

Formand Tom Gillesbergs tale til Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris

Jacques Cheminade, LaRouche-bevægelsens leder i Frankrig og fhv. præsidentkandidat, og Tom Gillesberg på en tidligere konference.

Den 4. februar 2020 organiserede det franske Schiller Institut et meget vellykket seminar i Paris med titlen: "Dialog mellem Kulturerne eller Handelskrig: Frankrig ved en skillevej." Tæt ved hundrede personer – kontakter, diplomater, foreninger, iværksættere og Kinaeksperter – fyldte lokalet på rådhuset i Paris' 5. arrondissement. Såvel Schiller Instituttets internationale grundlægger og præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche som formand for det danske Schiller Institut, Tom Gillesberg, sendte varme hilsner samt meddelelser til begivenheden.

Meddelelse fra Tom Gillesberg, formand for det Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:

Jeg er ked af, at jeg på grund af sygdom ikke kan være med jer i dag, men her er nogle tanker jeg gerne vil dele med jer.

I Danmark, og i resten af Skandinavien, har vi gennem de sidste par år set en voksende kampagne i medierne – og med støtte fra efterretningstjenester og regeringsinstitutioner – for at dæmonisere Kina, i lighed med, hvad der igennem nogen tid har været tilfældet for Rusland. Presset kommer fra USA og deres kontrollanter i Storbritannien, og udøves ofte gennem "soft power" ved at sprede historier om Kina såvel som Rusland der skal vise, at de er diktaturer, som man virkelig ikke kan stole på. På det seneste er dette set i den massive kampagne imod at lade det kinesiske firma Huawei, verdens førende leverandør af 5G-teknologi, levere udstyret til det nye 5G-netværk i Danmark og på Færøerne. Nogle prøver endda at bruge

udbruddet af en ny form for coronavirus i Wuhan som et eksempel på, hvordan Kina og dets indflydelse verden over bringer os alle i fare.

Derfor besluttede Schiller Instituttet i Danmark i 2017 at imødegå denne voksende fjendtliggørelse med et projekt for en "Dialog mellem Kulturerne". Sammen med venner, der var aktive i det dansk-russiske samfund, arrangerede vi en koncert, hvor vi havde klassisk musik og dans fra Rusland, Kina, Afrika, Indonesien og mange europæiske lande, for at vise, hvor berigede vi alle bliver ved at få adgang til alle disse andre nationers kultur. Kinas Kulturinstitut i København var også medsponsor, og arrangementet blev afholdt i det russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur.

Koncerten var en stor succes. Vi havde en fuldt pakket sal, og på trods af at vi fik ekstra stole bragt ind, var vi nødt til at afvise mange der kom. Publikum blev imponeret og bevæget af mangfoldigheden og skønheden af bidragene ved koncerten. Især afsyngningen af en kinesisk folkesang af en kinesisk studerende sammen med Feride Istogu Gillesberg, vicepræsident for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og hovedorganisator af begivenheden, betog publikum. Hvordan er det muligt, at en europæer kan synge på kinesisk og skabe så bevægende og smuk musik?

Siden dengang har vi haft yderligere to meget succesfulde koncerter, med fremtrædende og smuk deltagelse fra både russiske og kinesiske musikere, og musikere af høj kvalitet fra mange andre lande. Vi er blevet lovet, at den årlige koncert i 2020 kan finde sted i Kinas kulturcenters nyistandsatte faciliteter i København, som snart åbner.

Samtidigt har vi forsøgt at få information om Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet ud til offentligheden på enhver måde, vi kan. I København afholdt Schiller Instituttet et seminar sammen med 'Confucian Business Institute' ved CBS, og i Sverige har Schiller Instituttet samarbejdet om stiftelsen af BRIX, Bælte-

og Vej-Instituttet i Sverige. BRIX har afholdt en række seminarer med pæn deltagelse fra akademikere og industrifolk, der er blevet adresseret i fællesskab af den kinesiske ambassadør og ledende medlemmer af BRIX og Schiller Instituttet. På samme tid har vi intervenseret i mange møder og diskussioner om Kina, der finder sted i Danmark og Sverige, for at sikre, at den rigtige historie om Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet – og nødvendigheden af at de vestlige lande aktivt deltager i dette store foretagende for menneskeheden – kommer ud, så de løgne og falske bagtalelser om det i 'mainstream' medierne bliver modsagt.

Som det ses med udbruddet af det nye koronavirus i Wuhan er der mange udfordringer, når man søger at løfte 1,4 milliarder mennesker ud af dyb fattigdom og at blive en moderne nation. På trods af fremragende nationalt lederskab, kan lokal inkompetence skabe store problemer. Men jeg er sikker på, at Kina vokser med udfordringen, og vi ser nu, at den kinesiske regering intet sparer for at besejre denne trussel imod menneskeheden bestående af sygdom og død.

Da den nationale regering først blev opmærksom på epidemien, handlede den hurtigt for at besejre den. Oplysninger om koronavirus blev hurtigt sendt ud over hele verden, og resten af verden kunne forsvare sig mod sygdommen på en måde, som den lokale regering i Wuhan undlod at gøre. Og forhåbentligt vil samarbejdet mellem Kina og medicinske forskningscentre i resten af verden snart føre til behandling og en vaccine. I mellemtiden yder Kina enorme menneskelige og økonomiske ofre for at få epidemien under kontrol, og udgør menneskehedens bolværk imod en verdensomspændende pandemi.

Forhåbentligt vil de enorme ressourcer, som nu indsættes i Kina, og med hjælp fra verdenssamfundet, bære frugt, og besejre den nye koronavirus. Og forhåbentlig bliver det et eksempel på, hvordan Kina og verden kan arbejde sammen om en endnu farligere dræber: fattigdom. Kina har vist, hvordan det har været muligt at løfte 850 millioner kinesere ud af dyb

fattigdom. Og med Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet har de igangsat det største udviklingsprojekt, som menneskeheden nogensinde har set. Vi behøver fuldt internationalt samarbejde for at sikre sejr over fattigdom overalt i verden, ved at anvende videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt til først at etablere den nødvendige infrastruktur, og derefter den nødvendige industrielle udvikling, til at løfte hele menneskeheden ud af fattigdom.

Men hvis Danmark og andre vestlige lande skal deltage i disse, for menneskeheden nødvendige tiltag, må vi først besejre det mentale angreb, der finder sted imod befolkningens sindelag. Kina og Rusland er ikke vores fjender, men er vores vigtige samarbejdspartnere i sikringen af den bedst mulige fremtid for hele menneskeheden. Lad os derfor erstatte den kunstigt skabte frygt og splittelse med en dialog mellem kulturerne, og lad os alle deltage i Bælte- og Ve-Initiativet. Så vil vi se en verdensomspændende renæssance af de bedste bidrag fra alle de forskellige kulturer, og vi vil se en eksplosion af menneskelig kreativitet og udvikling, der ikke alene forvandler livet på Jorden, men også vores solsystem, og det der ligger derudover, når vi får ubegrænset billig energi på Jorden ved at høste helium-3 på Månen og bruge det til fusionsenergi, som kineserne har tænkt sig at gøre.

Se på 'Verdens-Landbroen'. Dette er det levende billede af de smukke ord, som vi hører i Beethovens 9. symfoni:

Seid umschlungen, Millionen!
Diesen Kuss der ganzen Welt!
Brüder! über'm Sternenzelt
muss ein lieber Vater wohnen.

Vær omfavnede, millioner!
Dette kys til hele verden!
Brødre, over stjerneteltet
må der bo en kærlig far.

Og den kærlige far bliver realiseret gennem vores handlinger; mænds og kvinders handlinger for at forandre verden til det bedre.

Annoncering af koncert: En musikalsk dialog mellem kulturer: Torsdag, 28. juni 2018

Tid: kl. 19

Sted: Russisk Center for Videnskab og Kultur, Vester Voldgade 11 (ved Københavns Rådhus)

Gratis adgang.

Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog, Det Russiske Hus og Det Kinesiske Kulturcenter præsenterer vores anden koncert for fremme af forståelse mellem kulturer. Der vil være en skøn dialog mellem klassisk europæisk musik og traditionel musik fra Kina, Rusland og andre steder.

En hovedattraktion vil være The National Folk Music Troupe of the Heilongjiang Song and Dance Theater Folk Orchestra, et ensemble af fire kinesiske musikere, der spiller traditionelle instrumenter, og som kommer direkte fra Kina specielt for vores koncert!

Hele koncertprogrammet kommer senere på Schiller Instituttets hjemmeside: www.schillerinstitut.dk

Sidste års koncert var en bragende succes, og vi forventer, at

dette års koncert bliver lige så vellykket. Kom og nyd musik fra hele verden, og tage gerne venner og bekendte med.

Koncerten fra 2017 kan høres [her](#).

