere den førende nation. Vi kunne stadig væk være en førende nation.

Kina har ført an i udforskning af rummet. Månen bag side, osv. USA plejede at være en førende nation i udforskning af rummet – det er vi ikke mere. Vi har stadig noget, der er blevet tilbage – vi har netop opsendt en satellit for at udforske Jupiter, hvilket er godt – men hvorfor tog det fem år at komme dertil? Fordi vi ikke havde udviklet visse brændstoftyper. Og hvordan bliver satellitten forsynet med energi? Gennem solpaneler. Dette kunne være en endnu mere effektiv mission, hvis vi f.eks. brugte plutonium som brændstof. Men vi gør i det mindste dette. Obama, der så berømt sagde, da han blev spurgt om at tage til Månen, 'Åh, der har vi været!' Det ville jeg ikke engang sige om Grand Canyon, eller om Weis-museet, 'Åh, der har jeg været. Har gjort det.' Under en anden valgbegivenhed var der en, der spurgte ham om fusionsenergi, og han svarede, 'Åh, vi behøver ikke noget af alt det der smarte'. Dette er forskningens fremskudte grænse! Hvis man ikke gør det, hvad gør man så!

Så forskellen i situationen, er, at den måde, som Putin handlede rent strategisk – han har f.eks. været meget åben omkring spørgsmålet om en dialog med Europa, inkl. om Ukraine-situationen. Han tog initiativ i Syrien-situationen, det sandsynligvis mest åbenlyse tilfælde, for ingen forventede, at han ville gå ind i Syrien og rent faktisk åbne for muligheden af at ødelægge ISIS. Hvordan ser USA så lige pludselig ud? Vi er der, og vi støttede ISIS, forstået på den måde, at vi beskyttede dem mod luftangreb ved at blande dem sammen med disse 'moderate' terrorister. Moderate terrorister? 'Det var en mindre smertefuld død'. Det kunne man formodentlig sige. De hugger ikke hovedet af én; måske bruger de mindre smertefulde metoder, jeg ved det ikke. De er moderate terrorister! Vi støtter dem, og derfor vil man ikke skyde på en fra ISIS, for de står ved siden af – ikke en civil person – men en moderat terrorist! Civile kan vi dræbe. Droneangreb på et par

hospitaler, der er i orden. Men lad os ikke gøre en moderat terrorist fortræd. Hvis man ikke gør nar af den slags – man er jo vred, man er indfanget af debatten, hvad skal man sige til en 'moderat terrorist'?

(Mere oversættelse følger. Bliv på kanalen!)

Phil, 36 min., fortsat:

Som vi ved ... en af de ting, der skete i går, som jeg ikke har en fuld rapport over, er, at kongresmedlem Walter Jones sammen med et par andre kongresmedlemmer holdt en pressekonference om disse 28 sider, der ikke er blevet offentliggjort, og som peger på saudiernes rolle, sammen med briterne, men her i særdeleshed de 28 sider omhandlende saudiernes rolle i [terrorangrebet på World Trade Center] 11. september [2001], og som er nært forestående, og som vil blive et punkt, der intensiverer sagen. Men de krævede den omgående offentliggørelse af de 28 sider; og ét af kongresmedlemmerne, Lynch, sagde faktisk, at, hvis dette ikke sker snart, og senest til 11. september, så vil vi oplæse de 28 sider i kongressalen, der således optages i protokollen. Det er et andet univers. Hvorfor sker det? Jeg tror, det er pga. det, kineserne og russerne laver, for det er sådan, verden fungerer. Alle leder efter en årsag nær ved hjemmet, og forsøg for resten ikke at forudsige det amerikanske præsidentvalg. For vi har Trump, der er et 'wild card', en sindssyg mand ... men hvorfor kom han så langt, som han er – fordi folk er vrede. Folk er oprørte over det, de gennemlever. Vi har Sanders, som folk troede, havde et bedre omdømme, men faktisk – han havde stemt for Irakkriegen osv., og han var et falsum et langt stykke hen ad vejen. Så er der Hillary, der virkelig er dårlig, og hun undersøges nu med denne FBI-ting. Verden befinner sig i en utrolig urolig tilstand, især i det, vi kalder det transatlantiske område (vesten). Men der er fremskridt i Asien, i Kina, og der er en nyligt valgt filippinsk præsident, der måske er i færd med at trække sig tilbage fra en konfrontation med Kina. Og USA presser på for

en konfrontation med Kina over det Sydkinesiske Hav.

Det, som Lyn og Helga siger, i det mindste, som jeg forstår det, er, at, i betragtning af en verden, der befinder sig i denne form for uro, så kan man ikke tage det væk. Noget af det, det foregår i USA – jeg kan ikke vurdere det alt sammen – men blot inden for de seneste par dage, med hvad der svarer til disse opstande, er, at vi har haft en ny runde med politiskudepisoder mod sorte mænd i USA, så protesterne er begyndt igen. Men der er en ustabilitet i situationen, der er global og universel. Vi har netop set åbningen af den sekundære Suezkanal, Panamakanalen åbner, kineserne investerer i det – faktisk er et stort flertal i verden i en position nu, hvor, hvis vi gjorde det, de kan sige, 'London er forbi. Vi gennemfører Glass-Steagall, New York [Wall Street] er forbi. Vi går tilbage til FDR med denne sag, og vi gennemfører win-win-politikken'. Men det, vi måøre for at få dette til at ske, er, at *vi må ændre vores syn på mennesket*. Vi har i det tyvende århundrede været igennem – og det er Lyns pointe, og hvor jeg kommer lidt frem til Einstein – i det tyvende århundrede er det, der i stigende grad er kommet frem, et syn på mennesket, der grundlæggende set kan reduceres til at være et dyr eller en maskine. Vi har måske – altså, folk går i kirke, i moskeen, folk har andre måder at udtrykke det, de har forskellige former for overbevisninger, som de taler om, spirituelle o. lign., men det siger faktisk ikke noget om, hvad arten af den menneskelige natur beviseligt er. I de fleste tilfælde vil det dreje sig om at opgive mennesket i denne verden, og om, hvad man så kan gøre for at redde sig selv. Hvad enten det nu drejer sig om at være en af 'de udvalgte', eller at komme i himlen; hvad historien nu måtte være. Og så har vi det system, som vi rent faktisk lever under, og dette står for mig mere end noget andet som det, som Det britiske Imperium vi sige, og hvorfor Obama er så dårlig. Og vi mener stadig, at Obama bør fjernes fra embedet; det ville være et pragtfuldt spark i – buksebagen – uanset, hvor længe han endnu kan sidde ved magten, fem eller syv måneder.

Det vigtigste element i Det britiske Imperium, mener jeg, og det er noget, jeg i hvert fald til en vis grad har lært af Lyn, er britisk epistemologi (erkendelsesteori; den menneskelige erkendelses natur, betingelser og grænser). Briternes syn på menneskeheden. Det er darwinisme, i den betydning, at, eftersom der er en evolutionær udvikling, så kan vi reducere mennesker til deres biologi, til at være aber, eller til noget, der stammer fra dyreliv. Eller gå længere endnu: at man kan reproducere menneskelig intelligens med en maskine. Der er nu opstået en hel ny runde af denne tænkning i øjeblikket. Denne idé kommer i bølger, at vi kan producere kunstig intelligens, at vi kan skabe maskiner, der tænker som mennesker. Det er rent ud sagt beviseligt, at man ikke kan. Kurt Gödel beviste det. Vi kan måske på en måde kontrollere biologiske former og skabe visse former for levende organismer, men det ville kræve en total ændring inden for videnskab. Det ville kræve, at man forstod princippet om livet; hvad det er, der gør livet levende. Jeg så et af disse causeriprogrammer med videnskabsfolk, hvor de angiveligt, eller faktisk talte om det, de kaldte kvantebiologi, som har nogle interessant punkter, men den store pointe hen imod slutningen var, at en af disse fyre sagde, 'jamen, det virkelige problem her er, at vi ikke ved, hvad livet er'. Men det her handler alt sammen om kvantebiologi. Og vi ved selvfølgelig virkelig ikke, hvad livet er. Hvad er det for et princip, der reflekteres i en levende organisme, og som giver det retning, formål? Som giver det en egenskab af hensigt? Af en drivkraft fremad ('go-orientation'), det, vi kalder teleologi[1]; endelige formål. Det er, hvad vi har med at gøre med livet; livet er under forandring, det er levende; det gør ting, der ikke er tilfældige. Hvad med menneskeligt liv? Og man hører disse diskussioner, og én af disse fyre vil indrømme, 'jamen, hvad er bevidsthed?' Og det er ikke blot bevidsthed, men det, som Lyn kalder kreativitet (evnen til at skabe).

