

# **De adelige erklærer krig mod menneskeheden; menneskehedens svar – »klokkerne kimer for jer«**

2. november (EIRNS) – Tiden er inde til at bevægelsen, grundlagt af Lyndon LaRouche og ledt af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, samler en verdensomspændende anti-malthusiansk modstandsbevægelse. Det uundværlige begreb, som LaRouche-bevægelsen bidrager til denne diskussion med, og foruden hvilket der intet håb er for at overvinde den oligarkiske fjende, er forøgelsen af tilgængelig energi, per indbygger og kvadratkilometer, for hele menneskeracen med en særlig betoning på de områder, hvor befolkningsvækst tydeligt forventes at blive størst i de næste halvtreds år – de asiatiske og afrikanske kontinenter. Selvom nogle verdensledere nu forsøger at yde modstand mod Den store Nulstillings »CO2-kolonialisme« og de »vilde ghoulers [fra det arabiske, som betyder udøde, zombier]« blodgilde i Glasgow, mangler de en tydelig forståelse af et alternativ og benytter ofte, selvom de måske kun ønsker at blive overhørt sige dette, de hedenske mantra om »Moder Jord« eller »CO2 er en reel trussel«. Vi kan ikke tillade begrebernes fornedrelse i diskussionen, for blot at se ud som om at vi diskuterer sandheden, som LaRouche diskuterer i sin artikel, »Riemann tilbageviser Euler«.

For eksempel sagde den bolivianske præsident, Luis Arce, i sin tale ved COP26, at »udviklede lande skubber på for en ny proces for genkolonisering af verden, som vi kan kalde den 'nye CO2-kolonialisme', fordi de forsøger på at pådutte deres egne spilleregler i klimaforhandlingerne for at fortsætte med at fodre det nye grønne kapitalistiske

system, imens de presser udviklingsnationer til at acceptere disse spilleregler uden nogen anden valgmulighed«. Sandt, men hvad så? Bolivia har tydeligvis forsvaret kernekraft som et ret for alle mennesker, men så, da Arce, en økonom, i den samme tale siger, at »løsningen er at forandre civilisationens model og bevæge sig i retningen af alternative modeller til kapitalisme, konceptet om at leve godt sammen i harmoni med Moder Natur«, er fejltagelsen, og fælden, blevet klar.

Medmindre LaRouches begreb om energigennemstrømningstæthed og »forøgelsen af forøgelsesraten« af energigennemstrømningstætheden gennem avancerede teknologier, såsom kernekraft og fusionskraft, er forstået, ligegyldigt hvor militant budskabet fra oppositionen til Den store Nulstilling ville lyde, vil det intet betyde; den samme tragedie vil udspille sig. Ingen »omfordelingstilgang« vil for eksempel overløste Lynn Rothschilds Råd for inklusiv Kapitalisme, hvilket, ligesom Bolivias præsident, opfordrer til »et alternativt syn på kapitalismen« – selvom de mener noget ganske andet end han gør.

Vi må omgående forandre diskussionens terminologi i hele verden på uventede måder. Overvej hvordan en opmærksom organisatør brugte pave Frans' opfordring til bøn for Haiti, en nation der nu er under opløsning, som også den Dominikanske Republik trues med. Ved blot at vedhæfte et link til vores program for Haiti – et program som i sig selv er en fysisk-økonomisk skabelon for, hvordan man kan løse ikke blot Haitis problem, men problemet for mange andre nationer i den caribiske sektor – blev en frigjort diskussion om en dybere løsning mulig. Funktionen af samarbejde mellem nationer, herunder med Kina, blev defineret. På denne måde blev pave Frans' opfordring til bøn besvaret: »Gud, hjælp os – via vores egen hånd«.

Tilgangen fra Schiller Instituttets Komité for

modsætningernes Sammenfald – for eksempel hvad Afghanistan-situationen angår – kan betragtes og organiseres som en arbejdsgruppe for et samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina, USA og Indien, og dermed mindske faren for krig, som ellers forværres nærmest hver time. Det er en militærstrategi baseret på »gensidig vinding« uden brug af våben og krig. »Ibn Sina-operationen« [også kendt som Avicenna (980-1037)], som er en nødintervention i verdens sundheds navn, er ikke mere en ren medicinal eller »humanitær« idé, end Ibn Sina blot var en selvlært bondelæge. Overvej følgende: Ibn Sina betragtes ikke kun som den »indfødte søn« af mange områder og lande i Sydvestasien; han er også vidt anerkendt i den intellektuelle historie, som en nøgleperson i dialogen mellem Islam og Kristendommen, og »Østen« og »Vesten«, på grund af sine teologiske og metafysiske skrifter, og er forløber til Nikolaus von Kues i visse aspekter. Hvis man tager sig tiden til at tænke over Arnold Toynbees og Bernard Lewis' gnostiske betoning af og glubske tilgang til både Islam og Kristendommen, samt deres rasende modstand mod begge, når det omhandlede spørgsmålet om disses fælles teologiske mandat til at være »frugtbar og formere« den menneskelige befolkning, da kan den britiske efterretnings strategi for et »sammenstød af civilisationernes«, inklusiv dens hedensk-religiøse side, nemmere forstås, herunder dennes udtryk fra RIIA (Royal Institute for International Affairs) og prins Charles om »økomord« og »økohær«.

»De er hverken mænd eller kvinder, de er hverken dyr eller menneske – de er sygelige kadavere afgang fra deres sjæle, kaldet ghoulere« (fra Edgar Allan Poes »Klokkerne«). Ved COP26 foreslog (eller, mere præcist, offentliggjorde) prins Charles en krig mod den menneskelige race, som var »feberdrømmen«, ikke blot for sin far, Philip, og Philips Verdensnaturfond, men for de europæiske, politiske synarkistbevægelser i 1930'erne, som formede begge, og selv

dronningen, da hun var lille. Prins Charles sagde, »Klimaforandringer og tabet af biodiversitet... udgør en endnu større, eksistentiel trussel end COVID-19-pandemien til en sådan grad, at vi bliver nødt til at sætte os i et krigslignende beredskab. Vi ved hvad vi må gøre. Med en voksende, global befolkning, der sætter et stadigt større pres på planetens begrænsede ressourcer, bliver vi nødt til at reducere udslippet hurtigst muligt, og handle for at imødegå den CO<sub>2</sub>, der allerede findes i atmosfæren, herunder fra kuldrevne energisystemer...«

»Vores anstrengelser må ikke være en række uafhængige initiativer, som løber parallelt; størrelsesordenen og omfanget af truslen som konfronterer os, kræver en global, systembaseret løsning...« Sir David Attenborough, en tæt samarbejdspartner til prins Philip og en central talsmand for det »natur-religiøse« »pro-Gaia«-udsyn, bedre kendt gennem Joseph Campbells og Carl Jungs arbejde, fik bifaldt, men ikke for sin manglende diskussion af sit menneskesyn. Det inkluderer idéen om, at 75% af den nuværende britiske befolkning er overflødig. (Hvad tænker han om Afrika?) På sin organisations (Population Matters) hjemmeside siger Attenborough: »Alle vores miljøproblemer bliver nemmere at løse med færre mennesker, og sværere – og i sidste ende umulige – at løse med stadigt flere mennesker«.

Verden fortjener bedre end Windsor-familien.

Billede: Flickr. Andrew Parsons, No 10 Downing Street

---

**Gå            ikke            glip            af**

# videohittet: "Jeg er selve modellen for en moderne klimamodelør!"

27. august (EIRNS) - LaRouche-organisationen udsendte den 22. august en knaldgod musikvideo med titlen: "I Am the Very Model of a Modern Climate Modeller". I en satire over den berømte tåbelige generalmajor fra Gilbert & Sullivans komiske operette Piraterne fra Penzance (1879), satiriserer den 4,45 minutter lange LaRouche-produktion over de arrogante folkemorderiske klimaprognosemagere, der i begyndelsen siger til seerne: "Bare sig NEJ til klimaforandringer!" Den geniale tekst af Bill Ferguson, der begynder med omkvædet: "Jeg er selve modellen for en moderne klimamodelør", blev sunget af Myles Robinson, Malene Robinson (fra Danmark) ved tangenterne, samt Schiller Instituttets korsangere fra Boston.

Klik her: [Crush the Green New Deal LaRouche-organisation internetside.](#)

Afskrift:

I am the very model of a modern climate modeler,  
Ecologist, empiricist, there's no one Aristotle-er,  
Employing mathematics, theoretic and statistical,  
And arcane correlation computations syllogistical;  
I prove that human action, agricultural, industrial,  
Will overheat with CO2 the planet, therefore must we all  
Obey the Queen of England's populational reduction goals  
And late at night I like to ogle Greta Thunberg videos.  
And late at night he likes to ogle Greta Thunberg videos!  
And late at night he likes to ogle Greta Thunberg videos!  
And late at night he likes to ogle Greta Thunberg viddi-iddi-oes!  
  
I'm getting paid to demonstrate the world is far too populous,  
Especially the poorer dark complexioned countries where we must  
Kill off six billion babies, adults, teenagers, and toddlers:  
I am the very model of a modern climate modeler!  
To kill six billion babies, adults, teenagers and toddlers,  
He is the very model of a modern climate modeler!

The climate factors cosmic and galactic I must disregard,  
They contradict the green agenda, I refuse to think so hard.  
Atomic power doesn't produce very much of CO<sub>2</sub>,  
But 'twill increase potentials of the population, that won't do;  
'Twould mean from pole to pole more Northern, Southern, Central 'Mericans,  
'Twould mean More Europeans, and more Asians and more Africans,  
From poverty, disease, and hunger many people could be saved,  
And dear old Bertrand Russell would be spinning in his honored grave!  
And Bertrand Russell will be spinning in his rotten stinky grave!  
And Bertrand Russell will be spinning in his rotten stinky grave!  
And Bertrand Russell will be spinning in his rotten stinky-inky grave!

My opposition to the Peaceful Atom isn't brains I lack,  
But geopolitics taught me that "Green is Good." and "Snow is Black."  
And if your mother disagrees, I may well have to throttle her:  
I am the very model of a modern climate modeler!  
And if your mother disagrees, he may well try to throttle her,  
He is the very model of a modern climate modeler!

The Green New Deal and Great Reset will stop greenhouse pollution  
And to the Human Question is a Final End Solution,  
But even a first strike at China and at Russia I would goad,  
Protecting the environment from progress on the Belt and Road.  
Alas, I fear too many people are beginning to defy  
My peer-reviewed and flawless calculations proving they must die,  
Perhaps they'll organize to generate eight thousand gigawatts  
Instead of playing Grand Theft Auto as they fry their brains on pot.  
Instead of playing Grand Theft Auto as they fry their brains on pot,  
Instead of playing Grand Theft Auto as they fry their brains on pot,  
Instead of playing Grand Theft Auto as they fry their precious brains on pot!

And then we'd see the living standards of the population zoom,  
For radical Malthusians like me there would be no more room,  
With hundreds more of happy humans in each square kilometer,  
I'll be a very unemployed and moody climate modeler.  
With hundreds more of happy humans in each square kilometer,  
He'll be a very unemployed and moody climate modeler!