**Schiller Instituttet holder
Kulturaften i Dresden,
Tyskland.
Med Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

**Hvorfor »Schiller
Instituttet«?**
**Om Konfutses og Schillers
æstetiske opdragelse af
mennesket.**

Helga Zepp-LaRouches budskab i anledning af Schillers fødselsdag 10. nov., 2017

Tom Gillesberg: ... Hvis Schiller var her i dag, hvad mener du så, han ville bidrage med, og hvad kan vi bruge Schiller til i dag?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg mener, at Schiller ville være meget glad, for grunden til, at Schiller Instituttet hedder Schiller Instituttet ... jeg har altid ment, at Friedrich Schillers menneskebillede var det mest ædle: Ideen om, at alle mennesker kan blive skønne sjæle.

Leder, Schiller Instituttet og LaRouche PAC, 11. nov., 2017 – Følgende er et svar, Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav på et spørgsmål, stillet af formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, under diskussionen, der fulgte efter Helgas briefing til Schiller Instituttets Venners valgarrangement i København, 10. nov.

Hendes svar udgør hendes lykønskingsbudskab til festlighederne 11. nov. i anledning af Schillers fødselsdag.

Tom Gillesberg: Da vi begyndte mødet, Helga, kommenterede jeg

det faktum, at det i dag er Friedrich Schillers fødselsdag [10. nov. 1759 – 9. maj 1805]. Så jeg mener, det er meget passende at tænke over dette. Og jeg vil gerne spørge dig, Helga: Hvis Schiller var her i dag, hvad mener du så, han ville bidrage med, og hvad kan vi bruge Schiller til i dag?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg mener, at Schiller ville være meget glad, for grunden til, at Schiller Instituttet hedder Schiller Instituttet – jeg kunne have en indsats for at etablere en bedre relation mellem relationer; jeg kunne have fundet en anden tænker: Leibniz, Cusanus, der er mange, der har gjort utrolige ting. Men jeg har altid ment, at Friedrich Schillers menneskebillede var det mest ædle: Ideen om, at alle mennesker kan blive skønne sjæle.

Som jeg for nylig skitserede i en tale, jeg holdt i New York, så er ligheden mellem konfutsiansk æstetisk opdragelse og Friedrich Schillers æstetiske opdragelse, forbløffende stor. Konfutse, der trods alt levede for 2.500 år siden, og Friedrich Schiller, der levede for over 200 år siden, kom imidlertid begge på den samme idé. Nemlig, at ethvert menneske har potentialet til ubegrænset selv-fuldkommengørelse; til at blive et geni. Og Schillers definition af geni var en skøn sjæl. Hermed mente Schiller, at man finder frihed i nødvendighed, og man gør sin pligt med passion. Ikke som én, der følger Kant, og som siger, »jeg må gøre min pligt« og ser rasende ud, og man er moralsk, men man hader det. Men derimod, at man glæder sig over at gøre det gode.

Jeg finder, at Xi Jinping er i besiddelse af denne egenskab. Jeg har studeret ham, studeret hans taler, hans bog med taler, *The Governance of China*, som I bør læse, som er udgivet dér; men man kan også finde alle hans taler på Google. Jeg kom til den konklusion, at han er en filosof; at han er et konfutsiansk renæssancemenneske. Og jeg mener, at Schiller ville have været utrolig glad over, at et sådant menneske er statsoverhoved, og at han har strømlinet hele det kinesiske samfund i overensstemmelse med disse ideer.

Jeg er meget optimistisk med hensyn til dette. Jeg mener, den vestlige propaganda er selvfølgelig flippet ud som bare pokker. De siger, »Åh! Xi Jinping er en ny Mao Zedong, endda en ny Stalin. Han koncentrerer al denne magt i sine egne hænder.«

Men undersøger man dette, ser man, at det ikke er tilfældet. Vist er det et meget centraliseret system, men det er et meritokrati; det er helliget folkets almene velfærd, og ikke kun det kinesiske folks, men udtrykkeligt også alle de deltagene landes [i Bælte & Vej]. Så jeg mener, Schiller ville genkende denne idé med at have en vision om en bedre verden, for, når man læser hans Æstetiske Breve, siger han: Man må give sine samtidige mennesker det, de har brug for, og ikke det, de begærer.[1] Man må være en tjener for sit århundrede, men ikke dets slave. Og andre, lignende begreber. Jeg mener, man må have en vision for, hvor man ønsker, menneskeheden skal være i fremtiden.

Det er ideen om, at den menneskelige art har muligheden for at blive forædlet, og dette var en udbredt idé hos Konfutse, og det var ligeledes absolut Friedrich Schillers idé.

Jeg mener, at dette er to meget gode udgangspunkter for at starte en debat om, hvad der er galt med den nuværende liberalistiske kultur, hvor »alt er tilladt«. [i modsætning til] ideen om, at kunst må være skøn. For kun, hvis kunst er skøn, kan den bevæge hjertet og forædle mennesket. Jeg mener, vi har et presserende behov for dette, for, ser man på vore samtidige mennesker, så har de et presserende behov for en æstetisk opdragelse. Og jeg mener, at det er, hvad Schiller Instituttet forsøger at gøre, og man kan ikke nægte, at det, vi hørte i begyndelsen, denne arie, der blev sunget [af Lena Malkki], er skønnere end det, man kan høre af Madonna. Hun er faktisk det modsatte af det, hendes navn siger; men det vil jeg overlade til jeres bedømmelse.

[1] Se også: [»Vi behøver Schillers Æstetiske Breve i dag«](#), af

Feride Istogu Gillesberg.

Valgmøde den 10. november 2017, del I, med Tom Gillesberg, Helga Zepp-LaRouche og meget smuk sang

Helga Zepp LaRouche Addresses Copenhagen Campaign Event of
'Friends of the Schiller Institute,' Nov. 10, 2017

- The Legacy of Friedrich Schiller and the Schiller Institute
-
- In the Confucian Concept of Xi's New Silk Road Today –

*Schiller Institute Chairwoman and founder Helga
Zepp-LaRouche was introduced by Schiller Institute in Denmark
Chairman Tom Gillesberg, who is running for mayor of
Copenhagen
on the Friends of the Schiller Institute slate.*

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE: I'm very happy to be here by Hangout
video, because there are a lot very important things happening
which the Western media are absolutely hiding from the
population. As a matter of fact, since you referred to the
founding of the Schiller Institute in 1984, I was just
reflecting
that the purpose why I created the Schiller Institute in the
first place, was because I saw the world very much in need of
a

different idea of relations among nations.

And that was the main reason why this institute was created, because I realized, in 1983, the relationship between Germany and

the United States, Europe and the United States, the so-called "advanced sector" and the developing countries, all of these foreign relations were terrible. For slightly different reasons

in each case, but I basically said, "this is not the way nations

should organized themselves, and that is not how they should relate to each other."

So I came up with the idea to create an institute devoted to the development of a just new world economic order, whereby every

person on the planet would eventually have a decent life, that was explicitly the idea; and that this new world economic order

would only function if it would be combined with the idea of a dialogue of cultures on the highest level, where one country would not refer to the worst tradition of the other, but to the

best, and vice versa. And that all of this would be accompanied

by a lot of Classical culture, a lot of emphasis on science, on

science and technology as the motor for such a development.

Now, I don't want to go through the long history of the Schiller Institute, which has done an enormous amount of work on

five continents since its existence, but I'm very happy to say that if you look at the world today, especially in the last several days, a lot of what the Schiller Institute was meant to

be, is coming into being.

People really have to realize that the summit which just took place between President Xi Jinping and President Trump,

was

an absolutely historic breakthrough. Now, if you listen to the

Western media, you would think the opposite; you would think, if

you read the *New York Times* you would say, "Trump sold out to the Chinese, because Xi Jinping is much more powerful than Trump." If you listen to second channel of German TV, their comment yesterday was that, yes, this was all a big show, but Trump is so irrational and changing so quickly that in two weeks

he will not even remember what happened. Or, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* this morning, I had to laugh when I was reading this. On the front page, they said if Deng Xiaoping were

still alive, he would have wept tears of joy when he saw that Xi

Jinping and Trump were meeting, seeing eye-to-eye, treating each

other as equals.

So the Western media are just completely beside themselves, they're cynical, they're absolutely geopolitically blinded in such a way that they can't even look at what is going on.

Now, let me tell you what really happened: First of all, on Wednesday [Nov. 8], the Chinese government did something which has never happened, giving an honor to Trump which they have never given to any other foreign head of state. They closed down

for an entire day the Forbidden City; this is the largest complex

of palaces in the world. Since the 17th century, it was the seat

of the emperors, and it is just one large complex of palaces, one

after the other: it has opera houses, it has living quarters, it's just an unbelievable environment.