Lad mig træde et skridt tilbage og give jer en idé om, hvad

denne form for begreb om kreativitet er. For det, Lyndon LaRouche siger, er, at kreativitet er nødvendig. Man kan sige en ting om kreativitet: På en vis måde er kreativitet det, som Leibniz ville kalde 'nødvendigt og tilstrækkeligt'. Den definerer, hvad menneskelige væsner er. Det er en bestemmede egenskab, der viser, at vi ikke er som dyrerne. Vi tilhører et andet domæne. Vi plejede at referere til dette som 'transfinit', altså med andre ord, at vi lever i et domæne, der er således, at man ikke kan måle noget som helst af, hvad vi gør, ud fra et standpunkt om et forudgående domæne. Man kan ikke måle noget som helst, der er af menneskelig art, ud fra standpunktet om abe-liv. Der er så mange mærkelige ting om alt det her med dyrerne; det er simpelt hen vanvittigt. For det første er chimpanser nogle af de mest afskyelige væsner, du nogen sinde har mødt. De er simpelt hen ondsindede. De slår hinanden ihjel, de æder deres afkom, i modsætning til dette billede, som folk engang yndede at udbrede. Jeg synes, det er mærkeligt, at modsætningen til chimpanser er det, de kalder bonobo-aber, en slags chimpanse af en anden art, den er yndefuld, slank, og hvad er så deres store ting? De har konstant forskelligartede former for sex. De er konstant engageret i seksuel aktivitet, og det gør dem så til en bedre version af chimpansen. Så det er altså det valg, man har. Man kan være en chimpanse og gå rundt og dræbe og føre krig og æde egne unger, eller også kan man være en bonobo, der hænger ned fra et træ og er engageret i sex i flæng hele dagen lang. Det er altså ikke det, der skete.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen!)

Det interessante; indgangsvinklen til at forstå det, som Lyn siger, er hans fysiske økonomi, fremsat i dens enkleste principper. Og man indser, hvor forskelligt dette er fra den måde, folk tænker på, til trods for, at det faktisk ikke er særlig kompliceret – jeg skriver ingen formler op. Jeg er alligevel ikke skrap nok til matematikken, og matematik er under alle omstændigheder ikke kreativitet. Hvad var det, Lyn

gjorde med den fysiske økonomi? Han gik ud fra det standpunkt, hvad er menneskets forhold, i samfundet, til naturen; hvordan overlever vi? Hvordan reproducerer vi menneskeslægten? Jamen, vi gør noget, der er meget enestående: vi applikerer viden, i form af teknologi, til en evne til, fra naturen, at udtrække ting, der tilsyneladende ikke er der. Selv jæger-samlere – som jægere udgør vi ikke den store mulighed: vi er ikke hurtige, vi har dog en hel del udholdenhed i forhold til andre dyr, så hvis man vil tilbringe sit liv med at jage giraffer i Kalahariørkenen, så er vi nogenlunde udrustet til at gøre det. Men den tankegang, at vi kan overleve som et kødædende dyr, er temmelig langt ude.

Så udviklede vi landbrug. Hvad gjorde vi? Vi tog videnskabelige kundskaber, ikke blot redskaber, men vi lærte visse ting om astronomi – hvem ved, hvor langt tilbage i tiden, der har været astronomi – sandsynligvis mindst et sted mellem 5.000 og 10.000 år. Der er endda fundet hulemalerier, der er 30-40.000, eller endda 50.000 år gamle, hvor der er tegn på kalendere. Men mindst 5 – 10.000 år. Vi anvendte denne videnskab til at ændre vores forhold til naturen. Vi blev i stand til at få ting ud af naturen, der tilsyneladende ikke eksisterede, som f.eks. vores evne til at anvende kobber og tin til at fremstille bronze, til fremstilling af metalredskaber. Og derfra rykkede vi opefter i vores viden om udvikling af metallerne. Det var alt sammen videnskabelige kundskaber, der blev anvendt til teknologi, der forbedrede vores evne – disse ting var der jo ikke bare, man kan ikke finde bronze i et flodleje, og der vokser ikke stål på en bjergside. Hvordan gjorde vi det – var det ved forsøg-og-fejl-metoden? Nej, det, der sker, er, at visse mennesker får en idé, de har en forestilling, men det er en ubøjelig forestilling; de vil finde ud af, hvordan de skal bruge deres tanker om det, der findes, til at udtrække ting, der tilsyneladende ikke er der for sanserne at se, og som i realiteten, i den form, i hvilken vi bruger det, ikke findes. Vi skaber eksistensen af i det mindste tæthedens af visse

materialer, osv., gennem skabende videnskabelig nyskabelse.

Hvis vi ikke gjorde det, ville vi ikke overleve. Vi ville ikke klare det, for vi ville løbe tør for ressourcer, ikke, fordi ressourcen ikke er der – det berømte eksempel er, at der i én kubikmeter jord findes praktisk taget ethvert mineral, man kunne ønske sig, men man kan ikke udvinde det, fordi det kræver en enorm mængde energi at udvinde det. Så, i takt med, at ens energi støder mod visse barrierer, må man udvikle ny videnskab, mere videnskabelig viden for at udvikle nye teknologier, der giver os nye ressourcer. Som vi altid har sagt, olie var ikke en ressource i 1400-tallet. Hvis man fandt olie i sin baghave, var det dårligt nyt. Det blev man ikke rig af, det blev man meget fattig af. Og så blev det til rigdom. Hvorfor? Det var ikke land-rigdom. Rigdom ligger ikke i jordbesiddelse.

Hvis man tænker over dette, hvad betyder det så; hvad er det, man i realiteten ønsker at skabe i en økonomi? Flere genstande – det har man til en vis grad brug for. Det, man virkelig har brug for, er flere mennesker. For, i takt med, at disse udviklinger finder sted, så øges uddannelsesniveauet, den forventede levetid, adgang til levestandard, og jeg mener ikke bare en levestandard, hvor man lever godt. Hvis man f.eks. ønsker at skabe børn, der kan, skal vi sige, arbejde i en moderne økonomi, kan man ikke berøve dem adgang til visse af et sådant samfunds produkter. Hvordan begynder et barn at lære om elektricitet, om at kontrollere lys og andre ting? Det lærer, at det har en vis magt over disse genstande. Og magten kommer visse steder fra. Det lærer også at relatere socialt til andre mennesker, fordi det har brug for disse mennesker for at kunne håndtere disse objekter og denne magt. Hvis han eller hun ikke har det, er han berøvet evnen til at forstå den videnskab, teknologi og det samfund, han eller hun lever i. Hvis man producerer fattigdom, er det ikke kun fattigdom, man producerer, men man underminerer udviklingen af selve samfundet og de kreative evner.

For det andet, så er kreativitet det træk, der definerer den menneskelige art. For nu at bruge et filosofisk-teknisk udtryk: Rent ontologisk er det menneskets natur at være kreativt, at vi har evnen til at være kreative. Vi kan udtrykke ideer, der frembringer kreativitet. Ideer, der udvikler andre mennesker. Hvis vi ikke har det, så agerer vi ikke i overensstemmelse med den menneskelige arts natur. Jeg tenderer – jeg er ikke en person, der har en vis baggrund – mod at fastslå den pointe, at dette er nødvendigt. Det er skønhed, hvis man tænker over det, at mennesker – ethvert menneske – har dette, og at det er en moralsk forpligtelse at give børn adgang til dette. Og jo mere videnskabelig udvikling, desto flere børn har man brug for, desto mere kreativitet har man brug for, og desto mere har man brug for at tænke på fremtiden.

De fleste af os – hvis vi ønsker at besvare nogle af de teologiske spørgsmål: Hvad er mit bidrag, hvad er min sjæl, hvad er det, jeg efterlader mig? Man efterlader en fremtid til de fremtidige generationer. Man bidrager til denne fremtid. Ideer, undervisning, udvikling, at redde mennesker. Og ikke alene det, for man må gøre noget, mener jeg, man må ikke alene skabe en fremtid; men man må skabe en fremtid på en sådan måde, at disse mennesker vil have evnen til at skabe en fremtid. Man må på en vis måde se ud over horisonten, længere end til horisonten til ting, som man ikke kan se; men at man har en følelse af, at man må agere på det, man må give de mennesker, der befinder sig på denne horisont, en garanti for, at de vil blive i stand til at se ud over den næste horisont. Og så begynder det i det mindste at nærme sig formålet med samfundet.

Dét er Lyns fysiske økonomi; det er i det mindste ét udtryk for det. Vi er af nødvendighed kreative, og med mindre vi får denne idé ud til andre nationer, andre folkeslag, til os selv, vil det ikke lykkes os at gennemføre det, vi må gøre lige nu for at garantere en fremtid. Vi vil stå over for krig. Lyn har

sagt, briterne bluffer, Obama bluffer; vi kan ikke gå op imod russerne på de østlige grænser med 4.000 tropper, eller hvor meget, det er. Men vi leger med ilden. Hvis vi tror, vi kan tyrannisere russerne, kineserne, presse dem, tvinge dem til at indvilge, efter det, vi gjorde mod dem i 1990'erne, er det højest usandsynligt.