---

# **NYHEDSORIENTERING JUNI-JULI 2021: Afghanistan ved en korsvej**

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Tid til et nyt paradigme! Fra 68'ernes fortid til humanismens fremtid, af Peter Møller**

Med stort ståhej kræves der at vi lytter, og adlyder: "Menneskeheden ødelægger planeten!" skråles der. "Vores CO2-udslip overopheder kloden på uigenkaldelig vis! Og alle videnskabsmænd er enige – nu er tiden til handling kommet! Ikke at handle uomgåeligt og stadigvæk at stille spørgsmål er komplet amoralsk og absolut forkasteligt!" Men er dette nu også sandt? Er det ikke muligt, at man kunne tage fejl? Og hvis nu man tog fejl, ville det virkelig være første gang i historien, at hele nationer, med uhyrlige konsekvenser til følge, var frygtelig galt på den ideologisk – ja, sågar hele civilisationer? Ville det da ikke være bedre en stund endnu på modig vis at stille de ubehagelige spørgsmål, også selvom det kræver at vi svømmer

imod strømmen? Og i så fald at de ovenstående påstande var forkerte, at forstå hvad årsagen var, der førte til dette skævvredne verdenssyn?

Dette, samt en langt mere videnskabelig og fascinerende forståelse af naturen selv, og menneskets rolle i denne, er det, som det efterfølgende vil handle om.

### **Modeller som ikke kunne forudse**

Så, til at begynde med, hvorfor er det egentlig at klimamodellerne aldrig rammer rigtigt? [Se grafikken ovenover. U.S. House Committee on Science, Space & Technology 29 Mar 2017 Testimony of John R. Christy Professor of Atmospheric Science, Alabama State Climatologist University of Alabama in Huntsville. Beskrivelsen er fodnote 1A]

Den øverste kurve er gennemsnittet af 102 klimamodellers forudsigelser; de to nedre grafer er egentlige målinger taget, henholdsvis, af vejrballoner og satellitter. Henrik Svensmark, som arbejder på DTU, og som har bevist et fascinerende forhold mellem skydannelse og kosmisk stråling, bemærkede for nyligt, at modellerne uden CO<sub>2</sub>-faktoren rent faktisk ligger temmelig tæt på de egentlige målinger [1B].

I figur 2 [ beskrivelsen i 1C] ser vi modellerne både med (rød) og uden (blå) faktoren af drivhusgasser, vist sammen med temperaturmålingerne (grå). Man kan se, at modellerne uden drivhusgasserne faktisk ligger relativt tæt op af de egentlige målinger, hvorimod modellerne med faktoren af drivhusgasser næsten altid viser for varme temperaturer.



Hvis man i fodbold ville blive ved med at skyde så skævt ville træneren nok på et tidspunkt hive én til side og foreslå, at man prøver en anden sportsgren. Men vores miljøvenlige politikere og andre "eksperter" synes, at



deres præcision er mere end god nok til at kvalificere dem til superligaen! Ja, i følge disse dommedagsklimaprofeter ville ikke engang en kat – med sine ni liv – kunne have overlevet sin egen undergang lige så ofte som menneskeheden har gjort dette i de sidste årtier.

Hér er blot et par eksempler fra et imponerende CV: Life Magazine, 1970: "Om et årti vil dem, som bor i byerne være nødsaget til at bære gasmasker for at overleve luftforureningen... I 1985 vil luftforurening have reduceret mængden af sollys, som når Jorden, til det halve..."

("In a decade, urban dwellers will have to wear gas masks to survive air pollution...by 1985 air pollution will have reduced the amount of sunlight reaching earth by one half...")

Washington Post, 1971: "Vedvarende emissioner over fem til ti år kunne være tilstrækkeligt til at udløse en istid." ("Sustained emissions over five to ten years, could be sufficient to trigger an ice age.")

Newsweek, 1975: "Den centrale kendsgerning er, at... Jordens klima synes at blive køligere." ("The central fact is that... the earth's climate seems to be cooling down.")

Men som det ufejlbarlige, moralske kompas, de bryster sig af at repræsentere, svingede de så fra stik nord til stik syd: Associated Press, 1989: "FN-embedsmand forudser katastrofe: ...Hele nationer kunne blive udslettet fra Jordens overflade på grund af stigende havvandstand, hvis ikke global opvarmning er vendt inden år 2000."

("U.N. OFFICIAL PREDICTS DISASTER: ...[E]ntire nations could be wiped off the face of the earth by rising sea levels if global warming is not reversed by the year 2000.")

The Miracle Planet, 1990: "Madagascar vil stort set være væk i fem år medmindre der sker noget. Og i øjeblikket sker intet." ("Madagascar will largely be gone in five years

unless something happens. And nothing is happening.”)

Michael Oppenheimer, Miljøets Forsvarsfond (The Environmental Defense Fund), 1990: ”I år 1995 vil drivhuseffekten lægge Nordamerikas og Eurasiens kerneområder øde med en forfærdelig tørke, hvilket vil medføre ødelagte afgrøder og fødevareoptøjer... Det mexicanske politi vil anholde ulovlige amerikanske indvandrere, som strømmer til Mexico for at søge arbejde som landarbejdere.” (“By 1995, the greenhouse effect would be desolating the heartlands of North America and Eurasia with horrific drought, causing crop failures and food riots... The Mexican police will round up illegal American migrants surging into Mexico seeking work as field hands.”)

CNN, 2001: ”Om ti års tid vil de fleste af de lavtliggende atoller omkring Tavalus’ ni øer i det sydlige Stillehav være dækket af vand, idet den globale opvarmning forårsager havvandstandens stigning.” (“In ten years' time, most of the low-lying atolls surrounding Tuvalu's nine Islands in the South Pacific Ocean will be submerged under water as global warming rises sea levels.”)

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez fra Repræsentanternes Hus i USA, MLKShow, 2019: ”Verden vil ende om 12 år, hvis ikke vi gør noget ved klimaforandringerne.” (“...[T]he world is going to end in 12 years if we don't address climate change.”)

Alle disse, mildt sagt, ikke helt korrekte forudsigelser har selvfølgelig ikke gjort dem mindre selvsikre – hvorfor nu også det? – og med fast overbevisning erklærer de deres hellige krig mod verdens CO<sub>2</sub>-syndere. Man mindes om hekseforfølgelserne i Den Lille Istid – brændt på bålet for at have forårsaget det radikale temperaturfald! Den eneste forskel fra i dag er, at der dengang var en betydelig temperaturforandring – bevirket af solens daværende ringe aktivitet kaldet ”Maunder-Minimum”. Det er det der sker, når man ikke går videnskabeligt til værks!

Vi bør måske her indskyde at de ofte citerede "97% af alle videnskabsfolk, som støtter teorien om menneskeskabte klimaforandringer" er en sofistisk fordrejning af virkeligheden. De såkaldte "97%", som stammer fra et studie af John Cook, er en sammensætning af ca. 12.000 forskellige videnskabsartikler om klimaet. Deraf behandler omkring 8.000 af disse ikke tesen om menneskeskabte klimaforandringer og indgår således ikke i statistikken [2]. I resten af artiklerne støtter knapt 3.000 af dem kun implicit tesen om menneskeskabte klimaforandringer [3]. Der er herunder også mange, som blot antager tesen som sand, og beskæftiger sig med de logiske følger af denne "sandhed", for eksempel artikler om mulige økonomiske konsekvenser. Udover dette inkluderes sågar artikler fra videnskabsfolk, som ikke støtter tesen om menneskeskabte klimaforandringer; for eksempel studier fra den israelske videnskabsmand Nir Shaviv, som i 2018 blev inviteret ind i det tyske parlament for at vidne mod tesen[4]. Studiet om de "97%" er ikke en statistisk analyse – det er politisk sofisme – og det ville gøre verden godt, hvis man ikke blev ved med at gentage den.

Men hvis det hele er så forkert, hvor kommer så denne udbredte fundamentalistiske dommedagsholdning fra? Hvordan er det muligt, at verdens befolkninger og regeringer kan være så skrækkelig galt på den? Og, før vi kommer til dette, hvad er de antagelser der ligger til grund for et så forskruet billede af menneske og natur?

### **To billeder af naturen**

Hvad, altså, er den naturforståelse, som vores miljøromantikere aggressivt prædiker, og hvormed de kræver at have patent på selve naturens egne love? De mener, at naturen er i en fuldstændig perfekt, om end skrøbelig, balance med sig selv; en balance nøje vedligeholdt over hundreder af millioner af år, som hvert eneste levende væsen spiller en uundværlig rolle i at opretholde: en præcis,


afstemt harmoni. Men nu træder mennesket frem, og med vold ødelægger det denne søde idyl! Landbrugets og husdyravlens imperialistiske ekspansion, industriens larm og støj, videnskabens unaturlige forståelse af naturens mystik, rumfartens nedbrydning af grænserne lagt fast fra naturens egen side; alle disse bringer nu det fine, kunstneriske urværk ud af balance, og ruinerer Moder Naturs møjsommelige arbejde!

Men svarer dette syn til naturen selv, som den erkendes, når vi studerer dens historie? Eller beskriver det ovenstående billede måske nærmere en psykologisk projicering af den fantasifulde romantikers skizofrene og skrøbelige sindstilstand, hvis opretholdelse konstant trues af videnskabens virkelighed?

Betragter vi naturens udvikling over millioner af år, må vi hurtigt fastslå at der, langt fra en balance, her er tale om en stadig voksende "ubalance". Den harmoni – som man med rette kan imponeres af – er ikke en slags "perfekt akkord", men i stedet nærmere en Bach-lignende komposition af konstant udvikling og transformation. Forandring og bestræbelse mod forbedring – dvs. evolution – synes naturens egentlige lov. Organismers individuelle eksistens er vigtig, kun for så vidt at de bidrager til evolutionens overordnede udvikling; og det faktum at naturen har været villig til at ofre 80-90% af alle arter indtil nu, hvis dette betød fremskridt for helheden, er et bevis derpå [5]. Fremskridt synes hér at betyde en stigning i evnen til at kunne transformere omgivelserne, således at disse kan understøtte højere former for liv. Dette ses for eksempel i den konstante forøgelse af organismers metabolisme over hundreder af millioner af år. Ikke tilpasning, men transformation af miljøet og ekspansion af livs egen virke er livets grundlov.

Med denne udvikling – fra havets dyb til landjord og luft – følger også et andet karakteristikum: indeslutningen af

omgivelsernes egenskaber i organismen selv. Da der endnu kun fandtes encellet liv dybt i Jordens have, var celledeling ensbetydende med en ny organisme. Men med livets udvikling kunne dette pludselig finde sted inde i organismen selv, og muliggjorde dermed et væld af nye organismer. Dog havde disse livsformer ingen motoriske egenskaber – ingen lemmer som kunne bevæge dem – og de fragtedes her og der af havets strømme. Over tiden udvikledes finner og hale, og de blev nu i stand til selv at bestemme deres færd. Deres æg, som ingen skaller havde, kunne relativt let interagere med havets miljø og befrugtedes først efter at de var lagt. Som liv bevægede sig op på land, blev dette havmiljø ligeså indesluttet i organismerne selv, beskyttet af en stærkere overflade. Æggene fik hårde skaller og marinemiljøet indesluttedes i deres indre; befrugtningen fandt nu også sted inde i organismerne selv. Indtil fremkomsten af pattedyr var temperaturen reguleret af miljøet; denne blev nu også indesluttet i organismen selv, og ikke blot befrugtningen, men fostrets udvikling fandt sted inde i organismen.