They closed this down, and they performed for President

Trump and his wife Melania, excerpts from three Beijing operas, and they showed ancient handicrafts in restoration; and really steeped the Presidential couple in Chinese culture. Which everybody who knows it, knows it's extremely beautiful and extremely impressive. And they called this a "State Visit-Plus."

A commentator from the think tank CASS [Chinese Academy of Social Sciences] said this has never happened in the history of China, either; they have never given a head of state such a high-level visit, so it was a highest honor ever given to a foreign President.

Now, the Western press is not reflecting why this is the case, but President Xi said that this is the beginning of a new start of relations between the United States and China, and it will do very important, good things not only for the two people, but for the entire world. And Trump, on his side, said, what could be more important than the two largest economic countries finding a good cooperation; and he also said that he looks ahead to many years of friendship and collaboration between the two countries, accomplishing incredible things. Obviously, not unimportant was the fact that there were trade deal deals signed for, altogether \$253 billion, ranging from energy, agricultural products, airplanes were being bought, infrastructure. And in a certain sense, this is important, and designed to grow – it's not the end of it. Trump made several speeches where he said – there was an incredible trade gap up to

now, but he doesn't blame the Chinese for it, he blames the former U.S. administrations for allowing this to happen. So obviously, there are many positive things in this trade relation, as such, but I think more importantly the spirit which comes from the New Silk Road, which is the policy which has been put on the agenda by Xi Jinping since 2013, and which in the four years since, has grown to be the largest economic infrastructure project ever in history: Already something like 70 countries are collaborating. They are building infrastructure corridors, six major corridors, almost 40 cargo trains and connecting between China and Europe, now, every week. The development is spreading with absolute excitement into Latin America, into Africa, into even European countries. The biggest change, in my view, has happened in Africa, because China has invested in a rail line from Djibouti to Addis Ababa; now from Kenya; another line is being built to Rwanda. Many hydropower dams, projects for hydropower, irrigation, industrial parks. And all of this has led to a completely different attitude of the Africans, who, for the first time, see the perspective of overcoming their underdevelopment. The philosophy behind all of this is the idea that only if you have harmonious development of all nations on this planet, can you have a peaceful development in China. And this is based on the Confucian idea that only with the maximum development of the individual, who should become a wide person, is spread throughout the entire family and all the families develop

harmoniously, can you have peace in the nation, and obviously in the world, among the nations.

This is not understood by the West at all. They are absolutely convinced – and I think some of these political forces are so geopolitically entrenched that they really believe

this, that they cannot mention that a country can actually be devoted to the common good of its people. And that China is doing that is without any debate, because, as Tom just mentioned,

I was in China in 1971, during the Cultural Revolution, and I saw

the country in distress. And I went back in '96, and I saw the

absolutely incredible change for the better in these 25 years.

And what has happened in the last 30 years is just the biggest economic miracle of any country on the planet. China has

lifted 700 million people out of poverty, and what happened at the just-concluded 19th Party Congress of the CPC, was that Xi Jinping announced that by the year 2020, China will have eradicated *all* poverty. There are only 42 million people left who are poor, in rural areas, and they now are using modern technology to overcome that, by providing the means for e-commerce to the farmers in the rural areas of poor regions, so

they can market their products via the internet, and that way they are starting to develop more income and more wealth, so that

they will no longer be poor by the year 2020. I have no reason to

believe that they will not succeed in doing that, because, when

you see the vector of development of the last 30 to 40 years, they are going to accomplish that.

By the year 2035, China wants to be a modern socialist

country, and Xi Jinping has developed a plan up to the year 2050, for China to be a strong, modern, harmonious, democratic, happy people.

Now, in this speech, at this party convention, Xi Jinping mentioned I think it was 15 times or so, that the purpose of the political work of the Communist Party is that people should have

a better and happier life. And what China is doing is obviously

a model which is much more devoted to the common good, than you

find it in the West, where, if you compare it to the poverty level in the European Union, for example, where you have 120 million people who are poor; or you compare it to the economic situation in the United States, where for the first time in an industrial nation, you have a lowering of the life-expectancy!

Now, if there's any parameter for the productivity and the well-being of an economy, it is the life expectancy of its people. And if you an industrial country with the collapse of the life span, then you know that there is something absolutely

wrong. And this is the result of what happened with the neo-liberal system, especially since the United States with the

neo-cons decided to become the leader of a unipolar world, which

went along with the neo-liberal system, where the rich became so

rich that it is unreasonable, and the poor become poorer.

And you have right now, I think something like 95 million people in the United States who are no longer counted as being in

the labor force, because they have given up looking for work, or

they are sick, or they are in prison, or they are somehow misplaced in some other form.

So, I think that what is happening right now is that Xi Jinping has put on the agenda a model of economic cooperation which needs to be studied. I think it's a *big* mistake that the

Europeans are just dismissing it. Like, for example, the French

Economic and Finance Minister Bruno Le Maire just went to Berlin

yesterday, and there he addressed a German-French economic forum,

where he said, now Europe must stop being naïve, we must be united to stand up against China, against Russia, against the United States. And then the German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel yesterday on a TV show basically said the same thing – he said, now, Europe must stand united against the aggressive powers of Russia and China, where human rights mean nothing.

I mean, this is such an arrogance! You know, talking about “democracy,” why don't you just look for a second at what happened with Hillary Clinton's campaign? Now the big scandal in

the United States is that the Democratic Party leadership, one year before the party convention was to supposedly decide on the

candidate for the 2016 Presidential election, has decided it would be Hillary. And then they channeled illegal money, violating FEC rules up and down, right and left, intriguing against Bernie Sanders. And then, concocting “intelligence” against Trump with the help of British intelligence, played back

into the United States. I mean, this is a joke! There is no democracy, not in this present system.

And I think that to accuse Russia and China of being “aggressive” is just absolutely wrong! The whole question of what was the Ukraine crisis: [Former German Chancellor] Helmut

Schmidt said it very clearly: The reason why the Ukraine crisis happened, and where it started was in the Maastricht conference in 1992, because that was when the EU decided to have the Eastward expansion without limit. And that is the same thing as what the NATO expansion to the East was, breaking all promises made to Gorbachev at the time, that NATO would never expand to the borders of the Soviet Union, or Russia for that matter. So we are in a real crisis. And rather than being so arrogant and saying there are no human rights in China and Russia, and these countries are "aggressive" – which they are not – we should rather reflect on what should the future be? China happens to be the only country which has presented a strategic model of international relations based on a win-win cooperation of respect for the sovereignty of the other country, of non-interference, of accepting the other social model of the other system; and this is a strategy for peace. This is the idea of overcoming geopolitics. And we should not forget that it was geopolitics which was not only the cause for many wars in history, but especially two world wars in the 20th century. And the idea to have an inclusive, win-win cooperation among all countries on the planet, what should be against that? Why can Europe not, why can't Denmark, and Germany, and France, and Italy, just say: When the relationship between the United States and China is already now on such a new historical basis, where the strategic partnership between China and Russia is also very, very strong, and Putin and Xi Jinping have both said that the relationship between these two countries are on the best level

ever. And now China and the United States are saying the same thing about their two countries. Now, what could be better, than to have the United States, China and Russia working together for a new paradigm of relations among nations? Why can the European nations not just say, "Well, that is very good, because if the biggest nuclear powers can cooperate in a peaceful way, then the danger of a thermonuclear war is obviously diminished and could be eliminated in a short period of time; and we cooperate." I mean, we have so many tasks which are urgent: The reconstruction of Southwest Asia, of the Middle East, of countries which have been completely destroyed by wars which are the outgrowth of regime change, of the unipolar world, on wars based on lies, which have cost {millions} of people their lives in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen. These countries have been absolutely destroyed and they need to be reconstructed. There is already a discussion that the only way you can do that, is by extending the New Silk Road into the Middle East. And I have said for a very long time, that the only way how you can have peace in the Middle East, is if all the major neighbors – Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, hopefully the United States, and hopefully European nations, are all working together, and then you can eliminate the present tensions and frictions and ongoing fights, which have almost been eliminated in Syria and Iraq. And look at Africa: Don't you think it's time that we join hands with China in the development of Africa? Do you really

think that the underdevelopment of Africa is a natural condition?

No! It is the result of hundreds of years of colonialism, of decades of IMF conditionalities, which insisted, that countries

should pay their debt and not pay for infrastructure and not pay

for social expenditures. And the reason why Africa has been in

such a terrible condition is because it was the policy of the West {not} to develop the African continent.

And now China has come, and said, "no," we have the idea to eliminate poverty in every corner of the planet, and they have started the industrialization of Africa, and Xi Jinping has offered to Europe, to the United States, to join hands and have

joint projects in all of these countries.

Don't you think it's time that we become adult as a human species? I think it should be clear to everybody that in the age

of thermonuclear weapons, war cannot be a way of resolving conflicts. And I think also, the idea that the human species should be able to come up with an idea of self-governance of one

human species; that it's not a natural condition that you always

will have one nation against another nation, or a group of nations against another group of nations.