Hvad vil det så ske? Jamen, enten provokerer vi russerne til et angreb, hvilket ikke er udelukket, hvis de tror, de selv vil blive angrebet – et atomangreb – eller også, hvis vi bluffer og bluffer, og vores bluff afsløres, ja, så affyrer vi, af ren desperation. Det er ikke bare 'krig ved et uhed', som man skal være bange for, selv om det er en mulighed.

Det er ét aspekt. Det andet aspekt er det, jeg fortalte om USA. Vi befinner os på en nedadgående kurs – jeg vil ikke gå i detaljer. Vi har høje rater af afhængighed af smertemedicin, osv. Vi har en voksende fattigdomsandel i befolkningen. Vi har ikke en infrastruktur, der er under udvikling. Vi har meget lidt videnskab tilbage, og det, der er tilbage – jeg vil fortælle noget, bare for at fortælle en vittighed. Vi plejede at sige, vi skaber raketcirklerne, og de arbejder på Wall Street! De hyrer nogle af topmatematikere, videnskabsfolk, raketingeniører osv., de hyrede dem i '80'erne og '90'erne til at udføre disse fantastiske algoritmer for finansverdenen, for en derivat; man skal være et geni for at regne det ud ... jeg bruger ordet bredt. Nu er Wall Street på spanden, så hvor bliver disse fyre hyret? De veluddannede fysikere? De bliver hyret til sportshold! Og hvad bliver de hyret til at gøre? De bliver hyret til at udføre endnu mere sofistikerede dataanalyser og fysiologi af atleten for at få dem til at præstere bedre og bedre og bedre og blive i stand til at vælge dem, der virkelig er de bedste spillere. Dette gælder for sport i USA, jeg kan nævne de sportshold, der har hyret nogle af disse fyre. Sikke et utroligt spild! Det er sandt; det er ikke noget, jeg står og finder på. Vi producerer knap nok tilstrækkeligt med videnskabsfolk, og så udregner de data for

det lokale fodboldhold.

Det, som Lyn taler om, er ægte kreativitet, og det er derfor, han refererer til Einstein. For at komme til pointen – men før jeg kommer til det, vil jeg fastslå en anden pointe, for det er vigtigt for at forstå Einstein. For spørgsmålet er: Hvordan skaber man kreativitet? Det, vi virkelig har behov for at reproducere, er kreative mennesker. Den virkelig værdi i en økonomi er raten af produktion af kreative mennesker, af videnskabelige og kunstneriske genier. Det er det mål, hvormed man måler sig selv. Hvordan gør man det? Man vil sige, at man uddanner folk videnskabeligt – ikke matematisk. De store videnskabsfolk var ikke matematikere, i modsætning til, hvad folk tror. Matematik er destruktiv, medmindre den anvendes som et tillæg til ægte videnskab. For hvad er matematik andet end et sæt af regler, som man må blive indenfor, hvilket betyder, at man ikke kan frembringe noget nyt? Man kan ikke skabe noget.

Hvordan frembringer man så kreativitet? Det er her, klassisk kunst kommer ind ... man kan ikke bare sige til et barn, gå ud og opdag noget! Man må have en idé om, hvordan intellektet må fungere for at gøre en opdagelse. Af hvilken art, den menneskelige natur er. Noget får man fra historien, ved at se på, hvordan opdagelser blev gjort, ved at gentage videnskabelig aktivitet. *Men kernen i det får man fra klassisk kunst.* For, hvad er det, man gør, især inden for musik, men også med poesi og drama; de har hver deres aspekt. Men hvad er det, man gør? Man skaber et vist tilsyneladende paradoks, en tilsyneladende problemstilling, hvor, hvis folk fortsætter med at agere, eller musikeren fortsætter ud ad det spor, han følger, i kompositionen, eller i opførelsen af kompositionen, så vil den bryde sammen, den vil ende med at lyde som støj. Eller også bliver den bare kedelig, for noget af det, der sker, er, at man bare bliver ved med at gentage sig selv. Måske med en let ændring, men hvis man lytter til visse former for musik, som rapp-musik, men selv folkemusik. Et af

problemerne, hvis man kun har folkemusik, den kan være smuk, har måske dejlige melodier, men den har tendens til at være repeterende. Så, hvis man ikke har en fornemmelse for at skabe noget nyt af den kanoniserede musik, så sidder man fast. Og hvad gør klassisk musik? Bortset fra korformen, den sociale form osv., så gør den det, at den af dig kræver, at du skaber noget, der aldrig hidtil er blevet hørt. Eller at man i det mindste opfører den, og i processen med at opføre den, så repeterer man på en vis måde i sit intellekt den oprindelige opdagelse. Hvad havde komponisten i tankerne, og hvad gjorde han eller hun, der ændrede musikkens natur og udtrykte den fundationale idé om skabelsen af ideer? Musik er på en vis måde en meta-disciplin. Man skaber ideer om, hvordan ideer skabes. Man ser dette i kor, det er derfor, polyfoni er så vigtigt. Det er derfor, det veltempererede klaver var så vigtigt. For det gav grader af frihed i udviklingen af og udtrykket for nye ideer.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen!)

Dette er én ting, som Einstein, og især hans generation, men som Einstein vidste. Han var en rimeligt habil violinist. Nogle mennesker siger, at han ikke var særlig god, nogle siger, at han var virkelig god; jeg har ingen anelse. Men iflg. alle overleveringer var han en rimeligt habil violinist. Det, der var vigtigt for ham, var, at musikken var afgørende for hans evne til at tænke. Ikke sådan, at han gav sig til at spille violin, og så følte han sig afslappet, og så fik han en idé. Men det var sådan, at musikken var den måde, han tænkte bedst på. [Max] Planck var lige ved at blive koncertpianist, og det var først ved et givent tidspunkt, han besluttede, det var bedre for ham at blive fysiker. Og i den generation spillede de fleste af dem, Nurdst, de spillede alle, Aronfels, de var ikke alle store videnskabsmænd; men denne kultur med at udvikle ideer, gennemarbejde nye ideer, gøre nye ideer gældende var rodfæstet i klassisk kultur, i Schiller. Einsteins moder var f.eks. en stor læser af Schiller, Heine,

og hans fader var vist også en stor tilhænger af Heine. Det var i heldigste fald den kultur, der blev udviklet. Og det var dette, der gjorde det muligt for sådan en som Einstein at blive en stor tænker. Han var f.eks. ikke nogen stor matematiker; han var ikke en dårlig matematiker, men han var ikke en stor matematiker; han var fysiker. Han havde sine berømte 'gedanken'-eksperimenter: Han skabte i sine tanker visse betragtninger, og han spurgte dem, hvad er løsningen på problemet i disse betragtninger, eller hvad var det, der reflekteredes? Hvad, om jeg kan rejse lige så hurtigt som en lysbølge? Ville universet stoppe? Er det muligt at rejse hurtigere ... Det var ikke løsningen, men det gjorde det muligt for ham at tænke over ting, som han ellers ikke ville have tænkt over. Og slutteligt fik han nogle afgørende ideer, om lysets hastighed var konstant, men mere endnu, det, at love, fysiske love, var universelt gældende. Det er det, relativitetsprincippet ... relativitetsprincippet er det modsatte af det, man tror, det er, og som det ofte fremstilles, var blot ens perspektiv. Nej, hele pointen med Einstein, i betragtning af nogle af tidens problemer, der er af mere teknisk art, om elektromagnetisme, teorien om æteren osv., dukkede der visse problemer op. Og Einstein sagde, vi må have et system, hvor dette systems love gælder for hele universet, for alt! Uanset, hvad den uniforme bevægelse er, uanset, hvad accelerationen var, og uanset raten af forandring, det var generel relativitet. Så det var ikke relativitet, men i virkeligheden, hvad er de universelle principper, som jeg kan sige er sande uanset hvilken bevægelse, der foregår? Og dette var, hvad han anvendte på grundlaggende set alting. Og hans indsats inden for enhedsfeltet var ikke én enkelt ligning, men det var et forsøg på at finde de underliggende, universelle principper, der styrede alle de tilsyneladende spørgsmål i universet. Elektromagnetisme, tyngdekraft, den stærke og svage kraft, og atomkerneniveauet. Og tænk over, hvad der foregår i det 20. århundrede. I det 20. århundrede er der et angreb på denne form for tænkning. Fra Bertrand Russel, til en vis grad fra

Hilbert; og det, der udgjorde en del af angrebet, var, at vi må holde os til matematikken. Lad os aksiomatisere matematikken.

(Der kommer mere oversættelse. Bliv på kanalen.)