 Eksempel på overgang af livsformer fra havet til landet: Tiktaalik roseae, en overgangsform ("manglende link") mellem muskelfisk og terrestriske hvirveldyr fra Øvre Devonian i Nordamerika. (Billede: Nobu Tamura email:nobu.tamura@yahoo.com

<http://spinops.blogspot.com/>, CC BY-SA 4.0 via Wikimedia Commons)

Vi ser over tiden altså – igen – ikke en stigende tilpasning til miljøet, men tværtimod en voksende uafhængighed, kombineret med en forøget transformation og dominans af liv over dets miljø. Med menneskets indtræden på evolutionens scene, synes den ultimative indeslutningsproces at have indtruffet: selve evolutionsprocessen selv blev nu indesluttet i én art, som kunne forøge sin forandring af omverdenen uden at være tvunget til først at vente på biologiens videreudvikling. Det var som om hele denne "klassiske" komposition

opsummeredes i temaets sidste gentagelse, der implicit bærer med sig, ikke blot kompositionens samlede potentiale, men også dennes dybeste og sande betydning.

Menneskets videnskab og teknologiske kunnen er altså ikke det mindst, men derimod det mest naturlige – en refleksion af livs primære, ontologiske eksistens: evolutionens fremskridt. At stoppe denne, at kræve at et givent stadie må bevares for altid – også selvom dette kan synes nok så smukt – ville være det samme, som at forbyde J.S. Bach at komponere i mere end én toneart.

### **Et frygteligt argument**

"Men", vil vi nu høre en stemme indvende – en stemme med et mægtigt modargument, som vi må give tilsvar, hvis ikke hele det forrige skal falde til jorden med ét slag – "projicerer vi ikke ligeså? Er dette fremskridtsorienterede syn på naturen ikke blot en genspejling af vores subjektivitet? Er der overhovedet noget tidspunkt hvor vi ikke projicerer vores eget syn? Er vi ikke altid "inde i" vores eget sind? Og hvis dette forholder sig sådan, er det da muligt at vide noget som helst?" Og sådanne stemmer, hvis de ønskede det, kunne sågar understøtte deres argument med geometriske eksempler.

Hvis vi forestiller os at et plan og en sfære hver især blev spurgt hvad vinkelsummen af en trekants vinkler var, ville planet svare, at denne altid er 180 grader. Men sfæren, på den anden side, ville modsige dette og insistere på at denne altid er mere end 180 grader og afhængig af trekantens størrelse. Ville de ikke begge have ret? Og hvad nu med parallelle linjer? Planet ville med absolut overbevisning fastholde at disse aldrig mødes, mens sfæren, med samme faste overbevisning, ville sige at de altid mødes ved "polerne". Har de hér ikke ligeså begge ret? Har de ikke hver især deres egen "sandhed"?

Står det da frit til individets smag at vælge om mennesket er en destruktiv virus i midten af naturens kunstfærdige mesterværk, eller om dets fremskridt er den naturlige videreudvikling af naturen selv? Hvordan kunne vi tilbagevise dette relativismens argument? Og hvis ikke, hvordan kunne man da hævde at kende vejen frem for vores samfund? Vi måtte da selv give tabt på relativismens hav og – uden hverken kort eller kompas – lade de blinde strømme føre os hid og did.

### **Hvordan ved man noget?**

Før vi tager dette næste skridt, er det værd at bemærke, at geometri, i og for sig, præcis ligeså meget – eller lidt – sandhed bærer med sig, som en hvilken som helst anden form for sprog. Platons dybsindige tanker udtrykkes, ligesom sofisternes bedragerier, begge på oldgræsk. Engelsk indeholder både Shakespeares skønne poesi, såvel som Benthams hedonistiske kalkule. Og på tysk er både Schillers ophøjede dramaer og Nietzsches pessimistiske filosofi at finde. Sandheden findes altså aldrig i udtrykkets medium i og for sig selv.

"Giv mig et sted at stå," sagde altså Archimedes, "og jeg skal bevæge verden!" Hvor er vores ståsted, vores faste grund? Hvor finder vi vores kort og kompas? Lad os, som klassicismens Tyskland gjorde det tidligere, læne os på Gottfried Leibniz' visdom: "En skabning er mere fuldkommen end en anden, hvis man hos den finder noget, der kan anføres som apriorisk grund for det, der sker i den anden. Det er på dette grundlag, at man kan sige, at den indvirker på den anden." [6]

Tager vi vores musikalske eksempel igen. Bachs kompositioner kan ikke forstås fra de individuelle noders eller skalaers standpunkt, som blot repræsenterer stadier i den overordnede udvikling. Idéen – enheden – som bestemmer kompositionens udfoldelse, transcenderer de individuelle

elementer, og deres eksistens' "mening" kan kun findes i kompositionen som helhed. Den overordnede udviklingsidé er derfor "mere fuldkommen" end delene, da den er grundlaget for disses eksistens (dvs. kan forklare dem a priori), mens delene, som isolerede størrelser, ikke kan påvise grunden hverken for helhedens, eller deres egen, eksistens.

Således forholder det sig også med evolutionen. Hver organisme har en rolle at spille i evolutionen som helhed, men disse – en hund, en fisk, et firben – har ingen mulighed for, at fatte deres egen rolle deri. Kun fra evolutionsprocessens helhedssyn kan deres roller forstås, som nødvendige stadier i den overordnede udvikling. Helheden er altså vigtigere – igen "mere fuldkommen" – end de individuelle elementer, og det er denne som vi må rette os efter. Kun mennesket – den eneste kognitive skabning vi kender til – besidder potentialet til at gøre sig denne udviklingsproces bevidst og handle ud fra viden, og er derfor, som konsekvens, mere fuldkommen end alle andre arter.

Lad os, for nu at være fuldstændig sikre, tage spørgsmålet op fra en anden vinkel, og dermed, forhåbentligt, begrave kulturrelativismens tågeslør for evigt. Det 20. århundredes Leibniz, Lyndon LaRouche, definerer, med sit koncept om den potentielle befolkningstæthed, viden, som det, der kan måles gennem menneskets systemiske effekt i og på det fysiske univers. Når vi får ny indsigt i universets processer, indeslutter vi – på samme måde som liv gør det – disse processer i vores virke, og øger derigennem vores uafhængighed, såvel som vores transformative effekt, på omgivelserne, set, for eksempel, i form af nye teknologier. Som eksempler på dette kunne vi nævne opdagelsen af de astronomiske cyklusser, som grundlaget for landbrug; forståelsen af rotation, som centralt i udviklingen af maskiner; Leibniz' Vis-Viva-begreb, som grundlaget for dampmaskinens succes [7]; og Mendelejevs harmoniske koncept



om elementernes orden, som grundlaget for en systematisk forståelse af alle kemiske processer. Det faktum at sådanne indsigter – der i øvrigt har hverken masse eller energi – øger vores magt over universets processer, demonstrerer, at vi nødvendigvis handler mere i overensstemmelse med universets underliggende love, end uden disse opdagelser. Hvordan kunne vores effekt ellers forøges i universet?

Hvad er altså forskellen på de to ovenfor opstillede hypoteser om naturen, i forhold til deres systemiske effekt i det fysiske univers, når vi handler efter dem? Miljøbevægelsens hypotese forbyder menneskets indgriben i naturen og forandring af denne, og søger at minimere dennes effekt – dvs. søger at minimere menneskets kontrol over universets processer – og søger, som logisk følge deraf, at maksimere vores sårbarhed til omgivelserne. De er blandede af denne kendsgerning gennem en romantisk "Adam-og-Eva"-forestilling om, at så længe de tilbøder Moder Natur, og holder fingrene fra "videnskabens træ", så skal hun nok forsørge dem med alt hvad livet kunne begære. Den anden opstillede hypotese søger at maksimere menneskeheds systemiske kontrol over universets processer, ved – ligesom evolutionsprocessen selv – at indeslutte alle disse i menneskets egen handlingssfare, dvs. at menneskeheden vil kontrollere en altid større del af universets processer. I religiøs terminologi ville man sige, at vores samfund til stadighed bringes i højere overensstemmelse med Skaberens intention, Hans "synspunkt". Vi ved altså, at den sidst opstillede hypotese er tættere på sandheden, da den, i diametral modsætning til miljøflippernes, øger vores systemiske magt i universet. At være "i harmoni med" naturen, svarer altså ikke til en formindskelse af vores indflydelse, men stik det modsatte, en forøgelse. Magt og harmoni er her fuldstændig kongruente begreber. Men, hvis menneskets fremskridt er det mest naturlige, hvor kommer da denne miljøbevægelses aggressive anti-natur fra? Lad os

dykke ned i historiens gemmer, for at forstå hvor nøglen til dette spørgsmål ligger begravet.

### **De paradigmatiske 68'ere**

Miljøbevægelsen er intet nyt under den historiske sol. Her er et brudstykke fra et episk digt fra det gamle Grækenland: "Der var en tid, da utallige menneskestammer, på trods af vid udspredding, undertrykte overfladen af jordens dybe favn, og Zeus så og havde medlidenhed og i sit vise hjerte besluttede at lindre den altnærende jord fra mennesket ved at forårsage den store strid i den trojanske krig, således at dødens last kunne tømme verden. Og heltene blev slået ihjel i Troja, og Zeus' plan gik i opfyldelse [8]." ("There was a time when countless tribes of men, though wide-dispersed oppressed the surface of the deep-bosomed earth, and Zeus saw and had pity and his wise heart resolved to relieve the all-nurturing earth of men by causing the great struggle of the Ilian war, that the load of death might empty the world. And the heroes were slain in Troy, and the plan of Zeus came to pass.")

Nutidens ekko – "overbefolkning!" – af denne oldgamle ideologi springer ikke organisk op som en græsrodsbevægelse, men er i stedet skabt, på unaturlig vis, fra træets oligarkiske "krone"; og hér, gennem 1001-Klubben, WWF, m.fl., får rødderne deres finansielle og ideologiske næring [9]. Den er skabt af en oligarkisk elite, der kaster sig selv i Olympens lys, og ser verdens befolkning som kvæg, der kan kontrolleres på zeusisk manér om nødvendigt. I modsætning hértil står den humanistiske idé, der betragter mennesket som et prometeusisk fornuftsvæsen, der er givet evnen – ja, sågar missionen – at fremme den universelle skabelsesproces. Dette har været, og er stadig den dag i dag, den historiske hovedkonflikt.