In reflecting about what happened in the recent period, especially with the 19th Party Congress of the CPC, where Xi Jinping developed a perspective between now and 2050, it is very

clear that if you look at the long arc of human civilization, sometime the idea that we would be the one humanity, the "community for a shared future for mankind" – which is the formulation Xi Jinping always uses – had to come! And that it comes from China should not be a reason not to be up on the

idea.

It has to do with the 5,000 year history of China, the 2,500 years of Confucian tradition that this idea was made by China, but it is a universal idea, it's not something limited to one culture or one nation.

So I think we are at a very exciting moment of history. I feel very much vindicated that the work, not only of the Schiller

Institute, but the organization associated with the name of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, is now being implemented. This goes back all to the early '70s, where my husband developed the proposal for an International Development Bank, the IDB. This was

picked up by the Non-Aligned Movement in '76, in their final resolution in Colombo, Sri Lanka; and it was the idea that a new

credit institution should be created, replacing the IMF, which would provide – at that time, the idea was 400 billion deutschemarks, or \$200 billion approximately, per year, for technology transfer to the developing countries.

And that's what China is now doing. That's what they're doing with the AIIB, with the New Development Bank, with the different Chinese banks, focusing on the real economy.

Then, if you look at all the development plans we have been working on: The first development plan for Africa, we published

in 1976. We had a plan for the development of Latin America, working with [then Mexican President] López Portillo. We had a

40-year development plan for India, on which we worked together

with Indira Gandhi. We had a 50-year development plan for the Pacific Ocean Basin in the early '80s.

Then, in '89, we had the Productive Triangle for the development of East and West Europe. And in '91, when the Soviet

Union disintegrated, we proposed a peace plan for the 21st

century, starting with Eurasian Land-Bridge, which we already called the New Silk Road, at that time.

So I feel very much that our lives' work has absolutely come into reality. And what we have to do now, is we have to get European nations to understand that the crisis not that China is

making these proposals, and the crisis is not that Trump is rejecting the neoliberal model, at least as it was represented by

Bush and Obama and Hillary. The real crisis is that people in Europe are still absolutely somehow in chains to their own ideological thinking that they, first of all, are very Euro-centric; they think Europe is the navel of the world; while

in reality, the power center is shifting to Asia, since they have

better principles than we have right now.

And just to illustrate the point, the Bundeswehr, the German army, put out this study already in February of this year, where

they have basically six scenarios by the year 2040. It has all

options, where the worst option is Europe will completely collapse, many European countries will leave the EU and join with

the Russia bloc; and Europe will just lose all importance. If you look at these six scenarios, what you see there is an absolutely wrong method of thinking: It's the projection of the

status quo, of geopolitical thinking, and naturally in a changing

world, there is no way how such thinking can survive, therefore,

if they keep thinking that way, this is probably what happens in

Europe.

Now, look at what China is doing, instead. They just

created the largest, highest-level regulatory body, which is even more important and has higher ranking than all the ministries, for the case of a new financial crisis. And it has absolutely nothing to do with the Chinese debt, because the Chinese debt has, as a counterforce, real assets – investments in infrastructure, in industries and so forth, so if there would be a blowout, these assets will be there. While the monetarist system of the trans-Atlantic sector, people have learned absolutely nothing after the crisis of 2008. That is the real danger, and obviously China is looking at that, and Xi Jinping has said this in many speeches since the G20 summit last year in Hangzhou, that the causes of the 2008 crisis have not been eliminated, and therefore the danger of a new crisis is absolutely there.

So what we have to do, is we have to absolutely reflect, what is wrong with the European thinking. The problem is not that other countries are rising and we are stagnating. The problem is that Europe has turned away from its highest traditions.

We have now a pretty decadent culture. If you look at the youth culture, pop music, many of these so-called pop singers are outright Satanic: They are ugly, they promote an image of man which is a beast, it's full of violence, it's pornographic, and it's just "everything goes." There is no more limit, there is no morality, everything is allowed: You don't have two sexes, you have in Germany now officially three sexes, you have 49 genders, it's just becoming absolutely Sodom and Gomorrah, or very much parallel to the end-phase of the Roman Empire, where you had similar phenomena.

So, I think that the problem is not China rising. The problem is that Europe has moved away. We have a beautiful tradition. We have a Classical period, the Renaissance of Italy,

we have the Andalusian Renaissance, the École Polytechnique in France. We have a German Classical period which has produced some of the most outstanding thinkers, composers, poets, you know, the rich tradition linking the Classical period of Germany

with that of Denmark. I mean, Danish people saved the life of Friedrich Schiller.

So there are enough points where we can say, "Let's just go back to our best traditions, and then we will find out that the

Classical periods of Europe, and the Confucian tradition of China, and the Classical periods of other nations, are indeed creating the basis for a new Renaissance."

I think we are at an incredible moment of history, and we should just remind ourselves of the words of Friedrich Schiller,

who said, "A great moment should not find a little people."

So

let's try to elevate our people, to think big, think beautiful,

become beautiful souls, create the basis that all children have a

chance to become geniuses. And if that is in our willpower to do, and this is why the election campaign of Trump and the other

members of the Schiller Institute are so absolutely important, and that is why we should all be happy that the Schiller organization exists in Denmark and creates an option for all Danish people to join this incredible historical moment and make

a better world for all of us. [applause]

»Øst og Vest: En dialog mellem storslåede kulturer«

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Lige fra begyndelsen havde Schiller
Instituttet den idé, at vi måtte have en
retfærdig, ny økonomisk verdensorden;
men at det aldrig ville fungere, hvis det ikke
blev forbundet med en renæssance af
klassisk kultur.*

Det, jeg vil tale om, er ideen om den højeste menneskehed, det fælles filosofiske grundlag for vestlig og asiatisk kultur ... Præsident Xi Jinpings håbefulde vision for det, han altid kalder et fællesskab for menneskeheds fælles fremtid ... er blevet vedtaget som en resolution i FN's Sikkerhedsråd. ... Med dette koncept er et strategisk initiativ, som kan erstatte den krigsskabende geopolitik med idealet om en forenet menneskehed, sat på dagordenen

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Vi befinder os midt i en kamp
for USA's sjæl.**

»Hvorhen, USA:

**Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«
LaRouche PAC Internationale
Webcast,
28. april, 2017**

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl, for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Vi ser denne kamp blive mere intens over spørgsmålet, »Hvorhen, USA?«, med den titel, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav den nylige Schiller Institut-konference i New York City – »Hvorhen, USA: Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«. Der er i løbet af den seneste måned, siden det meget ukloge angreb, som Trump-administrationen beordrede mod Syrien, sket det, at det er kommet offentligt frem, at der rent faktisk finder et britiskanført kup sted i USA imod Trump-administrationen. Indholdet er de løgne, de fabrikerede efterretninger, der er kommet fra britisk efterretning og er blevet bulldozet hen over præsident Trump; meget på samme måde, som Tony Blair brugte løgnene om maseødelæggelsesvåben i 2003 for at bringe USA ind i Irakkrigen.

***Vi må bruge det bedste fra alle kulturer
og skabe en virkelig universel
renæssance!***

Vært Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er 28. april, 2017; jeg er Matthew Ogden; velkommen til vores LPAC webcast fredag aften, her på larouchepac.com. Med os i studiet i dag har vi en

særlig gæst, Mike Billington fra *Executive Intelligence Review (EIR)*, som vi har inviteret i dag pga. af den aktuelle, strategiske situations ekstraordinære natur.

Vi står naturligvis blot to uger fra det meget betydningsfulde Bælt & Vej-topmøde, der finder sted i Beijing, Kina, den 14. og 15. maj; og det er altså præcis to uger fra i morgen. Flere dusin statsoverhoveder fra lande i hele verden har bekræftet deres deltagelse. Som vi har rapporteret, så er den russiske præsident Putin inviteret som æresgæst til at deltage i Bælt & Vej-topmødet. Vi fortsætter vores kampagne for at opfordre præsident Donald Trump til at deltage i dette topmøde, som særlig gæst; og for at bruge det som hans mulighed for at gengælde præsident Xi Jinpings tilbud om, at USA kan gå med i det nye paradigme for udvikling og fred, som repræsenteres af Bælt & Vej, eller den Nye Silkevej.

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl, for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Vi ser denne kamp blive mere intens over spørgsmålet, »Hvorhen, USA?«, med den titel, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav den nylige Schiller Institut-konference i New York City – »Hvorhen, USA: Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«. Der er i løbet af den seneste måned, siden det meget ukloge angreb, som Trump-administrationen beordrede mod Syrien, sket det, at det er kommet offentligt frem, at der rent faktisk finder et britiskanført kup sted i USA imod Trump-administrationen. Indholdet er de løgne, de fabrikerede efterretninger, der er kommet fra britisk efterretning og er blevet bulldozet hen over præsident Trump; meget på samme måde, som Tony Blair brugte løgnene om maseødelæggelsesvåben i 2003 for at bringe USA ind i Irakkrigen.