[1] filosofisk anskuelse, hvor man mener, at det, der sker i verden, har et formål, en hensigt.

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

**Hovedtale på Schiller
Instituttets
internationale konference i
Berlin,**

25. – 26. juni, 2016

Før jeg kommer ind på disse forskellige dødbringende farer, så ligger løsningen ligefor. Så vær fattede og bevar roen, og lad mig tale til jer. Hvis menneskeheden forenes omkring en god plan og handler solidarisk og modigt, kan enhver krise i den menneskelige civilisation overvindes, for det er menneskets natur – at, når vi bliver udfordret af et stort onde, vækkes en endog endnu større kraft for det gode i vores sjæl.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Tiden er nu inde for en
Ny Renæssance for
menneskeheden!
LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast, 1. juli
2016.
Inkl. videoklip fra
hovedtalere på**

Schiller Instituttets konference i Berlin.

Aftenens webcast omfatter en eksklusiv video-premiere fra Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Berlin, 25.-26. juni – en global intervention, der ikke kunne være kommet på et vigtigere tidspunkt. I kølvandet på Brexit-valget ser vi det finansielle systems sammenbrud dukke op igen og en accelerering af fremstødet for krig – udviklinger, der ikke blev forårsaget af Brexit-valget, men som er udtryk for det samlede transatlantiske systems sammenbrudsproces som helhed. Lyndon LaRouches vurdering er klar: diverse manøvrer og spil internt i systemet kan ikke fungere; systemet er gået ned, og der er ingen måde, hvorpå det kan overleve i sin nuværende form. Dette betyder ikke, at vi absolut skal i krig, men man spiller et meget farligt bluff. Som det blev demonstreret på denne historiske konference, så er den eneste løsning den at indføre en ny tankegang, et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden, et skifte i lighed med det, der fandt sted med den berømte, 14-hundredetals Gyldne Renæssance, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche uophørligt har understreget.

Lyndon LaRouche på Schiller Institut-konference i Berlin (uddrag; se video min. 14:05):

»For det første undersøger vi dette spørgsmål med, hvad er mennesket pr. definition? Menneskets evne til at skabe højere niveauer af udvikling af menneskehedens menneskelige evner?

Det andet er: Hvordan finder vi ting, der vil gøre menneskeden mere succesfuldt eksisterende? Det er endnu et spørgsmål. Alle disse ting er enkle, videnskabelige spørgsmål, og det, vi er afhængige af, er det, vi kalder at fremme fysisk videnskab, og

at fremme det til et højere niveau, pr. person, uophørligt. I denne proces må man definere, ved hvilke midler, dette skal gøres. Det har altid været min interesse at komme frem til en ny, mere avanceret teknologi; en teknologi, der vælter og fjerner behovet for en eksisterende teknologi. Mit speciale er at koncentrere mig om revolutionen i anvendelige teknologier. Og dette er det eneste redskab, jeg kender til, ved hvilket mennesket kan forbedre det, mennesket nu har behov for [for fortsat at eksistere].«

Engelsk udskrift.

— THE TIME FOR A NEW RENAISSANCE FOR MANKIND IS NOW! —

LaRouche PAC Friday webcast for July 1, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's July 1st, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here on Friday evening from LaRouchePAC.com. As you'll see, I'm joined in the studio by my colleague Benjamin Deniston; and we're joined via video by two members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee: Bill Roberts, joining us from Detroit, Michigan; and Michael Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California.

We have a very special broadcast tonight in which we will be featuring a short video "teaser," which will provide you a substantial overview of the conference, the very important and historic conference, which just recently concluded over last weekend in Berlin, Germany, sponsored by the Schiller

Institute.

As a preface to that video, which will provide us the material for a further discussion here tonight, let me just say

that it couldn't have come at a better time – this conference. It's clear to see that there's an absolute disintegration of the

trans-Atlantic system, which we are experiencing right now.

This

is not {only} an economic or financial disintegration, but this

is in fact a disintegration of the entire {system} as a whole.

This is a political breakdown, this is a social breakdown; this

is an intellectual breakdown of the axioms which have provided the foundation of that failed system. The axioms underlying this

trans-Atlantic system have failed. It's bankrupt in every sense

of the word, not only financially, but also politically, culturally, intellectually, and the only solution to that would

be replacing this failed system with an entirely new paradigm.

This is exactly what Mr. LaRouche had to say when we had an

extensive discussion with him yesterday. The people who are on this broadcast tonight all participated in that discussion.

What

Mr. LaRouche said is that there is no way that this trans-Atlantic system can survive. It's not to say that it is not

very dangerous and that it could have very terrible consequences

if the war were to be launched or if other things were to get out

of hand. But what's being done under these circumstances by the

so-called "leadership" of this failed trans-Atlantic system "is a complete bluff. It will not work," Mr. LaRouche said. He said, "We're facing a very serious kind of collapse, one which mankind is not well-prepared to deal with."

This is very clear. At the same time that you have a plummeting of the entire financial markets in the trans-Atlantic system, you've got an inverse escalation in the bellicosity and the aggressive stance that is coming out of Obama and his colleagues, against Russia and China, both. Obama was in Ottawa just yesterday at [the "Three Amigos"] summit of the North Americas, in which he was {twisting} the arm of the Canadians, telling them that they need to participate in a much more prominent way in combatting so-called "Russian" aggression, by lending their troops to this NATO deployment.

The Atlantic Council is calling for this NATO deployment to become a {permanent} deployment on the borders of Russia. Russia is very clear: Shoigu, the Defense Minister, responded, saying that NATO has already doubled its deployment along the border of Russia and this is already before the NATO Summit has happened, which is scheduled to occur in Warsaw, where you can expect that that deployment will "significantly increase."

Mr. LaRouche went on to say, when we were discussing this with him yesterday, that you can see that all the so-called "leadership" of this system is bankrupt. "The leadership itself is bankrupt as an institution. Not that they {have} a problem,

but that they {are the} problem." "They are fraudsters," he said,
"and we are, in fact, the only leadership available on the
scene."

What Mrs. LaRouche had to say – and this is, again, in
the
aftermath of her experience as the primary organizer and
keynote
speaker of this very important conference which you are about
to
see some excerpts from – she said, "Look, this could not have
come at a better time. This was literally two days after the
Brexit vote. And the Brexit is merely paradigmatic of the
entire
breakdown crisis. You have an ongoing disarray, ongoing chaos
and
disintegration coming out of this. You have the breaking apart
of
the entire leadership of the United Kingdom. All of the major
political parties are like gangs of wolves at their own
throats,
and it's very possible that Scotland, Ireland could both leave
the United Kingdom, turning 'Great' Britain into 'Lesser'
Britain, or 'Very Small' Britain."

She said we have no idea where this is going, but it makes
it very clear that this conference couldn't have occurred at a
better time, because what was presented and what you will see
in
this brief overview that we're about to play for you, is that
{there can be no piecemeal solutions.} Too little, too late.
You
can't solve this problem here and this problem there, and try
to
piece it all together. The only thing that will work is an
entirely new paradigm that supplants the failed way of
thinking

with an entirely new set of principles, she said, "A new era of civilization. And, if you don't make the jump," she said, "you're just not going to make it."

With that said, I would like to present to you a brief overview of the conference which occurred in Berlin. This is to entice you to watch the full proceedings, which will be available in video form in due time.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think we all have come to this conference because everybody who is in this room knows that we are experiencing an absolutely unprecedented, systemic, and existential crisis of civilization. You have the coincidence of a war danger, where NATO is confronting Russia in a very, very aggressive fashion which could lead to a third world war. You have a U.S. confrontation against China in the South China Sea. You have the danger of a new 2008-type of financial crisis which could blow up the financial system. And, two days ago, you had the Brexit – Great Britain voting to leave the European Union. As we all know, this was not a vote against Europe as such, but it was a vote against a completely unjust system and a corrupt elite.

The conference has one subsuming topic, and that is to define solutions to these crises, to discuss what would be the new paradigm, and is mankind capable of solving such an existential crisis?

We have distinguished speakers from four continents, from many countries. They are representative of the kinds of people who are determined that a solution is being found. Before I go

into touching upon these various mortal dangers, the solution is easy. So, be addressed and be calm. If men unite for a good plan and act in solidarity with courage, {any} crisis in human civilization can be overcome, because that is the nature of human beings: that when we are challenged with a great evil, an even greater force of good is being awoken in our soul.

AMB. (ret) CHAS W. FREEMAN, JR: Helga, I'd like to thank you for that very inspiring set of opening remarks. We have entered a world in which, as William Butler Yeats put it in 1919: "Things fall apart; the center cannot hold; mere anarchy is loosed upon the world." In Europe, in America, and in parts of Asia there is a sense of foreboding – an elemental unease about what is to come. There is vexing drift amidst political paralysis. Demagoguery is ascendant and the stench of fascism is in the air.