I moderne tid – dvs. efter den italienske Renæssance – har konflikten udtrykt sig i kampen mellem den amerikanske

Prometeus og den britiske Olymp. Den amerikanske Revolution, støttet af Europas humanistiske kredse, var ikke en spontan uenighed over beskatning eller monopol, men en århundreders kamp mellem disse to diametralt modsatte menneskesyn [10]. I Europa, specielt med Leibniz' og Bachs "elever", som Moses Mendelssohn, Gotthold Lessing, Friedrich Schiller og Ludwig van Beethoven, fandt humanismen sit højeste udtryk i klassicismens Tyskland. Denne leibnizianske alliance mellem Tyskland og USA, illustreret af Benjamin Franklins besøg hos Abraham Kästner og R.E. Raspe [11], byggede "rygraden" i vores vestlige civilisations nyere tid. Det økonomiske højdepunkt fandt sted med Bismarcks adoptering af det "Amerikanske System" i den anden halvdel af det 19. århundrede; en international alliance som på dette tidspunkt ledtes af Henry C. Careys kredse i USA [12]. Men med to verdenskrige, 60'ernes snigmord af moralske ledere i USA, og specielt 68er-oprøret, blev denne historiske rygrad, kulturelt og institutionelt, "knækket", og begge nationer mistede nu forbindelsen til deres bedre prometeusiske natur og dermed deres egen kulturs suverænitet.

I USA, under Franklin Roosevelt, havde humanismen opblusset, efter 30 års anglofil politik, og Churchill måtte finde sig i at høre hvordan Roosevelts USA planlagte befrielsen og udviklingen af alle de tidligere kolonier [13]. Men denne intention døde med Roosevelt, og de amerikanske soldater – som mere eller mindre bevidst havde delt præsidentens vision – vendte tilbage til et samfund under anti-kommunismens banner. Troen på en bedre fremtid blev nu erstattet med mistroens anti-kommunisme, og frygten for tab af status og sikkerhed afsatte medmenneskelighed og mod. Under sådanne kår opvoksede generationen, der senere skulle blive kendt som "68'erne". Med en konstant trussel af en atomkrig hængende i luften, så en moralsk usikker generation hvordan 60'ernes moralske ledere blev nedskudt

én efter én, uden mening og uden forklaring. Disse omstændigheder skabte en chokeffekt, som førte til en flugt fra virkeligheden, der var for skrækkelig til at rumme. Dionysiske udskejelser i form af psykotropiske stoffer, seksuelle nyskabelser og nye former for støj, blev udtrykket for denne skizofrene flugttilstand, som i stigende grad nu overtog ungdommens angstelige sind.

Robert F. Kennedy – den dræbte præsidents bror – udtalte sig om disse udviklinger, inden han selv i 1968 blev skudt: "Jeg tror at det er forklaringen, egentlig, bag hippierne. De har nået den konklusion, at de ikke kan påvirke deres egne liv og ikke kan påvirke samfundet... så de slukker og lukker. De hiver gardinet ned, og siger, vi vil – vi kan ikke forlade Jorden – men vil forlade den så meget som vi kan." ("I think that's the explanation, really, of the hippies. They've reached the conclusion that they can't effect their own lives and they can't effect society... so they turn off. They pull the curtain down, and say we're going to – we can't get off the earth – but we're gonna leave it as much as we can.")

Dette "parallelle univers" slog sig nu ligeså ned i efterkrigstidens Tyskland – et Tyskland hvis tidligere humanistiske kultur var blevet svækket af hyperinflation og økonomisk destruktion udspændt mellem to grufulde verdenskrige, og angloamerikanske kredses genindsættelse, i Tysklands efterretningstjenester, af en del af de selvsamme nazistiske netværker, der lige havde spredt terror og rædsel – internationalt, såvel som hos den tyske befolkning selv[14]; netværker, som i øvrigt var nemme at afpresse og kontrollere, givet deres fortid. Det er forståeligt, at der var stor utilfredshed med denne situation, men i stedet for at genopleve klassicismens humanistiske idé, smed Tysklands 68'ere "babyen ud med badevandet"; de afviste, som deres jævnaldrende i Amerika, selve idéen om en historisk identitet, og adopterede i stedet idéen om at leve i det

sanselige her og nu – som var det en isoleret størrelse afskåret fra fortid og fremtid – og styrtede sig ned i de mørke dionysiske strømme.

Men med afvisningen af en historisk identitet, forkastede de også idéen om fremtiden; de forkastede de næste generationers eksistensberettigelse. Der var ingen fremtid, og deres egen eksistens kunne kun retfærdiggøres gennem dennes absolutte udelukkelse. Dette var ikke blot en personlig "mening"; ikke blot et passivt synspunkt. Fremtiden blev nu til en trussel mod deres identitet, og alle ideologier og politiske initiativer, som søgte at underminere, ja, sågar tilintetgøre, fremtiden, blev nu i stigende grad 68'ernes psykologiske tilflugt. Miljøbevægelsens "grønne" ideologi er ikke andet end dette: retfærdiggørelsen af fremtidens tilintetgørelse. Dette er 68'ernes ideologi, og det er det som vi er oppe imod i dag.

### **Er der en fremtid?**

Nu er tiden kommet til at afvise denne uhyre menneskehadske ideologi med absolut beslutsomhed; ikke blot i sine individuelle argumenter, men i sin helhed. Vi må genoplive og forsvare den fremtid, som 68'erne forkastede årtier tilbage. Hvordan ser denne fremtid ud? Vil den være i overensstemmelse med de love i naturen, som vi præsenterede ovenfor? Selvom vi her ikke vil påstå at kende hele svaret, kan vi dog sige visse ting med sikkerhed. Vi mennesker kan forstå universet, fordi dets underliggende love harmonerer med vores sjæl. Som vi indeslutter og overtager ansvaret for en altid større bid af dette univers, ekspanderes vore virke – og alt liv, som vi tager med os – ikke blot på planeten, men snart, mere og mere, først ud i vores solsystem, og da, længere ud i det stadig ukendte. Og jo mere vi tør tro os ud i dette ukendte, jo mere vil vi begynde at forstå, at det aldrig var et truende mørke, men blot et overset og venligt potentiale der ventede os, ja sågar, vores allerbedste ven. Vi vil erkende, at jo mere vi

bevæger os ud i det ukendte, jo mere vil vi der genfinde vores egen sjæls ubegrænsede og sande natur.

Med dette i sinde, lad os afslutte med et par citater fra denne "fremtid" – fra Apollo-astronauternes succesfulde rejse til Månen og hjem igen[15]:

"Når sollyset skinner gennem rummets sorthed, er det sort. Men jeg var i sollyset og var i stand til at kigge på denne sorthed. Jeg mener, hvad er det vi ser? Kald det universet, men det er rummets uendelighed og tidens uendelighed. Jeg kigger på noget der kaldes rummet, som ingen ende har, og tiden, som ingen mening har. Man kan virkelig fokusere på det, fordi man har denne planet derude, denne planet kaldet Jorden, hvilket selv er i denne sorthed, men er oplyst, fordi sollyset rammer et objekt, rammer noget som kaldes Jorden. Og det er ikke en fjendtlig sorthed. Måske er den ikke fjendtlig, på grund af Jordens skønhed, som giver den en slags liv. Jeg følte mig meget velkommen der. Ved du, Månen har ventet på os i tusinder af år... millioner af år, måske, medmindre nogle andre har været der før os, på et tidspunkt. Det er muligt, selvom vi ikke så nogle beviser derpå. Jeg følte det som om at jeg var den eneste der, men ikke et rumvæsen... ikke et rumvæsen i form af at invadere en andens domæne. Jeg opfattede ikke Månen som fjendtlig. Jeg opfattede den som meget majestætisk smuk. Blid i farve, men majestætisk smuk."—Gene Cernan, Apollo 17

("When the sunlight shines through the blackness of space, it's black. But I was in sunlight and I was able to look at this blackness. I mean what are you looking at? Call it the universe but it's the infinity of space and the infinity of time. I'm looking at something called space that has no end, and at time that has no meaning. You can really focus on it because you've got this planet out there, this planet called Earth, which itself is in this blackness but it is lit up, because the sun-light strikes on an object, it strikes on something called Earth. And it's not a hostile

blackness. Maybe it's not hostile because of the beauty of the Earth, that sort of gives it life. I felt very welcome there. You know, the Moon's been waiting for us for thousands of years ... millions of years, maybe, unless someone else has already been there before us, at some time. That's possible, although we didn't really see any evidence of that. I felt like I was the only one there, but not an alien ... not an alien in terms of invading someone else's domain. I didn't find the Moon hostile. I found it very majestically beautiful. Bland in color, but majestically beautiful"—Gene Cernan, Apollo 17)

"Okay, Houston, mens jeg er herude i det ukendtes vidundere ved Hadley [-bjergets nedre skråninger på Månen] indser jeg, at der er en fundamental sandhed i vores natur: mennesket må og skal opdage!"—David Scott, Kommandør af Apollo 15 ("Okay, Houston, as I am staying out here in the wonders of the unknown at [the lower slopes of Mt.] Hadley [on the Moon], I realized there's a fundamental truth to our nature: man must explore!"—David Scott, Commander of Apollo 15)

"Evolutionens vej er nu i rummet, lige så meget som på Jorden. Mennesket, som en art, har vist, at menneskeheden var klar til at binde sig til... at leve i miljøer, som var komplet anderledes... end dem som arten udviklede sig i... Menneskehedens evolutionskurve er blevet bøjet..."—Harrison Schmitt, Apollo 17

("The path of evolution is now in space, as much as on earth. Man has shown that as a species ... mankind was willing to commit itself ... to living in environments that were completely different ... than those in which the species evolved... The curve of human evolution has been bent."—Harrison Schmitt, Apollo 17)

Dette er blot et splitsekund af den kontinuerlige inspiration, der venter os og den fremtidige menneskehed.

Denne fremtid kan være den smukkeste, den mest fascinerende, den mest glædelige af alle epoker indtil nu oplevet af den samlede menneskehed. Med den nye Silkevejspolitik, med rumfartens optimistiske tilbagevenden og med en ny tørst efter det sande og smukke i menneskets natur, står vi på tærsklen til en ny æra. Potentialer er synligt for dem der kan se. Men om det vil lykkes os at realisere denne glade, menneskelige, ubegrænsede fremtid eller om den grønne pessimismes unaturlige og menneskehadske mørke vil sprede sig og slukke dette lys, det, kære læser, er nu op til dig.

*Artikelen blev oprindeligt udgivet i det tyske tidsskrift Fusion, Vol. 40, No. 2, 2019, og EIR tidsskrift Vol. 48, No. 17, den 23. april 2021.*

#### **Fodnoter:**

[1A] "Five-year averaged values of annual mean (1979-2016) tropical bulk TMT as depicted by the average of 102 IPCC CMIP5 climate models (red) in 32 institutional groups (dotted lines). The 1979-2016 linear trend of all time series intersects at zero in 1979. Observations are displayed with symbols: Green circles – average of 4 balloon datasets, blue squares – 3 satellite datasets and purple diamonds – 3 reanalyses. See text for observational datasets utilized. The last observational point at 2015 is the average of 2013-2016 only, while all other points are centered, 5-year averages." Fra J.R. Christys foretræde.

[1B] Præsentation af Henrik Svensmark på Nærum Gymnasium, den 28. August, 2017: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lGaJvVoLsuM>.

[1C] "The linear trends of the average of the climate model simulations (red) and the averages of the three types of observational datasets described in the text." Fra J.R. Christys foretræde.