Men dette var ikke et enestående tilfælde for Irak i 2003, eller for Syrien i 2017. Dette er den måde, hvorpå briterne har spillet deres imperiespil i det ene årti efter det andet; de har brugt USA som deres dumme kæmpe, med det formål, fortsat at holde verden opdelt. Denne del-og-hersk-strategi har været en britisk imperiestrategi i århundreder, og tiden

er inde til, at USA bliver intelligent og siger, »Det er slut! Vi vil ikke lade os bruge på denne måde; og vi vil tage imod det Nye Paradigme med 'win-win'-samarbejde«. Briterne og deres rejsekammerater i USA har sandelig været meget ligefremme i deres forsøg på at destabilisere og vælte Trump-administrationen, fordi de var meget bange for, at han ville gennemføre, hvad han har sagt. Ikke flere regimeskift; ikke flere imperialistiske krige, og vi vil samarbejde med Rusland og med Kina. Det sidste var lidt mere komplekst, men det om Rusland var meget klart. Men som vi ved, så har præsident Trump og præsident Xi Jinping fra Kina, siden topmødet med præsident Xi, haft meget tætte, personlige relationer og har regelmæssigt haft samtaler. Denne kommunikationskanal er afgørende, især med det brændpunkt, som nu er vokset frem direkte på Kinas grænse, i tilfældet Nordkorea.

Vi vil bruge tilfældet Nordkorea som en case study, men i sammenhæng med denne meget bredere opfattelse af opgøret over, hvilket system, der i fremtiden vil styre verden: det imperialistiske del-og-hersk, eller et nyt 'win-win'-paradigme for fred og udvikling. I denne sammenhæng har vores gæst her i dag, Mike Billington, netop udgivet en ny artikel, som er en meget vigtig artikel, I bør læse . Den er meget klar. Den har den provokerende titel og stiller spørgsmålet, »Hvorfor er Korea ikke allerede genforenet?«.

(Artiklen findes i EIR's seneste nummer, men er kun tilgængelig for abonnenter. Andre artikler kan læses gratis – se knappen EIR på vores hjemmeside. Du kan henvende dig til vores kontor mht. at tegne abonnement på EIR, tlf. 35 43 00 33 – red.)

Hermed giver jeg ordet til Mike og lader ham gennemgå lidt af indholdet, de aktuelle udviklinger, og så spørgsmålet, som han fremlægger i sin artikel:

(engelsk):

MICHAEL BILLINGTON: Thank you, Matt. In fact, the purpose of this article was to show that the answer to that question is that there is {no} legitimate reason that Korea is not peaceful and at least on the way to reunification already. I'll review some of that material here. But let me start. There were some extraordinary developments today; so let me give a short update on the crisis. It has to be noted that this is a very serious crisis, in the sense that were something like what happened with Syria, where Trump was – as Matthew said – lied to coerced into carrying out an attack against Syria for absolutely no reason; on totally false intelligence. Were that to happen in Korea, this would not be like an attack on an airbase in Syria. This would lead to a total disaster throughout all of East Asia and perhaps even global nuclear war. Whether or not they could take out North Korea's nuclear capacities, North Korea – as I'm sure people know, because it's all over the press – they have massive conventional capacity. Their armaments lie a total of 30 miles from the capital [of South Korea] Seoul, this beautiful, developed, advanced city; which could be just absolutely wiped out if there were a war. And they could possibly attack even Japan, let alone US bases within South Korea; so this would be a move of insanity. The Japanese and the South Koreans know this very well. I should point out that our friends in South Korea

note that there is no panic in South Korea; because they've been through these kinds of things before, and they simply assume that nobody is crazy enough to launch a preemptive attack on North Korea.

But, because of what happened in Syria, a lot of people – including all of us – were very concerned that the British might pull off another stunt and get Trump to go with this. What happened today is extremely important. Trump himself did an interview with Reuters, in which he said on North Korea, “We'd love to solve things diplomatically, but it's very difficult. But Xi Jinping is playing a crucial role in this. I believe he's trying very hard. I know he would like to be able to do something. Perhaps it's possible that he can't, but I think he'd like to be able to do something.” Then, most extraordinarily, he said about Kim Jung-Un, the leader in North Korea and grandson of the founder of North Korea, Kim Il-Sung, he said, “He's 27 years old. His father dies; he took over a regime. So, say what you want, that's not easy; especially at that age. Now I'm not giving him credit, or not giving him credit. I'm just saying it's a very hard thing to do. As to whether or not he's rational, I have no opinion, but I hope he's rational.” So, this is useful. He then returned again to the fact that he has very good personal relations with Xi Jinping: “I feel that he's doing everything in his power to help us with a big situation. I wouldn't want to be causing difficulty right now for him; and

I

certainly would want to speak to him first before taking any action." Very useful.

Then Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, who chaired a meeting at the UN Security Council this morning of ministers, taking the

place of that wacky lady we have in there right now speaking for

the US too often. But Tillerson was not wacky; not at all.

He

was very clear in his presentation to the UN Security Council.

He said, "For too long, the international community has been reactive in addressing North Korea. Those days must come to an

end. Failing to act now on the most pressing security issue in

the world may bring catastrophic consequences." Now, what does

he mean to act now? The press headlines all over the world are

"Trump and Tillerson Are Threatening War on North Korea; They Want To Act Now. It's the End of Strategic Patience", which was

the policy of Obama. But keep in mind, "strategic patience" was

not being patient; it was saying "We will not talk to North Korea. We refuse to talk to North Korea; we simply sit back and

constantly increase the sanctions, increase the military build-up

around their border until they do what we say." Which, of course, they won't do as long as they're being threatened.

So, the question is, what does it mean to act now? Does it not mean, let's get back to talks, let's negotiate. What the President said about Kim Jung-Un is a very serious comment. Here's somebody who's in a difficult position.

Then, Tillerson said the following: "Our goal is not regime

change. Nor do we desire to threaten the North Korean people, or destabilize the Asia-Pacific region. Since 1995, the US has provided \$1.3 billion in aid to North Korea; and we look forward

to resuming our contributions once the country dismantles its weapons program.” Now that 1995 is a reference to something called the Agreed Framework, which I’m going to mention when I go

through some of the history on this.

Even more powerful, Tillerson – in an interview with NPR before he went into the UN Security Council – said the following: “You know, if you listen to the North Koreans, their

reason for having nuclear weapons is that they believe it is their only pathway to secure the ongoing existence of their regime. We hope to convince them that you do not these weapons

to secure the existence of your regime. We do not seek a collapse of the regime. We do seek an accelerated reunification

of the peninsula; we seek a de-nuclearized peninsula, and China

shares this goal with us.”

Now these are very positive steps; and they refute the British headlines and the {Washington Post} and {New York Times}

headlines that say “Get ready. We’re going to have a war in Korea.” So, this I think is extremely important. Let me go through a bit, some of the history of this; because even in my reviewing to write this article, I was a bit astonished at how close we were, twice before, to having a peaceful relationship in

the Korean peninsula and potentially even being reunified or being on the course to reunification.

The key point, I think, is that the British assets in the White House over the last 16 years – Bush and Cheney, and then

Obama, who served the British purpose of keeping the world divided East and West, as Matthew was pointing out. The key to doing that was making sure the US did not have good relations with Russia, and making sure the US did not have good relations with China. They used the South China Sea, they used Ukraine, they used Syria; all of these really had nothing to do with the South China Sea or Ukraine or Syria. They had to do with preventing any potential for the US and Russia to work together, and the US and China to work together. This is empire; that's the way empire works to keep the world divided, especially the East-West divide.

Let's go back to what Tillerson was referring to in 1995. What happened was that the North Koreans were part of the UN Non-Proliferation Treaty and non-nuclear development agreements; that they wouldn't develop nuclear weapons. Then in the early '90s, the IAEA – the International Atomic Energy Agency – believed that they were using small test reactor at Yongbyon. It was a graphite-moderated reactor which produces plutonium as a side-product of producing energy. So, they believed that they were hiding the plutonium being produced at the Yongbyon plant and using it produce weapons. This led to a very serious crisis.