This is the global context in which China has proposed to integrate the entire Eurasian landmass with a network of roads, railroads, pipelines, telecommunications links, ports, airports, and industrial development zones. If China's "One Belt, One Road" concept is realized, it will open a vast area to economic and intercultural exchange, reducing barriers to international cooperation in a 65-country zone with 70% of the world's population, with over 40% of its GDP, generating well over half of its current economic growth.

In concept, the Belt and Road program, which is one of the major topics of this conference, is the largest set of engineering projects ever undertaken by humankind. Its potential to transform global geo-economics and politics is proportional to its scale.

COL. (ret) ALAIN CORVEZ: I want to congratulate the Schiller Institute for organizing this conference at a critical moment when the threat of a nuclear war which would lead to the extinction of humanity becomes clearer every day, because of the concentration in the heart of Europe of weapons capable of destroying the planet within seconds.

To respond to the reinforcements of U.S. strategic forces inside NATO on European territory, Russia was forced to deploy an equivalent arsenal of deterrence on its western borders. It's therefore high time that the strategists of various countries, even those far from the European Theater, demand restraint and more wisdom from the heads of state of the entire world.

This is the purpose of this beneficial institute founded by Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, whom I wish to compliment personally.

JACQUES CHEMINADE; French Presidential candidate: So, LaRouche thinking proceeds from the becoming, as a science which is the active principle of the economy. The trans-Atlantic financial system in which we are living, based on accumulation of money, is leading to the opposite, not to increasing the size

of
the physical economy, but to chaos and war, or, more precisely and more tragically, to a combination of both.

The preceding speakers have shown that the current world is more dangerous, yes, more dangerous, than it ever was during the height of the Cold War. Those proclaiming themselves "realists" and "reasonable," while following the rules of the system, in reality contribute to its collapse by the mere fact that they operate inside the system without fighting it.

Now we have arrived at the point in history where systemic change, a just concept of economy and man, are necessary for the survival of all. Money has no intrinsic value. It is nothing but an instrument, acquiring value through what it promotes. From there on, what is the goal to reach?

LYNDON LAROUCHE: First of all, we're looking at this issue of man, as such – man's ability to create higher levels of development of the human powers of mankind. The next thing is: how do we understand, how do we find things that are going to make mankind more successfully existent? That's another question. All these things are simple, scientific questions. What we depend upon, is driving what we call "physical science," and driving it, {per capita}, to a higher level, always.

In that process, you have to define what the means is by which you're going to do this. My concern is always to come up with a new technology, a more advanced technology, one which

overturns and obviates the need for an existing technology.

My

specialty is concentrating on the revolution in the applicable technologies; and that is the only device by which I know that mankind can improve the requirements for mankind now.

MARCO ZANNI; head of M5S delegation in the Eco. and Monetary

Affairs Cttee. of the European Parliament: The European financial

system is collapsing; it's collapsing because of wrong policies

brought about by European governments and by the European Union.

Clearly, a first step – and we proposed one bill in the Italian

Parliament and one in the European Parliament in the framework of

the banking structure reform is restoring banking separation.

We

think that we have to set up a sort of modern European

Glass-Steagall that will simplify the regulation on the banking

system, and will make the separation between the core part of a

bank and a speculative bank in order to create a banking system

that is no longer focussed on speculation, on the financial system; but on the needs of the real economy, on the needs of people. This is the first step.

AMB. (ret) LEONIDAS CHRYSANTOPOULOS: Another threat facing

humanity is the US animosity towards Russia, as if we were still

in the Cold War period. This was discussed in the previous panel, but very roughly I would just say about it. A missile

system is being set up to encircle Russia; and of course, Moscow

is preparing a defense field to counter it. The EU embargo on Russia after the Ukrainian crisis is not at all helping the situation. Also, threats have been recently made by Obama against China and the need to restrict her economic power.

With

a collapsing EU and a USA looking for confrontation with Russia

and China, a solution for humanity can be the BRICS initiative;

which is the initiative of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa to pursue a policy of economic development for the

benefit of humanity. They have created their own development bank to invest in the necessary development projects. China has

established the Asia Infrastructure [Investment] Bank; joined by

over 20 Asian nations as founding members, and has set up a Silk

Road Development Fund.

AMB. HAMID SIDIG; current Ambassador of Afghanistan to Germany: I would like to express my gratitude and honor to be part of this important event. Over the past 30 years, the Schiller Institute has played a significant role in promoting international discussion on major topics, and has shaped the future of our work. Since ancient times, the Silk Road has been

a symbol of the commercial artery to connect Asia and Europe; creating wealth and cultural exchange to benefit all countries involved in this area. Our conference today – and I hope to build on this ancient tradition, by bringing together scientists

and politicians to develop a New Silk Road; and begin the process

of healing, integrating, and regenerating this very important region – Central Asia. Our vision is to create a secure and peaceful life for our region, which will allow thousands of refugees to return back to their homes and rebuild their communities again.

BEREKET SIMON; chairman of Commercial Bank of Ethiopia,

advisor to PM: I would like to express my heartfelt sympathy and

support to the people of Syria, Iraq, Libya, and the larger Middle Eastern and North African countries who are subjected to a

wanton destruction as a result of a mistaken policy of regime change by some global powers. Allow me also to thank the Schiller Institute for inviting me to speak on a broad topical issue – the importance of the economic development of Ethiopia in the context of the New Silk Road and the greater African region.

Dear Friends, Ethiopia considers China's Silk Road economic

projects and maritime Silk Road projects jointly known as One Belt, One Road as another milestone opportunity that could contribute to sustain its economic development together with all

the countries in our region. We believe that the last decade or

two have witnessed the resurgence of trade between Africa and the

East. The New Silk Road would also further strengthen the mutual

benefits of expanded trade between nations. This will apply to

the relationship between Ethiopia and its traditional partners [inaud; 20:49]. Together with our neighbors in the region, we are determined to an Ethiopian, and indeed African, renaissance

which can harness the new possibilities opened by developments like the New Silk Road. I thank you.

AMB. (ret) MICHEL RAIMBAUD: Good morning. I want to talk

to you about Syria and the title of my intervention is "In Syria

and Elsewhere, Against the War Party and the Law of the Jungle,

We Have to Rebuild Peace and International Law"; these are my themes. First of all, the world today is in great danger of war;

more than ever before. It's going through a global crisis – that has been said already. One hears much about a new Cold War,

which would lead us back to the old confrontation between the free world, so-called, the Axis of Good, and the totalitarian bloc, dubbed the Axis of Evil by George Bush.

We have lift immediately the sanctions; if there's a message

I want to give you, these sanctions have to be lifted. It's a crime of war; it's a major crime of war. This has to be lifted

right away; we have to fight for this.

Message from FOUAD AL-GHAFFARI; Chairman of Advisory Office

for Coordination with BRICS, Yemen: Dear Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the noble chairwoman of the Schiller Institute and

the New Silk Road Lady; dear Mr. Hussein Askary, the Middle East

coordinator of the Schiller Institute, Ladies and Gentlemen who

are gathered in this conference here in Berlin today; I carry a

great deal of joy and gratitude for you and for your team for

the outstanding awareness achieved in my country about the New Silk Road and the World Land-Bridge, and the new economic system of the BRICS. All that awareness delivered special marks that is occurring through our advisory office, the rights to publish and distribute the Arabic of the EIR Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge"; and printing 1000 copies for the Yemeni market.

DR. BOUTHAINA SHAABAN; from the Presidency of Syria:
If we need to create a world for all, if we need to create a peaceful world, if we need to create a prosperous world for all, we need to create a conceptual, intellectual concept of one world; we need to create a conceptual concept of the Silk Road. Not only an actual Silk Road, but an intellectual Silk Road. All of you know that Aleppo and Syria were extremely crucial in the ancient Silk Road that connected Asia to Europe. Syria and the Syrian people will be more than happy to be also very active in a New Silk Road, in a political, social, intellectual Silk Road that connects Asia to the West; that connects Eurasia to the West.

PROJECT PHOENIX video: Not only Aleppo, but all of Syria with its people, culture and artifacts, represents a unique and living testimony to the coexistence and continuity of different human civilizations. It is imperative that the world defend and preserve it; and when peace is established, make it the world capital for the dialogue of civilizations.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: So, I think we should be fully conscious that in this present crisis lies a tremendous chance to reach a new Renaissance as significant, and maybe even more significant, than the change from the Middle Ages to the modern times. That if we break with the axioms of the globalization, of the deductive thinking, of all the things which have led to this crisis; and focus on the creativity of mankind as that which distinguishes us from other species, that many of us can probably live to see a world where each child is educated universally and that the normal condition of mankind will be genius. That that which is human will be fully developed, to have all the potentials developed of the human species as creative composers, scientists, engineers, extraordinary people discovering things which we doesn't even know the question here of; like China going to the far side of the Moon. We will understand secrets of the Universe which we don't even know yet to ask. And people will become better people. I believe that the true nature of human beings is good; that every human being has a capacity of limitless perfection and goodness of the soul. And to accomplish that, is within reach; and let's work for it.