[2] For yderligere detaljer, se denne artikel:



<https://climatechangedispatch.com/when-32-6-becomes-97-the-bald-faced-lie-that-changed-the-western-world.html/>

[3] Se: <https://skepticalscience.com/tcp.php?t=search&s=a&a=&c=3&e=3&yf=1991&yt=2011>

[4] Se: <http://www.sciencebits.com/bundestag>

[5] Et af de bedste eksempler er den Store Iltkatastrofe, som fandt sted for omkring 3 milliarder år siden, hvor cyanobakterier frigjorde enorme mængder af ilt i havene og i atmosfæren, og forårsagede en masseudryddelse.

[6] Gottfried Leibniz' Monadologi

[7] Leibniz' beskrivelse af  $Vis Viva = m \times v^2$ , fremfor Descartes'  $m \times v$ , er grunden til at dampmaskinen fungerer, da partiklers hastighed pludselig får en langt væsentligere rolle. Se også Leibniz, Papin and the Steam Engine: A Case Study of British Sabotage of Science: [https://archive.schillerinstitute.com/educ/pedagogy/steam\\_engine.html](https://archive.schillerinstitute.com/educ/pedagogy/steam_engine.html)

[8] Kypria; et fragment af et tabt episk digt fra det gamle Grækenland.

[9] Se Lyndon LaRouches "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor," EIR magazine, Vol. 21, No. 43, October 28, 1994.

[10] Se H. Graham Lowrys How the Nation was Won: America's Untold Story, Vol. 1: 1630-1754, Executive Intelligence Review, Washington, D.C. 1988.

[11] Se David Shavins "From Leibniz to Franklin on 'Happiness,'" i Fidelio magazine, Vol. XII, No. 1, Summer 2003. Gentrykt her: [https://archive.schillerinstitute.com/fid\\_02-06/031\\_happinessA.html](https://archive.schillerinstitute.com/fid_02-06/031_happinessA.html).

[12] Se Anthony Chaitkins "The 'Land-Bridge': Henry Carey's Global Development Program." EIR magazine, Vol. 24, No.19, May 2, 1997, pp. 30-53.

[13] Se Franklin Roosevelts søns, Elliot Roosevelts, bog Som Han Så Det.

[14] Se Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ed., The Hitler Book, New Benjamin Franklin House, New York, NY. 1984.

[15] Fra dokumentaren For All Mankind, the first part of which can be found here: [https://youtu.be/otvtMfEI\\_9w?t=3](https://youtu.be/otvtMfEI_9w?t=3)

---

# **Aflys 'Jordens Dag'! Verden har i stedet brug for en 'Mars' dag'**

1. april (EIRNS) - Præsident Joe Biden har inviteret fyre statsoverhoveder til at deltage i et virtuelt topmøde i Washington den 22.-23. april for at fejre 'Jordens dag', ved at indvarsle en ny æra med global grøn afindustrialisering og affolkning under dække af at opnå "nul kulstofudledning" - uanset hvad dette måtte indebære - inden år 2050.

Det er ikke gørligt, og det vil ikke fungere. En af Indiens førende klimaeksperter og medlem af premierministerens råd om klimaændringer, Chandrashekhar Dasgupta, har allerede udtalt, at Indien bør foregive at støtte de globale mål, men absolut ikke lade sig binde af dem i deres eget land, fordi Indien er et udviklingsland, der enten skal vokse eller gå til grunde.

Det samme gør sig gældende for Bidens lovforslag om 2,2 billioner dollars til "infrastruktur- og jobskabelse", som *Washington Post* i dag tilstod ikke har meget med infrastruktur at gøre, men alt at gøre med at pålægge en dramatisk nedgradering af den energiteknologiske platform, designet til at skabe en ny æra af middelalderlig sol- og vindenergi. "Kernen i Bidens plan ... er oprettelsen af en national standard, der kræver, at forsyningsselskaber bruger en bestemt mængde sol, vind og anden vedvarende energi".

Dette, småler *the Post*, "ville udgøre den mest omfattende føderale intervention i elsektoren i generationer".

Men det kan heller ikke lade sig gøre, og vil ikke fungere. Talsmanden for Edison Electric Institute, elsektorens største handelsforening, sagde, at de med fornøjelse vil "gennemgå enhver foreslået standard for ren energi nøje", men de vil være uenige i, hvordan dette vil underminere den "overkommelighed og pålidelighed, som vores kunder værdsætter." Man kan forvente, hvordan allehånde produktionsbrancher, fagforeninger og andre professionelle samt forretningsgrupper modsætter sig 'Green New Deal', i takt med at det bliver tydeligt, at det betyder USA's tilbagevenden til middelalderlige teknologier og tilhørende middelalderlige befolkningsniveauer.

LaRouche-Organisationens nyudgivne brochure, "Det store spring tilbage: LaRouche knuser 'Green New Deal'-svindlen", afslører detaljeret det mareridt, som vedtagelsen af en sådan politik vil slippe løs. Men nok så afgørende præsenterer den også, hvad ingen andre kritikere formår at tage fat på: De egentlige globale løsninger på sammenbrudskrisen, som den amerikanske økonom og statsmand Lyndon LaRouche og hans medarbejdere har beskrevet dem gennem årtier. Alle disse programmatisk forslag er afhængige af, at USA slutter sig til Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ for at samarbejde om store infrastrukturprojekter - på denne planet og videre ud på Månen, Mars og resten af solsystemet.

Så det ville være en meget bedre idé hvis Narendra Modi fra Indien, Vladimir Putin fra Rusland samt Xi Jinping fra Kina inviterede Joe Biden til at deltage i et topmøde mellem disse fire magter på "sidelinjen" af det virtuelle topmøde den 22.-23. april. De kunne benytte lejligheden til at diskutere de virkelig pressende kriser, som planeten står overfor - COVID-pandemien, det økonomiske sammenbrud, truslen om regional- og verdenskrig - og de nødvendige løsninger, herunder internationalt samarbejde om menneskehedens næste videnskabelige og teknologiske grænse: rumforskning og kolonisering baseret på fusionsenergi.

(Alt imens forslaget fra Finlands præsident om at fejre 50-årsdagen for Helsinki-aftalerne, ved at bringe USA, Kina og Rusland sammen for at diskutere klima- og arktiske spørgsmål, ikke rammer plet med de foreslåede emner, er det korrekt i identifikationen af de

nødvendige deltagere.)

På den måde kunne 'Jordens Dag' transformeres og passende blive erstattet med 'Mars' dag'.

Læs LaRouche-organisationens hæfte her.

---

**Dødsfald fra strømsvigt i Texas er et forvarsel om hvad der vil ske, hvis der kommer en Grøn New Deal.**

**Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, den 17. februar 2021**

c

I sin ugentlige dialog advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche om, at de totalt unødvendige dødsfald og lidelser i Texas og andre amerikanske delstater på grund af en polarkoldfront giver et tegn på hvad der vil ske, hvis den "store nulstilling" og dens grønne New Deal ikke stoppes. Disse dødsfald er

ikke resultatet af en "naturkatastrofe", men en advarsel om hvad for en fremtid vi står overfor, hvis nedlæggelsen af kul- og atomkraftbaseret elektricitetsproduktion ikke tilbagerulles. Den nye EIR-rapport, "The Great Leap Backwards" ("Det store spring bagud"), giver både en analyse af de tydelige farer ved at vedtage en grøn dagsorden, og et alternativ baseret på hendes afdøde mands, Lyndon LaRouches, videnskabelige idéer.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche diskuterede også, hvordan kampagnen for konfrontation med Rusland og Kina udsætter menneskeheden for truslen om atomkrig på et tidspunkt, hvor samarbejde ikke kun er bydende nødvendigt, men også opnåeligt. Hvis NATO insisterer på sanktioner mod Rusland over den meget opblæste Navalny-affære, burde nationer som Tyskland, Frankrig og Italien forlade NATO. Tilsvarende viser EU's manglende evne til at beskytte sine borgere mod COVID-pandemien ved igen at forkludre leveringen af vacciner, at denne form for overnational institution ikke er i stand til at sørge for borgernes behov – en fiasko, der også ses i de sandsynlige ødelæggende virkninger af dets kampagne for en europæisk Grøn New Deal, hvilket kunne føre til en nedbrydning af det europæiske energinet.

Hun stillede de økonomiske og strategiske tragedier, der udvikler sig i de transatlantiske nationer, i modsætning til det optimistiske potentiale i de tre samtidige rummissioner til Mars. Det faktum, at De forenede arabiske Emirater startede sit rumprogram for kun seks år siden, giver håb om at, med internationalt videnskabeligt samarbejde, kan nationer bevæge sig hen imod en fredelig udforskning af vores univers, med enorme fordele for alle.

Afskrift på engelsk:

**Deaths from Power Outages in Texas Give**

# a Foretaste of Things To Come with the Green New Deal

The LaRouche Organization Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche  
Wednesday, February 17, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger with our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. It's February 17, 2021, and Helga, we have an extremely dramatic development, which seems ironically to coincide with the release of our Special Report, and that is the cold front that has hit Texas, leaving between 3 and 4 million people freezing in the dark. This is really quite dramatic, isn't it?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes, it is actually very horrible, because already 26 people died. Now, this is incredible, and you have the state of Texas, where the wind turbines froze up, the solar panels were covered with snow, so the energy production went down from an average of 25,000 MW to only 12,000 MW, and naturally you have blackouts, not only in Texas, but now there are rolling blackouts in 14 other states in the United States.

Now, this is absolutely unnecessary, and it's not a natural catastrophe. People should not look at it this way, because if you had normal coal-generated energy and nuclear energy, you would not have this situation, so people should not say this is a "natural" catastrophe. Because I would rather say, if we want to have a good note about it, we should take it was a warning from St. Peter, a warning sign what could happen with the weather if you don't have the energy required to deal with it.

Since we have this new report out, "The Great Leap Backward—LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal," and the Great Reset, there we have warnings in it, that this will lead to blackouts and the blackouts could be even more

dramatic. We have the case of the EU, where studies were made by the scientific advisory service to the German Parliament, already nine years ago, that you could have a collapse of the entire European energy grid, and that would have much more devastating consequences than even this. But this is bad enough. I think 4 million people in Texas, in the U.S., and 5 million people in the north of Mexico are without electricity. Now, that means people can die in the cold, they can die of the effects of it in various ways, and I think it's quite important that the former governor of Texas, Rick Perry, who was also the Energy Secretary in the Trump administration, blasted this in a very powerful way, saying that if you cut out coal, if you cut out nuclear energy, then you are completely dependent on an ideologically based energy policy, and people are dying! And that is what would happen if you have an energy policy defined by such people as AOC [Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez] and the like.

So, this is a very serious warning, and I can only advise people to get the Special Report *EIR* has put out, because the consequences of what the Great Reset would do, the Texas developments give you a meager foretaste of the kind of economic collapse which would result as a consequence of the implementation of this policy. And this could lead to very dramatic developments, social chaos; it would have a devastating effect on the strategic situation, because some parts of the world are not so stupid—Japan, for example, when they had a snowstorm, I think it was last December, the Energy Minister immediately said that Japan must turn back on all of its nuclear plants; and obviously, Russia, China, India, they are all massively investing in the production of fission energy, of the third generation fission energy, and naturally, very much emphasis on fusion power [research]. But the idea that the world can live without coal plants, modern coal plants which are

absolutely environmentally friendly, I think this is really an illusion and must be corrected immediately.