The Clinton administration and their Defense Secretary at the time, William Perry – and I'll mention Perry a couple of times here – were very seriously considering a strategic take-out of the Yongbyon plant. Would that have been as serious as now? I

don't think so, but it would have been very serious. What happened is quite interesting. Former President Jimmy Carter went to North Korea – supposedly on his own; I'm sure this was very carefully worked out with President Clinton. But he went

on

his own; he met with Kim Il-Sung who was still alive at that time, the original head of North Korea. Out of that meeting, [they] came to an agreement that they would, through negotiations, come up with an agreement to solve the crisis; which they did. It was called the Agreed Framework of 1994. This was quite extraordinary. The North Koreans agreed to dismantle the Yongbyon nuclear plant and to stop construction on

two other plants that also were graphite and could produce plutonium. In exchange, the US built a nuclear plant for North

Korea. The US and the South Koreans were, and they began – they

didn't get very far – to build a large 1000-megawatt nuclear plant; but it was going to be a light water reactor that didn't

produce fuel for nuclear weapons. It was a safer form of a nuclear plant. In the meantime, they did provide oil, until they

got the nuclear plant going, for heating.

They agreed to start negotiations toward a peace agreement.

The US and North Korea are officially still at war. After the Korean War, there was not a peace agreement, but just an armistice to stop the fighting. Officially, there is no peace agreement; we do not have normal relations with North Korea.

We're actually in a state of war with North Korea. Clearly, the

North Koreans want to have a normal relationship with the US, not

to be constantly threatened. It was agreed that that would happen. This was moving forward quite well; it was slow, there

were problems. The US didn't live up to all its agreements; but

it was moving forward.

Then, extremely importantly, in 1998, Kim Dae-jung was

elected President of South Korea. Kim Dae-jung was a very interesting character; he had been a very strong opponent of the military regimes in South Korea. He had been thrown in jail several times, and there was a point where he was about to be executed; the US intervened and saved his life at that time. By 1998 things had changed; there was more of a move towards getting away from military regimes. They weren't exactly dictatorships; they were elected, but they were military regimes. Kim Dae-jung was elected. He immediately began to not only democratize domestic policies, but he set up something called the Sunshine Policy, which was we will work with North Korea on development; on opening up economic collaboration as the basis over the long term to establish peace between us and long-term reunification. So, Kim Dae-jung was in power. William Perry, the Defense Secretary – he had left being Defense Secretary by that time – but in a recent article on his history in all of this, said that towards the end of the Clinton administration, they were working to take that agreement even further. To have the North basically swear that they were giving up all weapons programs, in exchange for having a peace agreement and setting up normal relations between the two countries. It was so close that they had actually planned a Presidential visit to North Korea; that Clinton would visit North Korea. Unfortunately, as William Perry points out, the Clinton administration ran out; and Bush and Cheney came in. You may

remember that the Defense Secretary under Bush and Cheney was Colin Powell, a general; a fairly wise gentleman. He, in his first press conference, said we intend to engage with North Korea, and pick up where Clinton left off. Very important.

The

{next day}, Bush – with Cheney behind him and Paul Wolfowitz around – said “There will be no engagement with North Korea. They’re a dictatorship.” Sounds familiar, right? Dictators. “We will not talk to them. There will be no engagement.” And Colin Powell was basically put in his place, and the whole process began to fall apart; at least in terms of the US working,

collaborating, and playing a key role in collaboration with North

and South Korea, and Russia and China and Japan.

In any case, Kim Dae-jung and the others – Russia, China, Japan, North Korea, South Korea – continued the process. They basically said OK, that’s what Bush and Cheney are saying; but this is the future lives of our country and really of the world.

They moved forward. Kim Dae-jung, by 2002, was successful in setting up an extraordinary process. I should mention here that

Lyndon LaRouche’s ideas through that period – 2000-2002 – were all over South Korea. One of our members, Kathy Wolfe, was going

back and forth; she was meeting with people in the government, around the government, cultural people in South Korea. You may

remember that 1992 was when Lyndon LaRouche first came up with the idea at the time of the fall of Soviet Union, that we should

build a New Silk Road; we should have a Silk Road which would bridge Europe, Russia, China, and bring them together around a development process by building the New Silk Road – what the Chinese called the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

So, Kim Dae-jung, the South Korean President, built a

process he called the Iron Silk Road. I can assure you there was an influence there; that term didn't come out of nowhere. LaRouche had always said that the New Silk Road should go from Busan to Rotterdam. Busan is at the southern tip of South Korea. In other words, it had to go through North Korea, through Russia, and also through China into Europe. So, this idea of the Iron Silk Road was taking shape. It was taking shape so much – put that first map on [Fig. 1]. This is the map. The plan was to reconstruct two rail lines from South Korea into North Korea, which of course had been shut down. There was an armed Demilitarized Zone [DMZ] with fences on either side; and a no man's land in between. The idea was to build rail connections as you can see on the map. One of them going through the West, that would go up through Pyongyang and then into China. One that would head out towards the West and go up towards Russia into Vladivostok and hit the trans-Siberian railway in both directions, actually. Indeed, they began this process. Kim Dae-jung went to the North and met with Kim Jong-Il, who was the son of Kim Il-Sung; who was in power. Kim Il-Sung literally died the year they signed the Agreed Framework; but his son continued it. They made this process; they built this process up. By 2002, they literally opened up the Demilitarized Zone fences in both of those spots. Both the North-South and the [inaud; 21:43]; they cut the DMZ fences. Soldiers from both the North and South went into the DMZ and began clearing the mines that were all over the place in the DMZ. They reconstructed the rail line between

the two countries. In 2002 [Fig. 2] you had the extraordinary event of a railroad going across the DMZ; going from South Korea into North Korea. Symbolic, because there had to be a lot of construction on the rail lines to make them connect all the way through. But as you can see here, they had a big banner in the front; the Reunification of the Koreas. This was an extraordinary event, which we reported in {EIR} at some length; these pictures were in those articles back in 2002. It wasn't just the railroads. At the same time, Kim Dae-jung began an industrial park in North Korea – the Kaesong Industrial Park. This was across the border in North Korea with South Korean companies setting up factories in the North with North Korean labor. This grew to the point where recently there were 123 South Korean companies working in the North. This was obviously in the direction of setting up collaboration between the South Korean industry and the skilled but very poor workforce in the North. So, this was proceeding forward. They also set up six party talks. You've probably heard of the Six Party Talks. This was where Russia, China, Japan, North and South Korea, and the United States began a series of talks to try to regroup from the failure, the collapse, the shutdown by Bush and Cheney of the Agreed Framework. These meetings began. I won't go through the details of what happened; it's tedious, because every opportunity that Bush and Cheney had to say that

the North Koreans were cheating, the North Koreans are lying; you can't trust these vicious dictators. Every opportunity they had to sabotage forward direction; there were some positive agreements made. If you read the history of it from the US press, it'll say the North Koreans reneged. Well, it wasn't that way. It was sabotage by Bush and Cheney every chance they got. It went into the Obama administration and Obama continued sabotaging it every chance he got. So eventually, these fell apart under Obama. Obama then began this so-called "strategic patience"; which meant no talks, build up your military, impose sanctions. They might have said that the purpose was that they expected the North Korean regime to collapse; but that wasn't it at all. Bush and Cheney and Obama {wanted} North Korea to build nuclear weapons. Now why would somebody be so insane as to want North Korea to have nuclear weapons? First of all, they knew that they wouldn't use them, or they'd be blown off the face of the map. William Perry, in his recent article, said the North Korean regime is reckless, but they're not crazy; they're not suicidal. If they were to use a nuclear weapon preemptively, they know that the country would be obliterated overnight and their leadership entirely killed. They're not crazy. But why would the West want them to have nuclear weapons? Because the target is not North Korea; it's China. As long as you have this bugaboo of North Korea threatening the world with their nuclear weapons, you can go ahead and build up a massive force around China, the way

they

were in Europe where they're building anti-ballistic missiles and

moving NATO right up to the Russian border. Sending troops, tanks, planes right up to the Russian border. And in Asia doing

the same thing, supposedly to counter North Korea.

Most people have read about what's going on with these THAAD missiles. Literally just a couple of days ago, they actually set

up the THAAD missiles in South Korea; claiming that these are needed for the defense of South Korea against the North.

THAAD

– this is Terminal High Altitude missiles. North Korea is 30 miles from Seoul; they don't need to send 8 ICBMs up into space

and back down onto Seoul. The THAAD is useless against North Korea; it may be useless in general. But it's a threat to China

and to Russia, because with that you have the X-band radar, which

sees deep into Chinese territory and Russian Far East territory.

Which thereby gives them an advantage in a potential first strike, where they could take out – they fantasize – they could

take out the counterstrike capacity of China. The Chinese and Russians are saying this destroys the balance; we're going to have to put something together to counter this.

The other thing to point out is the obvious fact that North Korea sees very clearly what happened to Iraq; what happened to

Libya. Two countries that voluntarily gave up their nuclear weapons program with all kinds of praise and promises from the West, although they lied about Iraq. But as soon as they did, their nation was bombed back to the Stone Age, their leaders killed, and their country turned over to warring terrorist

forces.