OGDEN: So, as you can see, this was an absolutely extraordinary conference. And on the final screen, you saw briefly the website displayed where you can find the full proceedings of the conference. It's newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com. And although that was a

tour
de force of incredible speakers of a really incredible caliber,
that was not even all of the speakers who were present. So,
we
encourage you to go to the website and watch all of the presentations in full. Mrs. LaRouche was emphatic in saying after the fact, that this was an absolute breakthrough in terms of the activity of the LaRouche Movement, the types of people, the caliber of people who were there. This was not just an analysis, or talking about issues, or the problems of the planet.

But it could be seen very clearly that we are the center of organizing the solution, organizing the change in paradigm.

One of the other things that was a major feature of this conference, which we just couldn't include in that overview, was an outstanding Classical musical concert that was organized on the evening of the conference. This included a Russian children's choir singing Russian songs; it included a string orchestra based out of London that plays professionally at the lower Verdi tuning of A-432; it included a performance of Chinese folk songs and other Classical music; and then a grand finale performance of the Mozart Coronation Mass by the greater European Schiller Institute Chorus, joined by other choruses from around Berlin.

So, this is an absolute breakthrough; and as Mrs. LaRouche said, the conceptions which lie at the heart of the solutions to the crisis were there. And this was representative of the leadership of the world. And I think that's what we have to

offer in this moment of danger and uncertainty.

So, I think we can open up the discussion from there; it's a hard act to follow, I'm sure, but ...

MICHAEL STEGER: Well I think that the point that Helga made

that you just referenced, Matt, on this question of shaping policy; what you see increasingly now not only in Eurasia, but what we saw with the participation at the conference with significant participation from Europe, high-level participation

from the United States. You see an increasing desire to look at

the fact that this current system, even the {New York Times} had

the intellectual ability to recognize that this post-World War II

system, the system set up by Churchill, by the FBI – this Wall Street system – since Franklin Roosevelt's death, is essentially

now coming to an end. That's what the Brexit references. The conference as a whole was in the context of the Brexit vote; but

it's not simply a vote to leave the European Union. This is a reaction by an increasing majority in the trans-Atlantic within

the population; which recognizes that the system is dying.

It's

dead. There's no longer a future, a life in the current system

they're living in. Whether that's Great Britain, whether it's the United States, where you see the major populist revolts here;

this was discussed by many of the speakers. And many of them didn't expect it to occur; and yet, when you're on the ground and

you're organizing the population, when you have increasing suicide rates, increasing drug overdoses, increasing levels of unemployment, it's not hard to figure out when talking to the population.

It's a new system, a system of value, a financial system; but it's a policy. It's a policy for the long-term development of mankind that has to be conjured and redeveloped in the minds of the population. And I think that's what's so essential about the conference is that Helga's entire intent with this conference, and why Lyn's participation was so important, was because it provokes a quality of discussion. A new conception of where mankind must go and what mankind must become; and that really is the essential nature. Because at this point, this trans-Atlantic system has no longer any life; it almost like it's breaking, it's fracturing. Each break leads to more breaks. The question is, what's the new whole; what's the new conception of mankind in the trans-Atlantic and for the world?

And I think we have a lot of work to do, but clearly it's the most open situation politically that we've ever seen.

WILLIAM ROBERTS: I would just add that I think for an American audience, the thing really to take away from this whole process is that clearly what we're seeing in terms of the process of development of the New Silk Road, and in terms of the beauty of the idea which I think people, as they have a chance to

experience the cultural panel, the musical process from this conference, will geopolitics is irrepressible at this point. What that means is that there's no turning back; there are no half measures or piecemeal measures to do anything

of a halfway nature at this point. I would say that this includes that it really should be very obvious to the American population that this current election process is a complete and

utter sham. A so-called "democratic" election process, where you

have a couple of candidates, but there's absolutely no discussion

of the ridiculous war crimes of the last 15 years of administrations in the United States. Even in Britain now, you

have Jeremy Corbyn who is threatening to bring a war crimes tribunal, should he come into government, against Tony Blair.

The

Blair crowd is shaking in their boots, and you can see that there

is a complete and total situation of weakness of this entire British Empire at this moment. And because this is really unclear in the minds of the American people, and because it's very unclear how close we are to thermonuclear war, how aggressively the threat of thermonuclear warheads is being used

against China and Russia. Because the ignorance to that is the

most dangerous thing that's contributing to the danger that's facing this planet right now.

I think the one pathway or one tool in the United States

that expresses that level of an abrupt shift against geopolitics

in particular, is what is now the motion around the 28 pages to

expose the role of the British and the Saudis and the cover-up of that process. Sen. Bob Graham has made the point in a recent interview in the {Daily Beast} that it's very clear now that the two-month period that the Obama administration gave him assurances of that they would review the pending release of the 28 pages. That's come and past now; and it's clear the intent is to keep this thing in the dark and continue the desperate war push.

I'll just mention one more thing. There are also now, the Obama administration is completely pushing a lie and vastly under counting the number of innocent civilians that have been killed by drone strikes throughout the countries that we're not at war with. It should really just hit people, the contrast between the beauty of this process of a world beyond geopolitics and the unconscious war crimes and the acceptance of the legitimacy of a process which completely covers over and overlooks the tremendous war crimes of these recent two administrations. So, I think that should be a real immediate wake-up call that we do have to, as Americans, break out of this current paradigm.

OGDEN: What Helga began the discussion with, which I think shaped the entire quality of all of the panels, was the statement – which was a very profound statement – that in the face of

great evil, mankind is capable of finding within himself great good. And I think that you were witnessing that in all of the speakers. The spirit that was moving all of these speakers, is

one that this system can no longer be allowed to continue; it has

reached the point where it is too horrible to contemplate the logical outcome of following through with a continuation of the

values that underlie this system as a whole. And we see it breaking itself down all around us. None of these events that have occurred are somehow causal of the breakdown of the system;

they are merely systematic, they are paradigmatic. The Brexit is

paradigmatic; everything that you see in terms of what Michael was sighting about the depression, the demoralization, the despair in the populations in both the United States and Europe.

This is symptomatic of a system that is in dire need of dramatic change.

The good news is that that change, the wind is blowing in

from the East. You have a new system, which has come to life based on proposals that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche laid out in their seed form 30 or 40 years ago. It's now taken the form of

the official policy of the most populous country in the world. You have the official, public integration between the New Silk Road and the Eurasian Economic Union; this is explicitly based on

a return to the values that Franklin Roosevelt envisioned would

dominate the world following World War II. However, [they] were

supplanted by some very evil and destructive forces. Now you

have the New Silk Road, you have the opportunity for an entirely new paradigm, which Helga says repeatedly; and which she said at that conference. It would be so easy; this is not some daunting, never-ending distant dream of a new system which is a fantasy. It's very real; it's very present; and it's something that, on the turn of a dime, by a handful of leaders comprised of many of the people you saw speaking at that conference and the circles that they represent. A decision overnight to enter this new paradigm and to drop some of the failed values that have led us down this path to danger and destruction, would be sufficient to bring Europe, to bring the United States, to bring the Western world into harmony with a New Paradigm which is already emerging.

Not that anything is perfect, but there is a directionality, there is an impulse towards the perfection of man, towards the increase of the productive powers of the human race, towards the greater good of the human species; which is guiding us or pulling us into the future. And if we're willing to listen to that voice, the voice from the future; we can save man at this critical juncture in our history.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think it really goes to the issue to the power of ideas in this whole process. Because I think Helga made the very emphatic point that this was a major breakthrough conference. If people are familiar with the Schiller Institute, much of its activity is centered on these international conferences. And if you go back to the mid-'90s, the

conferences we were involved in, Helga was involved in then, and the launching of the whole Eurasian Land-Bridge perspective when it was just an idea. It was just a conception; it was a right idea, it was true, it was on principle. And Lyn and Helga fought for that conception; and now you see it coming to fruition. So I think this whole process is useful, especially for people who watch too much TV in the United States and are immersed in the insanity of the United States, to get a sense of what's actually real; what's actually powerful. What matters in history. It's not the crap you see thrown around that this culture is inundated with; that is a passing breeze in history that's going to come and go. What matters is your truthful commitment to principles, to true ideas.