SCHLANGER: One of the things I found most interesting, is that Rick Perry, in his discussion also mentioned the advances of nuclear fusion, so that's a very good sign that there are at least some people thinking.

But Helga we have another problem that this comes up against, which is the absolute dysfunction of the political parties in the United States, with a feud going on in the Republican Party which broke out this week; with the Democrats somewhat chaotic and stuck with nothing but the Green New Deal. How does this look to you?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It looks very worrisome, because also the fact that Kamala Harris is now conducting foreign policy with President Biden resting in Camp David. This has caused the raising of quite some eyebrows, because normally a Vice President participates maybe, in overseas phone calls, but here, Kamala Harris is conducting foreign policy all by herself. So the question is, in what condition is President Biden? Naturally, the situation in the Republican Party is one of utmost chaos.

And I think the only way how this can be addressed, is that we have to organize with The LaRouche Organization and the Schiller Institute to really promote, absolutely, the solutions of my late husband Lyndon LaRouche, and hopefully large segments of the population will understand that a change of the paradigm is absolutely necessary. At this point, the only voice of reason is really coming from The LaRouche Organization and the policies promoted by my late husband. But it needs a broad mobilization of the population to change the course of these developments.

SCHLANGER: One of the things that The LaRouche Organization is doing is conducting a series of dialogues, such as the one from last Saturday on U.S. Russia policy.



[[https://laroucheorganization.nationbuilder.com/forum\\_worsening\\_u\\_s\\_russian\\_relations\\_reverse\\_them\\_with\\_new\\_paradigm\\_or\\_face\\_nuclear\\_war](https://laroucheorganization.nationbuilder.com/forum_worsening_u_s_russian_relations_reverse_them_with_new_paradigm_or_face_nuclear_war)] It is clear that the war machine that was never removed under President Trump is now back on all gears, targetting Russia and China. Where do you see this headed?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It is extremely dangerous. We had the Atlantic Council Paper, "The Longer Telegram," so-called, basically referring to the "long telegram" paper by George Kennan from 1946, now referring to the need to have regime change against China, especially targetting Xi Jinping to be toppled. Now, if you put yourself in the shoes of such a government as China, and you hear that coming from the largest nuclear power, and probably still the largest economy in the world, it has consequences. It leads to a hardening of positions. And in a certain sense, this is going on against Russia, with the Navalny campaign. So I think it's quite interesting that Prof. Lyle Goldstein, who is from the Naval War College, he made a couple of warnings, both in the radio and also in the *Washington Times*, basically saying that this is leading to a situation where there is practically a warlike situation between the United States and Russia, and that the people who are pushing the Navalny campaign should be aware of the fact, is it really in the interest of the West to have a very sizable nuclear power like Russia to have chaos, or is it not in the interest of the Western countries, that the nuclear weapons of Russia should be under the control of a stable, unified force—I mean, just imagine, you have a civil war in Russia and then these nuclear weapons would get into the hands of some strange, terrorist kind of forces!

I think that there is actually the need to really be aware of that, and come to the conclusion that this whole policy of sanctions against Russia is not functioning; this was,

for example, just made as a statement by the head of the Kiel Institute for the World Economy [<https://www.ifw-kiel.de/>], Mr. Gabriel Felbermayr, who said that the whole idea of sanctions against Russia does not function, because you don't get countries like China, or India, or other partners of Russia to cooperate, so therefore, the only forces which are hurt by the sanctions, is, in this case, emphatically Germany. So, this whole policy of geopolitical confrontation can only lead to a complete catastrophe, if it is pursued.

SCHLANGER: There's also a very sharp warning coming from Sergey Lavrov, the Russian Foreign Minister, about the policies of the EU, which are definitely part of this anti-Russian grouping.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. He said that if this is stopped, if these sanctions are not stopped, that Russia is prepared to break off all relations to the EU. Now, there was a rather stupid article in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, basically pooh-poohing it, saying this is just meant to cause people to now say, "Oh, we should do something now that this doesn't happen." But these liberals, and the *FAZ* is full of them, they don't understand the connection between cause and effect, but these policies, as I said, they lead to dramatic changes.

I mean, if you put yourself in the shoes of Russia and China, what is the natural consequence of these policies coming from the U.S., from the EU, from Great Britain? Already in October 2020, at the annual Valdai conference, Putin raised the possibility—this is not the first time it was raised, but he raised it publicly at this Valdai conference—the possibility of a Russian-Chinese military alliance. And this was brought up again on Feb. 4, this year, in a meeting between Wang Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, and Sergey Lavrov, discussing this option. Now, Putin in some context, also said it's not necessary, but

obviously, it would be a major change in the strategic situation. What it would do is, it would protect China, if China would sort of come under the nuclear umbrella of the Russian nuclear forces, which are sizable, they're extremely modernized; Putin had introduced these new weapons systems, the hypersonic missiles, the nuclear-powered submarines—all weapons systems which sort of make the previous plans for a global missile defense system by the U.S. and by NATO obsolete; obviously, all these countries are working high-speed in their own hypersonic missiles, so it's a dangerous arms race.

But, it would mean, if China would come under the nuclear umbrella of Russia, it would completely change the situation for good; it would basically make a limited nuclear attack on China impossible, unless you want to have World War III all the way. It would basically allow China a greater flexibility in dealing with the problems in the South China Sea, in respect to Taiwan. It would definitely have an incredible signal effect on all the countries participating in the Belt and Road Initiative. It would basically give them assurance that there can be a peaceful win-win cooperation.

Now, obviously, the efforts by the U.S. is to counter that, and that was going on already with the Trump administration, Pompeo and Esper, to build the Quad, that is, the Indo-Pacific alliance, trying to pull India into an alliance with the United States against Russia and China. But that is the kind of geopolitical games which really is what led to World War I and World War II, and I think it is really something we have to overcome: Because if this kind of geopolitical maneuvering is going on, the Damocles Sword of nuclear extinction hangs over the world. And people should really wake up.

The only consequence for European nations is to stop the sanctions campaign against Russia, to stop supporting

Navalny, who is—it's a typical Western intelligence-promoted operation for regime change in Russia. I think his support in Russia is very little. He has maybe a few hundreds of supporters—that looks big when they go on the street—but in reality it's a very tiny fraction of the Russian population, and as we discussed previously, Ahurkov, one of the campaign managers of Navalny had begged the British second in command in the Moscow Embassy for money so they could do these operations. This is really something which should not happen! Regime change policy is a complete interference into the sovereignty of a country, and it is what Obama and Tony Blair were doing, the so-called "humanitarian interventions," "spreading democracy"; democracy has gotten a very bad name as a result. And what should happen instead, is that the European nations, like Germany, France, Italy and others should leave NATO and rethink what is their security interest. I think we need to discuss a new security architecture, and that must represent the security interests of every single country on the planet, if we want to overcome the danger of nuclear war.

So, I think the consequence of this is to really leave the kind of NATO alliance, which has become obsolete in any case, after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and right now, the idea to expand NATO as a global force, is really—it will lead to World War III if it's not stopped.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned China possibly going into an alliance with Russia: The Chinese made a threat that they may withhold rare earth materials that are necessary for aircraft construction and other kinds of defense contracting. How serious is that threat?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think it's being seriously looked at. I think the Chinese government has started an investigation, exactly of what the effect would be, as you say, on the military sector, on the production of fighter

jets, and if this escalation increases, one could actually see that happening. That would be a sort of nuclear bomb, but it would be one of these signs of a prewar situation if it happens.

SCHLANGER: And speaking of pre-war, we're seeing a number of developments in Southwest Asia around Yemen, also around Syria with the Israeli strikes on Syria, threats to Iran. How does this situation look from your standpoint?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: The situation in Yemen is a complete tragedy, and also I can only say the world community which allows this to happen—I mean, the Yemen population is the worst humanitarian catastrophe in years; it's escalating; everybody knows it, nobody does anything decisive about it. Right now you have 2 million Yemeni children under the age of 5 who are in acute malnutrition; 400,000 of those are in acute severe malnutrition, which is acute danger of starvation. Now how easy would it be to tell the Saudis, "you open the ports, you allow the entrance of food aid," and if the EU and the United States and some other countries would really put their foot down, it could be remedied, practically in a week! The fact that this is not happening, I really think that the EU policies on the question of refugees, what they have done with Frontex [EU's border guard] backing and participating in the pushback operations against refugees, all of these policies are completely inhuman, and I think any nation in Europe that wants to have a decent policy should leave the EU! The EU and NATO, right now, are really alliances which are completely against the interests of the member states, and there is no need to have a bureaucracy in Brussels.

Look what they did in terms of getting vaccines: Ursula von der Leyen is a complete failure; this woman was a problem when she German Defense Minister. Now her record as the so-called President of EU Commission is a disaster. Why does she not resign? She should resign! And I think the European

nations should leave the EU and form an alliance as republics of “fatherlands” as de Gaulle was calling for it, and you can have a multinational cooperation for the development of Africa, for the reconstruction of Southwest Asia, and you don’t need a supranational bureaucracy.

These things have to be remedied, and these policies are clearly not in the interests of the European nations. And in the case of Yemen, I really appeal to all of your viewers—that is, you—to help to change the policy in respect to this genocide which is going on before our very eyes.

SCHLANGER: Now, speaking of the EU, we have the man from the British royal yacht *Britannia*, who is now moving into power in Italy, Mario Draghi, former head of the European Central Bank: This is just another disaster, and he’s committing himself to the entire policy of so-called “monetary integration.” Is this going to go over in Italy?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: We have to see. Right now, you have the Lega being in the government, and they have one minister post; I think one big test case will be what happens to the Messina Bridge and also the Taranto steel plant, which Draghi basically wants to shut down, and the EU wants to shut down: This steel plant is the production facility which could actually produce the amount of steel needed for the Messina Bridge [to Sicily], which obviously would completely change the dynamic in terms of the Mezzogiorno, bringing real development to Southern Italy and Sicily. And the Lega basically wants to convince Draghi to go ahead with this bridge. Let’s see how this plays out: Draghi made his first speech in the Senate which was unfortunately, everything one could expect. He made the absurd statement saying that the more there is European integration, the more Italian, the Italians become. He also called for Schumpeter-like “creative destruction,” saying that some industries are not worth saving. So this is exactly what

one could expect from somebody who has been in the ECB for many years, and demanding all kinds of “reforms” which created the problems in which Italy right now finds itself. So this does not look good.

SCHLANGER: To conclude, we want to go back to this question of Lyndon LaRouche’s solutions, and you’ve been speaking very enthusiastically about the development of the space program in the United Arab Emirates. We now have a Chinese mission on Mars, and as of tomorrow, there will be U.S. rover landing on Mars. How significant is this? This really does represent—when you talk about the Texas situation being the foretaste of the bad things that could come from the Great Reset, doesn’t this project around Mars give us a foretaste of the good things that could come out of international scientific cooperation?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Obviously. Look, for the Mars missions—I’m still most impressed by this U.A.E. operation, because this was a Mars mission which was only started, I think six years ago; so, in an incredible speed, they caught up, at least with Japanese help, but nevertheless, and they have now an spacecraft in Mars orbit. This shows you that any developing nation—after all the Gulf States only discovered oil less than 30 years ago—and turned from total desert states into, in some cases, states which are really doing quite remarkable things, in terms of for example, the Emirates have an island which they irrigated and turned into beautiful gardens and forests. And when my husband and I were in Abu Dhabi in 2002, he made a speech there on the future of oil; this was organized by the Zayed Center. And he basically said, look, forget oil as a fossil fuel, it’s too precious and should be used for chemical production, for pharmaceutical production, and use the revenue to invest in the production of water, that will green the deserts.