So, the North Koreans are not crazy! And they're aware that, were they to give up their nuclear weapons program preemptively, they'd probably get the same regime change statement. Which is why it's so important Tillerson is saying we

are not going for regime change; which is what Trump had said throughout the campaign – that they weren't going to have regime

change. They also see that the targetting of China, they're aware of this, is part and parcel of this operation. You should

point out that the Obama administration had this TPP – this Trans-Pacific Partnership – which was also a part of the attempt

to isolate China. It didn't work; largely because the countries

there recognized that this was an attack on China, and they absolutely depend upon and appreciate the infrastructure development coming from China through the New Silk Road the New

Maritime Silk Road.

That's where this stood. And the last thing I'll bring up here is that the last administration in South Korea – Park Geun-hye; I'm sure that everybody has seen that she was recently

impeached and thrown out of office. The impeachment was upheld

by the Constitutional Court, and there's now an election which is

taking place in less than two weeks on May 9; which makes it all

the more absurd that the US deployed this THAAD missile system,

literally few days before an election in which the candidates are

both against the THAAD missile system. They rushed this in,

in

order to make it – hopefully, they think – make it impossible to be reversed. But we'll see. It was a foolish move by the US

to ram this through.

But in any case, Park Geun-hye started her administration – this is the daughter of Park Chung-hee, who was the brilliant leader who brought Korea out from being one of the poorest nations on Earth to being one of the great industrial, nuclear power producing and exporting countries in the world. His daughter, Park Geun-hye, was elected President. But unfortunately, she was elected mostly on her name. However, she

began her administration with what she called the Eurasian Vision. This was, in fact, part of the New Silk Road process. She saw working with Russia, China, and Japan, that Korea belonged to Eurasia; which obviously meant that it had to work through North Korea. Officially, the regime in the South under

her and her predecessor were not allowed to have relations with

North Korea, except for the Kaesong Industrial Park. But, Park

Geun-hye allowed three major South Korean companies – Hyundai Merchant Marine, which is their biggest ship company; KoRail, which is their state rail company; and POSCO, a huge steel company – to have a consortium with Russia and North Korea.

Literally, a consortium; a business agreement where the Russians

rebuilt a port in the north of North Korea; rebuilt the railroad

from Vladivostok down to that port. They were shipping Russian

coal into North Korea, where it was picked up by a South Korean

Hyundai ship; shipped to the South, put on South Korean rail and

shipped to a South Korean steel mills. This was, again like the
Kaesong, it was a model for the kind of collaboration which could
lead towards long-term economic progress and development and trust; and lead towards a reunification.
Then, without going into details, the North Koreans tested I think it was the fourth of their nuclear tests. Everybody knew
it was going to happen for the reasons I said. They're not going
to give this up unless they can get an honest pledge that there's
not going to be a war, a regime change against them. They did;
and unfortunately, Park Geun-hye who was weak, capitulated entirely to Obama. She shut everything down; shut down even the
Kaesong Industrial Plant which had been up for 15 years, which killed their own industries. Shut down the [inaud; 31:25]
process of the rail, and basically cut off all ties to the North
all together on behalf of Obama, on behalf of a war against China. Despite the fact that in 2015, she had gone to Beijing on
the 70th anniversary of World War II's victory against the Japanese and the Germans. She'd gone there and stood on the podium with Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin; the three of them standing together, honoring the war victory. Then she comes back
and basically pulls the plug on the whole thing.
She wasn't impeached because of that; she was impeached because of a corruption case within South Korea. But I'm certain
to this led to the loss of any trust in her; that she'd undermined her own industries; that she'd capitulated to an American policy, that she was going ahead with this THAAD

deployment. She lost the industry, she lost the left factions that were about to win the election, the more liberal side.

So,

this was a real disaster for South Korea, and potentially for the world.

Now, we have Trump; we have Xi Jinping; we have Abe in Japan working very closely with Putin. And we're going to have a new

regime in South Korea. I won't go into exactly who these guys are; but in general, both the leading candidates want to work with Russia and China and want to open up better relations with

the North. So, you have the geometry. If Trump goes with the Silk Road process, you have a geometry which is going to end this

last British outpost of destabilization and instability – this North Korea monster. The monster issue; it's not that North Korea is a monster. But this has served the British imperial purpose of keeping the US at a point of conflict with Russia and

China. If we can solve that, then all of Asia is now unified, except for the North Korea issue. With the election in the Philippines of Duterte, his rejection of the war policy in the South China Sea, it basically united all the Southeast Asian countries; all ten of them are now united around working with China. Not cutting off ties to the US, but working with China.

So, you have tremendous potential; and it's all really coming down to the next very short period. Weeks, months at most. A lot of this is going to be determined in the very near

term. As LaRouche has always insisted, to look at any particular

crisis – like the North Korean crisis – you have to look at it in the context of the entire world; and certainly in the context

of the Eurasian potential of the New Silk Road. I think there's

every reason to be confident that some sort of talks are being discussed privately; not just threats. That this is going to move forward in the context of the Silk Road. As Matthew mentioned, if Trump were to go to this meeting on May 14 and 15,

Abe would probably then go from Japan; and there's no question that we would have a peace process that would be almost unstoppable, no matter what the British claim they're going to unleash.

So, this is a very great moment in history. A dangerous, but potentially great optimism is in hand.

OGDEN: And you can tell that the British are definitely very anxious of what could be lurking around the corner for the

future of their divide and conquer strategy. I know we were talking before the show, Mike, about the very appropriate and incisive statements that were made by the Russian representative

at that meeting at the United Nations Security Council. Here's

the quote. This is the Russian Deputy Permanent Representative

to the UN, Vladimir Safronkov, and he turned to Matthew Rycroft,

who is the British Permanent Representative at the United Nations

Security Council, and he said the following: "The essence is, and everyone in the United Nations knows this very well, is that

you are afraid. You have been losing sleep over the fact that we

might be working together with the United States; cooperating with the United States. That is your fear. You are doing everything to make sure that this kind of cooperation be

undermined.”

BILLINGTON: This has had a tremendous impact, because people know that LaRouche has argued all the last 50 years, that the problem is the British Empire. Almost nobody of stature has ever acknowledged that continuing role of the British Empire until this, really.

I learned today that Ambassador Rycroft, who was a close ally and advisor to Tony Blair, and was one of the authors of the “dodgy dossier” which started the Iraq War in the first place. I

learned today from our friends in England, that Rycroft was meeting today with the head of the White Helmets; the terrorist

so-called “humanitarian” group that works with al-Qaeda and al-Nusra, and who provided the fake evidence of Assad carrying out a chemical weapons attack. So, this is confirmation that this open collaboration with a terrorist organization funded by

the British, and functioning to try to start a war in Syria for

which we can and must prevent that in league with this overall fight to bring about the New Silk Road, not a new war.

OGDEN: Let me end with this, and I’ll let you respond to it. I think as everybody knows, a very significant personality

in Korea and that area of the world, was the great US General Douglas MacArthur. In the aftermath of the original Korean War,

Douglas MacArthur came back to the United States, and he reported

back to Congress. This is a quote from MacArthur’s speech to a

Joint Session of Congress in 1951. I think it gets directly at the much broader point that Helga and Lyndon LaRouche have been making at the present time about what is really at stake, and what is necessary if we're going to move civilization into a new paradigm of survival. This is what Douglas MacArthur said: "Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn fail; leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blocks out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem, basically, is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

So Mike, you were one of the speakers at the conference the Schiller Institute sponsored in New York City two weeks ago. The subject of that conference was not only the diplomatic and strategic cooperation which is necessary between the United States and China right now, the United States joining the New Silk Road and the Belt and Road Initiative. It was also a dialogue of civilizations; a dialogue of the greatest parts of these two great cultures – European culture and Chinese culture.

In a form where Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in a really profound way,

stretching across generations, across centuries, across millennia

really put the great German poet, the revolutionary poet and philosopher Friedrich Schiller in dialogue with the poet and philosopher who really is the basis of all of modern Chinese civilization – Confucius. That dialogue she set up between Friedrich Schiller and Confucius, speaking to each other across

the span of millennia and across literally two sides of the world, created the kind of image of mankind, the possibility of a

mankind which could emerge if we were to finally put an end to this imperial system of dividing the East and the West and bringing these two great cultures into a dialogue with each other.

So, you presented at that conference, and maybe just in that context

BILLINGTON: Those are available now. The new {EIR} that came out today has Helga's speech and a speech by Patrick Ho, who

is a very good friend of ours from China, from Hong Kong, who is

campaigning all over the world for the New Silk Road. It's three

conferences now that we've done together. He gave a presentation

then on Confucian thought and Western thought; but in that presentation, he showed a very serious problem which I had addressed over my long years of sabbatical leave in prison, where

I studied extensively the Chinese culture and the relationship between Confucian culture and the Western Christian Renaissance.