And I think Helga's concluding remark about looking at where we are from this much longer historical perspective and saying "We need a new shift in our very recognition of what mankind is. We need to look to things like the Golden Renaissance; and look at mankind in the Middle Ages, in the Dark Ages. And compare that to what mankind became after the Renaissance. It's a complete transformation of the human species that I think Lyn was intervening with in some of the discussions; that we have to recognize that that character of continual complete revolution in the very nature of our existence, is human. So you're looking at

a moment like this, and Lyn really emphasized the self-breakdown of this trans-Atlantic system. This self-feeding breakdown process. People talk about the Brexit like what maneuvering are

they doing; why did they decide to do that. They're panicking;

they're responding to crises that are being created by the breakdown process itself. This is not something that's in control. In that complete disintegration, it's these conceptions, these ideas, this gathering of people of this caliber for international discussion around what does mankind really need to be doing as mankind on this planet. Can we finally reach the point where we actually unite nations around a

real conception of what is a universal, unifying, truthful principle about humanity? About what makes our species unique and different from anything else we see on this planet.

That's

us; that's mankind. We can have that as a common goal, as a common unifying factor; and that's emerging now.

So, I think for people inundated with the degeneracy of the political process, the cultural process, this stands out as a reference point that people can use to lift their minds out of the gutter of popular opinion and into history and see what's actually happening right now.

OGDEN: Absolutely. One thing that people will have noticed from that overview video that you had the opportunity to watch, is that there was a very significant involvement from leadership within Syria. Right in the war zone, including a government advisor, Her Excellency, the advisor who you saw speaking; which

was a live video hook-up directly from Damascus. And she engaged in a dialogue process with the attendees of that conference, which was very significant. Helga LaRouche said that that panel, which was an entire panel on the reconstruction of Syria. What happens after we bring peace? How can we bring peace to this region? A region which is a crossroads of civilization; was a crossroads of the old Silk Road, is a crossroads between three continents. She raised the fact that President Assad, prior to the outbreak of the fighting, had proposed an idea called the Five-Sea Strategy. And if you look at the five oceans – the Red Sea, the Caspian Sea, the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, and the Persian Gulf – you have Syria situated right in the middle of those. So, it's not only a crossroads of the Silk Road as a land route from Asia to Europe to Africa; but it's also a crossroads of the Maritime Silk Road, and the connections between these five seas.

There was a video presented which was prepared prior to the conference called "Project Phoenix"; which is a vision for the reconstruction of Syria. And there was other dialogue at the conference from very high-level persons from within cultural circles and also government circles within Syria. So, Helga was emphatic to say that this panel on the reconstruction of Syria was certainly a highlight of the conference; and I think it was just exemplary of the fact that the Schiller Institute really is

the go-to body in terms of these people who are desperate for a solution, desperate for a future for their countries. They know who has the ideas, they know where to go to get those ideas. So, the combination between the expansion of the New Silk Road, the reconstruction of Syria, there were three resolutions that were passed at the conference. One for the immediate end to the sanctions against Russia; another for an immediate end to the sanctions against Syria; and also one against the Saudi bombardment of Yemen, which is ongoing to this day. And you saw a gentleman who sent in a video from Yemen; right from the war zone there.

I can't emphasize enough, and I think you got a little bit of a flavor during that overview, of the caliber of this conference. But I really can't emphasize enough: You need to watch this conference in full. You need to share this; you need to get this around to everybody who you know. As you were saying, Ben, this is a completely different perspective on the world than what you would normally get from your average mainstream media. So, I just wanted to encourage you, again, to – as the videos become available – to go the newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com website.

STEGER: Just to add to that, Matthew, I think you might have mentioned this at the beginning; but in the discussion with Helga and Lyn yesterday, the reality is that the kind of collapse

and crisis we are now incurring is something beyond anything mankind has experienced up to this point. This is not a collapse

of the stock market; it's not a Lehman Brothers financial collapse. You're now seeing the political dissolution. The Presidential spokesman for Russia, Peskov, made some comparison

to the breakdown of the Soviet Union; but you see that this is even of a greater scale than that kind of collapse. You might say that the world is better prepared for this crisis than the one in 1989, but I would say that it's not prepared sufficiently.

And the leadership in the United States and the trans-Atlantic is

not prepared sufficiently at all at this point. And the population has to bear some responsibility on this. There's so

much emphasis on democracy in the West; democracy in and of itself is not a principle. As Ben referenced, we need an actual

return to a sense of universal principles; knowable scientific,

physical characteristics of the Universe to shape our policies.

But those principles cannot exist within a small set of people;

you can't expect an elite to somehow solve and address the problems we now face. The population as a whole – and this is why our outreach in the United States to uplift people beyond this Presidential fiasco; and to recognize that there is not a preparation, there is not yet a capability to address this problem sufficiently. But what this conference addresses is the

level of discussion, the level of participation that begins to move it in that direction. And that is of an urgent nature; because these events, as we saw last week, are only going to increase in the weeks ahead.

Just in the last couple of weeks, you've seen fundamental changes in orientation from Japan towards Russia and China. The new Philippine President Duterte made major motions toward the FDR and Lincoln tradition and a collaborative effort towards China. You've seen major changes even in the last week by Turkey and their rapprochement towards Russia. There are major developments constantly happening which are reshaping the world. But the crisis of a collapse of this trans-Atlantic system is far beyond anything most people have ever imagined; and I think the seriousness and urgency to develop these ideas and participate in this dialogue has never been greater.

DENISTON: The collapse goes to the heart of this British system. A lot can be said, but go to Adam Smith, go to the original fundamental cultural assumptions, ideas about the nature of man. Man is governed by pleasure and pain; that mankind is just a species that can respond only to pleasure stimulus, avoid pain stimulus. The whole ideological framework of the British system, which has increasingly infected and taken over the United States and run the trans-Atlantic system, goes to those deep issues about what is your understanding of the nature of mankind in the Universe. And we're seeing the breakdown of this entire British ideological imperial cultural system that has dominated

really for centuries. I think that is the scale that we're looking at. This is the breakdown of a century-spanning imperial outlook that's had ebbs and flows and increases and decreases of its dominance; but it's not reaching the point of self-inflicted collapse. So in a certain sense, Americans have a certain tradition in direct opposition to that clearly; and people should be celebrating that in the next couple of days, not just hot dogs and fireworks. But actually use this as an opportunity to get a real rooted sense of what is our mission as Americans in opposition to this imperial ideology. In direct resonance and collaboration with what you're seeing out of Asia right now; this is the time to bring that back.

OGDEN: Right. It's exactly what you said – to constantly come back and say what is the ideological failure which is underlying all of the events that you're seeing. The breakdown, the refugees, the disintegration politically, financially, culturally of the European system; and as Helga emphasized at this conference, it's only a paradigm shift on the level of change from the Dark Age to the Renaissance which will something that will function at this moment. That didn't just happen; that was not some sort of organic process of historical materialism transforming itself. That was a willful change; that was a willful change in the fundamental ideas underlying society and the way that society worked. It's people who have to ability to

self-consciously reflect on the fact that we are facing the failure of a system of thinking; and then to say to examine what those failed ideas are. And then to say, how do we replace them; how do we discover a new principle and create a fundamental intellectual revolution which will allow mankind to carry itself forward into the future? I think that's what we witnessed in the proceedings of that conference; but as Michael said, it's something which cannot stay within the confines of that conference and the people who attended it. It is something which must become an integral part of our national dialogue as a people; and it's our responsibility to bring that about. That's not something that we can sit back and wait for somebody else to do.

So, I think that's a good Independence Day message.

DENISTON: People think they are what they experience; they think that's what they are. That's not what you are; people are what they create, or what they fail to create. People are not just your experiences in life; people are what is your new fundamental contribution you're making to human society, or you're failing to make to human society. Until people completely transform their understanding of what they think their lives mean, we're not going to reach the level needed to make the transition that was presented very clearly this past weekend.

OGDEN: All right. I'm going to bring a conclusion to our show at this point, but what you should immediately do is visit the newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com website. Some of the videos are available; I know that Helga Zepp-LaRouche's keynote video is available in full. That's a 30-35-minute length video; so at least please watch that. And then, as the other videos become available, it'll be posted on that website; so bookmark it, make sure that you follow the YouTube channel, and you'll be notified as soon as those videos are made available.

So, I'd like to thank all of you for joining us today. And I'd like to thank Bill and Michael for joining us via video. And again, to emphasize: newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com. And we will have continuing coverage on larouchepac.com as well. So, thank you very much. Happy Independence Day, and good night.

Projekt Fønix: Genopbygning af Syrien – Aleppo: Den evige stad

28. juni 2016 – I historiens løb har Aleppo været vidne til mange øjeblikke af storhed, så vel som også nedgang og urolige tider, men byen har altid igen rejst sig af asken, som Fugl

Fønix. Det syriske folk og den syriske regering har holdt denne samme ånd i live, konfronteret med den værste krise i landets historie.