[<https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2002/eirv29n23-20020614>

/eirv29n23-20020614\_006-the\_middle\_east\_as\_a\_strategic\_c-lar.pdf]

And he advised basically to go for innovation and leapfrog—and this is exactly what the Emirates have done, and other Gulf States are going in a similar direction. They are cooperating with China on the Belt and Road Initiative, and now you have this Mars mission.

Now, if you think what incredible technologies are opened up with space research and space travel, we have seen it many years ago with the Apollo Project, where it's often cited that every cent investment brought back fourteen cents in terms of value as computers, as all kinds of spinoff products. But we are now on the verge of getting fusion power as a propulsion, which is the only way how human beings could safely get to Mars. There is discussion about studying the weather patterns, the underground water, the traces of life. And obviously, not only manned Mars missions are what is being looked at, but also a village on the Moon, a city on Mars, creating the conditions for longer term existence of man on these planets, as a stepping stone for future interstellar travel. Now, that means that the character of humanity will completely be transformed, because it's very clear that once you undertake such endeavors, you cannot have a geopolitical war on Mars, or else you will not live, and you will not exist.

And the kind of international cooperation among astronauts which we have seen on the International Space Station (ISS), that is the model for the future cooperation among nations, like the United States, Russia, China, India, Europe—the best policy of Europe is their work on ESA, the European Space Agency, where its head, Mr. Jan Wörner, is enthusiastically speaking about the village on the Moon all the time; and ESA has just put out a request for young people to be trained as astronauts. That program should be



enlarged. Europe should have a much, much larger space program, and if a small country like the Emirates can have a Mars mission, why cannot Germany have a Mars mission on its own? You know, Germany right now is in place 27, in terms of the number of people being vaccinated; the Emirates are in place 6 or 7.

So there's something right which the Emirates are doing, and something fundamentally wrong what Germany is doing and the EU is doing. However, this is the future, and if mankind is supposed to live as an immortal species—and that was a notion which was coined by my late husband—because we are different from other species, because we have creative reason. We can solve any problem through scientific and technological breakthroughs, by discovering new laws of the universe. And since our mind *is* the most advanced part of that universe, there is all the reason for optimism that once we attune our own existence and our own practice with the laws of the universe, our chances to become the immortal species is absolutely there. But it does require space travel as a precondition, and I think this idea of nations working together to discover the beautiful secrets of the universe, that gives you a taste of what the future of man can look like, when we decide to become adults.

SCHLANGER: Well, Helga, it's always good to end with a healthy dose of optimism, as you just did. For our viewers, let me remind you: You can get the new report "A Great Leap Backward—LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal" on why we have to defeat the Great Reset and the Green New Deal, go to <https://schillerinstitute.com> and get an invoice for it. And Helga, I guess that's what we have now, so we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: And join the Schiller Institute!

---

# **Overvind Davos' "store omstilling" med LaRouches nye paradigme. Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, den 27. januar 2021**

Se Helgas Ugentlige webcast, her:

Mens de utopiske fascister fra den globalistiske erhvervselite har planlagt at bruge den nuværende Davos-konference som det tidspunkt, hvor de gennemtrumfer deres globale bankdiktatur for at indføre en dødbringende Grøn New Deal, er der tegn på, at en opposition vokser, centreret omkring Kina og Rusland, som også inkluderer nogle europæiske elementer. Helga Zepp-LaRouche beskrev konferencen hidtil som "en pose blandede bolsjer" og sagde, at finansoligarkerne, der fremmer negativ økonomisk vækst og befolkningsreduktion, er stødt ind i ledende nationers hensigter, som ikke er villige til at overgive deres suverænitet for "aktionær-kapitalismens" skyld. Begge præsidenter Xi og Putin opfordrede til samarbejde og multilaterale løsninger, og Xi sagde, at den unipolære model, der afhænger af at sætte nationer op mod hinanden, er forældet. I det som Zepp-LaRouche kaldte et "tidens tegn", støttede Tysklands kansler Merkel Xis appel for

multilateralisme, som hun sagde, stred mod den idé, som præsident Biden søsatte for et "demokratisk topmøde" for alle nationer mod Kina og Rusland.

Mens Helga Zepp-LaRouche var forsigtigt optimistisk med hensyn til Biden-Putin-aftalen om at ratificere en femårig NY START-atomnedrustningsaftale, sagde hun, at Bidens belæring af Putin om de sædvanlige geopolitiske spørgsmål viser, at dem der står bag ham stadig er fast besluttet på en strategisk orientering, der kan føre til krig. Yderligere betyder de rige landes manglende evne til at yde hjælp til fattigere lande med at bekæmpe COVID19-pandemien, at vi enten fremtvinger en ændring i tankegangen, eller også vil pandemien ikke blive overvundet. Den eneste løsning på de problemer, som Xi og Putin rejste i deres taler, er den fulde indførelse af Lyndon LaRouches plan for en firmagtsaftale [mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien] for at etablere et Nyt Bretton Woods-kreditsystem, og at gennemføre LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love på verdensplan. Hun opfordrede seerne til at slutte sig til Schiller Instituttet for at hjælpe til med at realisere potentialet for et globalt system, der giver mulighed for udvikling af alle nationer.

### **Engelsk afskrift:**

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger, welcome to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche: It's Jan. 27th, 2021. And I think we should start with the ongoing summit of the World Economic Forum, the Davos billionaires, the gathering of corporatists from around the world to talk about the "Great Reset."

Helga, what's the latest you have on what's going on there?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It's a mixed bag, because on the one side, you have all the CEOs of the large firms and banks, BlackRock, Standard Chartered, you have basically the

people who—they don't talk about the Great Reset any more because that has been discredited a lot, so they're calling it the "Great Transition." For example, Bill Winters who's the CEO of Standard Chartered bank, said this is the great \$50 trillion opportunity for the next ten years; others like Philip Hildebrand, the Vice President of BlackRock and so forth, they're all saying they need a lot private finance, private investment. Basically this is a scheme to transform the world economy, get rid of fossil fuels, naturally no emphasis on nuclear energy, and it would mean to bring the energy flux-density of the world down to a level where, for sure, the present level of more than 7 billion people cannot be maintained. As a matter of fact, Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, the former head of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, he had said many times that he thought the ideal population for the world is 1 billion, and if these policies of these people would be implemented, you would destroy the world's industrial capacities. Because if you eliminate fossil fuels—first of all there are clean coal plants now; secondly if you eliminate coal plants, especially for the developing sector, there is no way how you can prevent mass death! And obviously, this is the hidden, or not so hidden, implication of all of these schemes.

This is a big danger, because these are people who are allied with the central banks, the Fed, the ECB, the Bank of England, all the large corporations, but they're not the only ones in the world who count, because there was also Xi Jinping, who gave the keynote. For some reason WEF director Klaus Schwab asked him to give the keynote, and he had a quite different tone. First of all, he said the mode of setting countries against each other is outmoded and that what is needed is a multilateralism which is in the interest of all participants. He also emphasized a lot the role of science and technology innovation, that China is

continuously intending to help the other countries of the South to overcome poverty.

So I think the fact that China is just existing, and is offering a different model of development, including having now started to deliver vaccines for the COVID pandemic to 150 countries, is setting a different tone. And if these oligarchs of the big banks and corporations want to push through their scheme it just means they will dismantle the industries of the United States and Europe and other countries that go along with that; but I don't think that they can win. So it is a sign of the times that Chancellor Merkel, who spoke after Xi Jinping basically supported Xi Jinping in his idea of having multilateralism. She said she does not want to be put in a position where she has to choose where one bloc is centered around the United States and another one is centered around China, and that she thinks future relations must be based on multilateralism.

Now, this is very important, because, as we know, President Biden has been pushing, or had hoped to have this "Democracy Summit" which was his idea to collect all the NATO countries and get them all lined up against China and against Russia; so that is obviously not functioning, so you see a new—it's still in a nascent form and baby steps, but you see a tendency in Europe to not want to be treated like the colonies of whatever is being said in Washington, and indirectly, naturally, with London given the marching orders from behind. So this is an interesting development.

However, I just got a report before we started this program, about the speech of President Putin, and while I didn't have time to read it at length, I think some of the elements which he said are extremely important: Because he said that the danger is that the world risks a conflict of all against all if global development concerns are not taken care. And he also said that he really hopes that it will not come to a hot global conflict, because this could

mean the end to our civilization.  
[<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/64938>]

I think Putin, and the Russians in general, are very clearly aware of the dangers in general are very clearly aware of the dangers which are in the situation, and I think it's very important that he expressed it with that clarity.

I think this Davos virtual summit is just a measurement of where the different forces in the world stand. I think the decisions are being made by the central banks and the forces of Wall Street, City of London, Silicon Valley, and that is the new oligarchical power, which is the real problem.

But as I said, it's a divided world, and there is an alternative between absolute zero growth, or reduction of growth, poverty, leading to war and conflict, and the perspective of joining hands to attack the problems of underdevelopment together. So I think it's new and naturally, people like the BlackRock representative said there is now a new game change, a new landscape because Biden is the new President and he has brought the United States back into this Green New Deal arrangement—yeah, that's true and it's very problematic for the United States, but as I said, that is not the only story in town.

SCHLANGER: To continue that thread a little bit, if you think about what you just said on what Putin said and what Xi said, it's clear that the alternative to what's being pushed by the central banks is your husband's proposal for the four powers as having the strength to combat Wall Street, the City of London and so on. Now in that, when we're talking about Biden and Putin, they had a discussion yesterday which had some interesting aspects to it, starting with the renewal of the START agreement, but what do you make of that talk?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: From the little which is known about it, I think it was useful, because they agreed that the New START Treaty will be extended for five years, which is what Putin had offered, and both sides expressed that it's in their mutual interest. [Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei] Ryabkov said that this is very good because it gives five years for a complete reevaluation and the refounding of the relationship between the United States and Russia. Naturally, then of course, Biden could not help himself to bring in the usual geopolitical issues, like the Navalny case, the supposed hacking of SolarWinds, and similar things, so he had to say these things; but I think it's important, because when the two largest nuclear powers stop talking, then this is the most dangerous. So while I'm not saying that this is resolving anything, I think it is an important first step. And it is important, because the world is really in a very dangerous situation, so I think that that's what one can say about it.

SCHLANGER: One of the dangers is the continuing inability of big powers, including the European Union and the United States, to bring the coronavirus pandemic under control. This was discussed peripherally there, and Biden's coming up with a plan. But unless you deal with this as you proposed, as an international question, with a new health system for every nation, this is not going to be stopped by the kind of half-measures that are being taken.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, there is obviously an effort to beef up the production of vaccines. I think there are efforts being made. But now, there's a huge scandal in Europe, because—this is unfortunately true, that the EU was very slow in ordering vaccines; they clearly had the idea of saving money rather than ordering as many different products from different firms and then see which one comes first, and there is no danger to order too many, because if you have too much you can give it all the other countries

in need. So this was clearly not done by [European Commission President Ursula] Von Der Leyen; she's now targetted even in {Bildzeitung}—this tabloid—that she did not order, and that the result is in Germany, it's going very slowly; in other countries in Europe, it's going very slowly, and this is a reflection of the same austerity mentality which is really—I hope it shortens the career of Von Der Leyen, because she is just the wrong person to be in any leading position in Europe.

The real problem, however, is what the head of the African Union and President of South Africa Cyril Ramaphosa said, who pointed to the fact that so far the rich countries have mostly cared for themselves, and he said there will be no solution to the pandemic as long as one country is not having the necessary vaccines. And Tedros from the World Health Organization said that the behavior of the rich countries so far, which got themselves 95% of all the vaccine orders, and leaving the so-called third world with only 5%, that this is a “catastrophic moral failure.” One can only hope that this is being remedied as quickly as possible, because it now turns out that the idea that Africa was having relatively little problems with COVID-19, turns out not to be true, and as we suspected, it was only due to non-reporting, little testing; and now it comes out through a study from a university in Zambia, that especially the age group between 19 and 59 years of age have the highest mortality rate, {and} children! Now, as we also know there are new strains in Britain, in South Africa, and in Brazil, which are much more lethal and also spread more quickly; and there are now medical experts warning that what could happen is that one of these new mutations, new variants, could develop to become vaccine-resistant. If that would happen, then we would be in a very dramatic situation.

So I think there is not yet a recognition, at least not in



any way necessary, of the leading institutions, to really understand that we are in a race against time, because it is very clear that the economic collapse coming from the COVID pandemic, is going to ruin a lot of industrial substance. For example, in Germany and other European countries, a lot of small and medium firms are not going to make it. The situation now, where a possible lockdown will start again in a hard way in France, or it has started already, with lockdowns from 6 in the evening until morning, people are not allowed to leave their house; so a lot of economic hardship will follow, and a lot of substance will be destroyed.

So either there is a change in the attitude, that people understand that you have to start to build modern health systems in every single country, or this cannot be controlled, that rethinking has not yet started in a serious fashion and that's what the Schiller Institute is campaigning for. Because unless we take this crisis to really start to overcome the underdevelopment of the developing countries in a serious way, there is no guarantee that this will not lead to a major crisis. And I think Putin, in his speech in Davos reflected that dimension very clearly, that out of chaos you could have a global catastrophe.

The ILO just reported that the loss of jobs in 2020 was equivalent to 255 million fulltime jobs. I don't think that covers all the shadow industry jobs, but that's a significant number, and they expect another 130 million losses in 2021, and they say this does not yet take into account the likelihood of a fourth and a fifth wave. So that all makes clear that we have to change the whole situation: I cannot see a willingness right now on the side of the central banks in Europe, the United States, to go in that direction, but that will be a subject of mobilizing the population, because if these institutions

are unable to reform—and you know, if you look at the situation, with the riots having now spread to Holland, where for four days you had massive riots in 10 cities; last week we had the same thing in Denmark. This was not unlike the mob which stormed the Capitol on Jan. 6 in the United States, and if you now have more job losses, more unemployment, the danger of blackouts—we have a huge danger that if this Green energy policy is implemented that you will have blackouts leading to complete chaos, I think this could really lead to major social upheavals, and the only way to avoid that would be to really go for our program, starting with the health system in every country. And we have published this program for 1.5 billion productive new jobs, which have to be created [[https://larouchepub.com/-special\\_report/2020/larouche-plan-for-1500000000-jobs.pdf](https://larouchepub.com/-special_report/2020/larouche-plan-for-1500000000-jobs.pdf)]. And despite the coronavirus condition there has to be a rethinking and there has to be a vision for the population to see the light at the end of the tunnel, that even if some of these things will be very difficult to implement under coronavirus conditions, I think it is important that there is a willingness by the leading institutions to address that.

Xi Jinping in his speech in Davos also mentioned that he wants to strengthen the G20, because he said that that is the institution to build up global governance—well, that is important because as long as you have some countries at least in that combination that go in a different direction, it is important. And just to mention it, China has had last year 550,000 new patents, which is an increase of 17%; that is because the Chinese government put a lot of emphasis on science and technological progress innovation, and there was just a study by a German university that found that the civil law in China is compatible to Western standards, essentially because they took the entire canon of civil law in Germany as a model to write their Chinese

civil law. So the university study comes to the conclusion that this an absolutely Western standard and there's no reason to complain about it.

And I think there has to be a rethinking about a lot of the prejudices in the anti-China/anti-Russia campaign, because if we want to solve the problems of the world, we have to stop geopolitical confrontation and find a way of putting our forces together to address these urgent questions **which face all of humanity.**

SCHLANGER: As far as being stuck in the old paradigm, we have this fight continuing in the United States against Donald Trump, with the impeachment bill from the House moving to the Senate for trial. This is dividing the country once again. It's being used to create the kind of confrontation that would serve as a pretext for more crackdowns, more censorship. You mentioned that you are somewhat excited, or intrigued by what Tulsi Gabbard said, and also what Putin had said about this. What's your thought about what's going on with this impeachment?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, there was the vote in the Senate where only five Republican Senators voted with the Democrats, so the impeachment trial will start on Feb. 9th, but I think it has almost zero chance to succeed, because they would need 17 Republican Senators to go along, and there are already now many voices that there is no basis in the Constitution to even do that, because the Constitution does not allow for private persons to be impeached. So you can impeach a sitting President, but not a former President. So that is a big argument. And the whole campaign is ludicrous in the first place, because Trump did not incite violence and the mob to storm the Capitol, despite the narrative which is being put out by the media and the Democrats. He gave a speech to his supporters! And then said, "let's move down Pennsylvania Avenue," and "we have to take back the country"—I mean, these are normal

things to say; many politicians have said many things like that. So it's a complete orchestration, and to somehow now criminalize 75 million Trump voters is also not going to work.

It is the danger of a polarization, naturally, and what Tulsi Gabbard said is quite to the point. She said that the mob which stormed the Capitol, this is dangerous, but she said also dangerous is the John Brennans and the Adam Schiffs and the Big Tech, but they're more dangerous because they're more powerful.

Now, also Putin, in his speech at the World Economic Forum pointed to the role of the Big Tech that they have more power than the elected governments, and I think this is something which should be of concern to everybody, because if these Big Tech firms can allow people to say one thing, and not allow another thing, make total censorship, this is really dictatorship. And I think the population must be mobilized against it, and governments around the world must take measures to put these high tech firms under control and under government regulation. And Biden, if he doesn't do it, will be discredited by that as much, as well.

SCHLANGER: Also a reflection of the old paradigm is the effort to continue with sanctions against the Nord Stream 2 project, which is very far advanced in terms of the U.S., the U.K., NATO, and there's a reaction growing against this from Germany. What do you think is going to happen?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think it's going to be built. I think it's only few kilometers left. They restarted the completion of it, and the government spokesman of Merkel, Steffen Seibert said that this is not something which concerns the government, because it's a private contract between private firms, and even the Environment Minister Svenja Schulze said these were contracts which were made many years ago, and it would put into question the reliability of Germany

as a partner in any kind of trade deal if they would now stop it. So I think this is interesting, and as I said, I do see baby steps of self-assertion on the side of the German government, and I think it is a tendency in Europe as well; and one could only hope that it would continue.

SCHLANGER: A lot of what you've been discussing today Helga, is related to the fight between the old paradigm and the new paradigm, which I think is becoming more obvious to a large number of people. You've been at the center of this fight, you've made it the cause of the Schiller Institute to push for a move into a new paradigm, outside of the realm of the false choices that are presented by geopolitics, with neoliberalism. What can you say to the viewers, that they need to do, to make sure we get this push for a new paradigm?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: We have a program. The program was in large part authored by my late husband Lyndon LaRouche, who said that we need absolutely to have a New Bretton Woods system which has one main goal: to overcome the underdevelopment of the developing sector. Now that happens to be exactly what Franklin D. Roosevelt intended the Bretton Woods system to be, which it never became, because he died before it could be established. But I think that there is the potential to have a global system which allows the development of all nations. It is the sign of the times.

The fact that China, Russia, about 150 other nations are going in this direction, I think this is something which is a hopeful development, and I don't think the efforts by the Biden Administration to go back to the old confrontation with China, with Russia—well, the only thing it can bring is World War III, in which case, nobody would enjoy it, not Biden, and not anybody of his cabinet. They have no way of crushing this ferment without causing World War III. Now, that's a real danger and I don't want to belittle it for one second. But I think that if people really think about,

there is a way to solve this problem, and that is to do exactly what the American System of economy was, in the beginning of the American republic, what the German economic miracle was in the postwar period, to go back to scientific and technological progress, to go in the direction of increase of productivity, the Four Laws which were designed by my late husband, to go for global Glass-Steagall, get rid of the casino economy; implement national bank in every single country on the planet; then go in the direction of a credit system, cooperate in long-term development projects—it would bring the whole world out of this crisis!

And we have reached a point, where one year after the pandemic, at a point where it's very clear the economy is in a very dangerous collapse phase, I mean: Are human beings capable of reflecting on the mistakes which were made and correcting them? I fundamentally think, absolutely yes. It's just that we need the kind of discussion, how should we shape the world for this coming period, for the next hundred years, and then take the vision of having the idea of peaceful cooperation. Why don't we just allow the different systems, if a country wants to have a different social system and is not trying to impose that on another one, why should we not accept that? Accept sovereignty, accept non-interference into the internal affairs, accept the different social system. Can we not have an alliance of republics working for the common good of all of humanity? That's what John Quincy Adams was advocating, and I think that that is exactly what is needed now.

And I also think this must be combined with a cultural renaissance: I think we have to realize in the West that this exaggerated liberalism, where you replace moral standards with the principle of everything is allowed, the more pornographic, the more violent, the more perverse something becomes, the more interesting it becomes—that was

a wrong way! And I think we have lost our way in the West, and all we have to do, is to do the same thing that China is doing, what Russia is doing; they went back to their own high traditions of their high culture. There is a big revival of 5,000 years of tradition in China. Russia is doing the same thing. And we could do the same thing as well! In Europe, we have a {beautiful} European Classical period, we have the Italian Renaissance, the Andalusian renaissance, we have the Ecole Polytechnique in France; we have the German Classical period. In America, you have the principles of the American Revolution, the American System of economy. We have so many wonderful traditions which we could revive and be an absolute important shaping factor in the future world. And I think we have to mobilize the population to rally around that, and then solutions are possible.

So I want to invite all of you, our viewers, to join with us, and help us to get the world out of this crisis.

SCHLANGER: Well, Helga, thank you for your insights, and your optimism in this moment of pessimism, confusion, demoralization is really refreshing, and it ought to be something that will bring people to The LaRouche Organization. We welcome all of viewers to go to the websites of The LaRouche Organization and the Schiller Institute, where you can much more in-depth material on what Helga has been discussing today.

Helga, thanks for joining us this week, and we'll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Till next week!