I denne fremlæggelse gennemgår vi et forslag til genopbygningen af Syrien, ved navn Projekt Fønix, og som fokuserer på, hvordan Syrien, der har en ideel placering ved korsvejen, hvor tre kontinenter mødes, kan få gavn af at blive opkoblet til Den Nye Silkevej og den fremvoksede Verdenslandbro. Denne video blev optaget til Schiller Institutets Internationale konference i Berlin, Tyskland, 25.-26. juni, 2016: »En fælles fremtid for menneskeheden, og en renæssancekultur for klassiske kulturer«

Se også: Projekt Fønix – diskussionspunkter for en genopbygning af Syrien.

Se også: En fredsplan for Sydvestasien, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche. EIR-Pressemeddelelse i anledning af udgivelsen fa den arabiske version af rapporten “Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen”.

Se også: Playlist: The World Land-Bridge & Global Development

Lyndon LaRouche: Det transatlantiske finansielle system er dømt til undergang (og det ved I!)



30. juni 2016 (Leder) – Under en diskussion torsdag med sin Policy Committee og andre kolleger understregede Lyndon LaRouche, at det nuværende, finansielle system er ved at bryde sammen, og at systemet, som system, ikke kan overleve. De store, finansielle institutioner, inklusive centralbankerne, er håbløst og uigenkaldeligt bankerot. LaRouche bemærkede, at, alt imens der eksisterer en forfærdelig risiko for krig, der drives frem af de kredse, hvis magt udspringer af det aktuelle finansielle system, så er en stor del af de trusler, der kommer ud af munden på Barack Obama og nogle NATO-folk, faktisk ikke andet end bluff. Truslerne, som de udslynger imod Rusland og Kina, virker ikke.

Ikke desto mindre kan denne sammenblanding, med både den finansielle front og krigsfronten, føre til et alvorligt sammenbrud, som menneskeheden ikke er parat til at håndtere.

I denne uge udstedte både Den Internationale Valutafond (IMF) og Den Internationale Betalingsbank (BIS) rapporter, der klart indikerede hele det transatlantiske finansielle systems disintegration. Bankernes udlån i hele den avancerede sektor er totalt kollapset. Der er ingen som helst kapitalindstrømning til realøkonomien, den produktive økonomi,

i henhold til de data, som BIS har frembragt. IMF har udstedt en dyster advarsel om, at Deutsche Bank står foran nedsmelting, og alene dette kunne udløse en systemisk krise.

I takt med, at NATO-folk færdiggør planerne for statsledernes topmøde i Warszawa, Polen, den 8.-9. juli, opbygges vanviddet mod Rusland yderligere. Onsdag var præsident Obama i Ottawa til sit endelige topmøde med sine canadiske og mexicanske modparte. Han benyttede anledningen til at kaste sig ud i en tirade imod Rusland og nærmest tiggede Canada om at udsende en kampbataljon til De Baltiske Stater.

Sæt denne galskab op i kontrast til **Schiller Institutets ekstraordinære konference, der fandt sted sidste weekend i Berlin**, hvor ledere fra fire kontinenter kom sammen for at diskutere spørgsmålet om et nyt paradigme for en tankegang, der skal få verden ud af den nuværende, eksistentielle katastrofe.

Som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche understregede under weekendens begivenheder i Berlin, så er det presserende nødvendigt, at vi skaber et revolutionært skifte i tankegang, der fokusere på en opbygning af en fremtid med samarbejde mellem suveræne nationer og integrerede regioner i verden. Kinas program med 'Ét bælte, én vej' er paradigmatisch for denne nye form for tankegang, der må vedtages af ledende borgere i verden.

Det nuværende system er dødt, og det kan ikke overleve ret meget længere.

Video: Hør Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale fra konferencen i Berlin, 25.-26. juni, 2016. En dansk oversættelse af talen er på vej. Bliv på kanalen!

Titelfoto: Mineudlæggeren FNS Uusimaa fra den finske flåde sejler i Det baltiske Hav (Østersøen) under BALTOPS den 7. juni, 2016, som en del af øvelser, der skal demonstrere beslutsomhed hos styrkerne fra NATO og dens partnere.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 30. juni 2016:

**Efter Brexit: EU
disintegrerer, mens Rusland-
Kina konsolideres//
Schiller Institutets Berlin-
konference**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

PRESSEMEDDEELSE: International Schiller Institut-konference i Berlin, 25. - 26. juni

2016:

**»At skabe en fælles fremtid
for menneskeheden,
og en renæssance for klassisk
kultur«**

28. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttets internationale todages konference samlede flere end 300 gæster fra 24 nationer og fire kontinenter til en intens og dybtgående dialog om, hvorledes den umiddelbare fare for en verdenskrig kan standses ved i stedet at skabe et nyt paradigme for globalt samarbejde og udvikling, baseret på en dialog mellem civilisationer og den menneskelige arts enestående kreativitet. Konferencedeltagerne var ekstremt opmærksomme på optrapningen af den vestlige, geopolitiske konfrontation mod Rusland og Kina og faren for atomkrig, og en resolution vedtages, der krævede den omgående afslutning af sanktioner mod Rusland og Syrien. At gøre en ende på krigen og genopbygge det krigshærgede Syrien og hele det sydvestasiatiske område var et hovedfokus på konferencen, hvor dr. Bouthaina Shaaban, medlem af Syriens præsidentskab, talte til konferencens tilhørere og deltog i en bevægende, Spørgsmål & Svar-live stream.

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

Bliv ikke igen krigens ofre – Der findes en løsning

28. juni 2016 (Leder) – Ved afslutningen af todageskonferencen i Berlin, sponsoreret af Schiller Instituttet, hvor ledende talere fra fire kontinenter fremlagde det rædselsvækkende billede af både den 'evindelige krig', der finder sted i dag, og truslen om en atomkrig i morgen, samt de nødvendige løsninger med den Nye Silkevejs-proces, kom Lyndon LaRouche med følgende bemærkninger (parafrase):

Vi kan som et folk indgå aftale om ideer om en fredelig løsning på den krise, vi står overfor, hvilket er afgørende. Send et stærkt og klart opråb; spred ordet. Vi søger ikke krig. Der er en anden løsning end atter at blive krigens offer.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche afsluttede dernæst konferencen, som stifter af og præsident for Schiller Instituttet, med ordene: »Jeg opfordrer jer til at tilslutte jer Schiller Instituttet og, hvad der ligeledes er vigtigt, at følge Lyndon LaRouches vise ord.«

Aldrig har den overhængende krise stået mere skarpt. Den britiske Brexit-afstemning sidste torsdag afslørede den kendsgerning, at Imperiets finansielle system går rundt i den bare natskjorte. Brexit forårsagede ingenting – den afslørede simpelt hen den kendsgerning, der i mange år har været åbenlys for alle, for nær de blinde, at det enorme spillekasino, kendt som det transatlantiske finansielle system, ikke kan »reddes« – og ganske bestemt ikke ved, at man trykker flere penge for kunstigt at stive de bankerotte banker af i endnu nogle uger eller måneder. Londons førende bankaktier er kollapset med over 30 % siden Brexit-afstemningen torsdag, og med halvdelen i løbet af det seneste år. Alle de vestlige »To Big to Fail«-banker – 'for store til at lade gå ned-banker' – står over for

en lignende skæbne, der allerede er i gang.

Vi må gøre en ende på systemets elendighed med en total Glass/Steagall-afskrivning af de værdiløse værdipapirer, der dominerer de såkaldte aktiver i storbankerne. Først da kan et kreditsystem efter Hamiltons principper blive genindført, som det kræves, for at Vesten kan tilslutte sig Rusland og Kina i den globale udviklingsproces, der nu er i gang, sammen med verdens nationer og folk, gennem programmet med Ét bælte, én vej, Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen, den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, BRIKS' Nye Udviklingsbank – som alle er helliget til, og nu aktivt investerer i, regionale infrastrukturprojekter i stor skala i hele verden. Som LaRouche har understreget hele sit liv – udelukkende kun en sådan kreativ transformation af verdens borgeres produktivitet, gennem videnskabelige opdagelser, kan gøre en ende på det mareridt, menneskeheden nu står overfor.

Det vestlige finansoligarkis frygt er, at Storbritanniens afgang fra EU vil indgyde mod i det voksende antal ledere i Europa, der ønsker at afkaste City of Londons og det sjælløse EU-diktatur i Bruxelles' länker. Den tyske udenrigsminister Steinmeiers fordømmelse af, at NATO rasler med atomsablen og udøver militære provokationer mod Rusland, har mange støtter, der blot mangler modet til at tale offentligt. Dette er vores opgave – LaRouches »stærke og klare opråb« om, at der er en løsning, hvis folk finder det sublime i sig selv og handler på vegne af menneskeheden som et hele.

Foto: Lyndon og Helga LaRouche på Schiller Institutets Konference i Berlin, 25. – 26. juni, 2016.