Patrick didn't take up that challenge for this speech; so he gave

a speech which fell prey to exactly what I then spoke about.

That speech is also in the {EIR} this week; or you can watch it on the Schiller Institute website. It's very important, because what I learned in studying this, is what the British set about – as they do in every colony that they took over – in profiling the backward tendencies within that culture and then grasping those backwards tendencies that want to stay primitive, stay backwards; and defining those to be the natural ideology of that country.

In the case of China, they recognized that Confucianism was a very great threat to their ability to control and keep China backwards; because it's a vision like Platonism in the West. And as Helga had brilliantly shown, like the Renaissance thinking in Europe that professed progress. It valued the mind of the individual as that which made him human; it's the creative power of the human mind. Against that, the British said no, no, Confucianism is keeping you backwards because it's formal and it's structured. You have to go back to the roots of Taoism, which basically tells the peasant that he's a happy peasant; he's happy not knowing about science and technology. Stay backwards.

Or the so-called "legalist" ideology which was punishment and reward; you treat people like animals. You punish or reward them like you do a dog, to make them do what you want them to do. The unfortunate reality is that the British deployed their top guns – especially Bertrand Russell – into China; especially when Sun Yat-sen came along promoting the American System. They

sent Bertrand Russell in to poison that system; to denounce Confucianism; to promote the happy peasant and the Taoist ideology. Unfortunately, this was deeply ingrained into the Chinese culture, so that even today, Xi Jinping, who is fighting to bring that country forward, is faced with this kind of thought in China. And, what they presented to the Chinese as “Western thought” so-called, was not Leibniz and Schiller and Nicholas of Cusa; the people who gave us the Renaissance, who gave rise to modern science. But rather, they said, “We, the British, defeated you because we have wealth and power. How do we have wealth and power? It’s that we believe in Darwinism, social Darwinism; that the strong must crush the weak. That’s the way you get strong. So, if you want to be strong, then you should be like us and believe that Western thought – i.e., British empirical anti-human thought – is what you should aspire to. I won’t go into more details, but I encourage you to read it; because these are fundamental debates. This question of how can we create a renaissance, which crosses every great culture; because every great culture has great moments and bad moments, bad tendencies. Weak tendencies, and strong tendencies which honor the human creative power; the other which tries to keep people enslaved as master and slave. We have to pull out the best of every culture throughout the world. Islam; Judaism; Christianity; Confucianism; the Muslim tradition of the Baghdad Caliphate. All of these are there – the Indian Gupta period. We can pull these together and have a Renaissance which is not this part of the world as opposed to that part of the world; but is truly universal. Of man with a common aim for mankind as

Helga likes to say.

This is within our grasp; this could truly be the end of war for all mankind. People say, "Oh, that's naïve; because human nature is war-like." Well, {human nature} is not; human nature

is creative. It's the bestial imposition of this backward ideology on peoples which leads to wars. If we had a true, global renaissance based on science and technology, great culture

and great music, there's no reason to think we could not end the

scourge of war once and for all; as that beautiful quote from Douglas MacArthur – which I'd never heard – clearly indicates. These are philosophic and theological issues; but they're in our

grasp today. This is what the LaRouche Movement has been about

since its inception; and it's now literally within our grasp.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Mike. This material is available; Mike's article is going to be published. This is in

the {Executive Intelligence Review}, and it will be made available through LaRouche PAC as well. As Mike said, all of the

proceedings of that Schiller Institute conference in New York are

also available. LaRouche PAC also made a video a couple of years

ago on the question of the reunification of Korea and some of these initiatives from the 1990s and these reunification efforts.

So, we'll make that video also available; it will be linked in the description of this video. But I think that's a wonderful discussion; and it's extraordinarily valuable for people to have

this view, this depth of background. But also this vision of

what is possible. Douglas MacArthur's point that in essence this is a spiritual, this is a theological question. Will mankind come to know himself as a creative species? Will we change the way that man views himself, which is what is necessary if we are to survive? The vehicle for doing that is this type of "win-win" development projects; that's the true name of peace. So, I think we have a wonderful microcosm in what we just used as a case study in Korea; but this type of thinking is what is so urgently necessary for the entire world. That's absolutely the value of what the LaRouche Movement has done over the last several decades, and continues to represent on this planet today. So thank you, Mike. And thank you all for tuning in, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Tom Gillesbergs åbningstale ved koncerten, »En musikalsk dialog mellem kulturer«, København, 17. feb., 2017

Vi mener, at dette er en tid, hvor alle må tænke på, hvordan de kan bidrage til at opbygge disse globale alliancer, til at

opbygge denne politik for menneskehedens fælles skæbne, og formålet med denne koncert er således at gøre dette inden for et meget vigtigt område, der undertiden overlades lidt til sidelinjen; og det er det kulturelle område. For, ingen stor opdagelse, ingen stor videnskab, ingen udvikling kan finde sted, hvis der ikke er uddannede mennesker, der i sig har et billede af mennesket, der fortæller dem, at menneskeheden kan blive til noget langt bedre, end den i øjeblikket er. De har gennem kultur uddannet deres intellekt, deres humane følelser, så de har kunnet blive forskere, kunnet erobre rummet, som vi netop nu ser det; kunnet konfrontere de store udfordringer, menneskeheden står overfor.

Deres excellencer, medlemmer af diplomatiet; mine Damer og Herrer: Jeg er Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, og jeg er, sammen med Jelena Nielsen fra Russisk-Dansk Dialog, vært for i aften.

Koncerten er arrangeret af Schiller Instituttet; Russisk-Dansk Dialog; Det Russiske Hus og Det Kinesiske Kulturcenter. Vi vil gerne takke medsponsorerne og Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur for velvilligst at stille deres hus til rådighed for aftenens koncert, samt de mange kunstnere, der frivilligt har stillet deres indsats til rådighed for at gøre denne aften til en rig dialog mellem kulturer.

To praktiske meddelelser: efter det første nummer kommer der ekstra stole, nogle af jer kan sidde på; det andet er, at jeg gerne vil have, at alle slukker for deres mobiltelefoner.

Vi lever i øjeblikket i virkeligt interessante tider; Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, hustru til Lyndon LaRouche, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, sagde for nylig, at det globale, strategiske billede er meget dynamisk, flydende, lovende og farligt, alt sammen på én gang. På den ene side har vi stadig denne uhæmmede konfrontation, med deployering af tropper mod de russiske grænser og andre konfrontationspolitikker, der stadig finder sted og stadig

ikke har forandret sig. Vi har ligeledes et globalt finanssystem, der, hvornår, det skal være, vil bryde sammen i den næste, store krise, der sandsynligvis vil blive langt større end det, vi så i 2008. Men samtidig har vi fået en ny præsident i USA, Donald Trump, der både i sin kampagne og i det, vi hidtil har set, har annonceret, at der vil komme forandring i USA's politik, og at, med ham som præsident, ønsker USA at genoprette normale bånd til Rusland, til Kina og til andre nationer i verden, baseret på en politik for genopbygning af USA, men at dette ikke står i modsætning til en genopbygning af hele verden.

Samtidig har vi et momentum, der er blevet opbygget i en rum tid, med især den kinesiske drivkraft med Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, og som i øjeblikket er engageret i mindst 70 nationer i hele verden, i en politik, som vi for årtier siden lancerede under navnet 'Fred gennem udvikling'. At, samtidig med, at man har økonomisk udvikling, så har man også grundlaget for samarbejde og varig fred.

Vi befinder os altså i en tid, hvor alt kan ske. En masse mennesker er flippet ud over dette; de ved ikke, hvad dagen i morgen vil bringe. Men vi ser dette som en stor mulighed for forandring, og vi kunne meget vel stå ved et punkt, hvor vi kan få USA til at tilslutte sig indsatsen fra så mange andre nationer, som Kina, som Rusland, som Indien og mange andre nationer med dem, der samarbejder om hele menneskehedens fælles skæbne; og hvis USA tilslutter sig denne indsats – samt naturligvis også Danmark og de europæiske nationer tilligemed – så står vi pludselig i noget, der uden enhver tvivl vil blive den største epoke i menneskehedens historie. For vi vil pludselig blive i stand til at få en verdensomspændende renæssance, der omfatter hele planeten på samme tid – noget, der aldrig tidligere har fundet sted i menneskehedens historie.

Vi mener, at dette er en tid, hvor alle må tænke på, hvordan de kan bidrage til at opbygge disse globale alliancer, til at

opbygge denne politik for menneskehedens fælles skæbne, og formålet med denne koncert er således at gøre dette inden for et meget vigtigt område, der undertiden overlades lidt til sidelinjen; og det er det kulturelle område. For, ingen stor opdagelse, ingen stor videnskab, ingen udvikling kan finde sted, hvis der ikke er uddannede mennesker, der i sig har et billede af mennesket, der fortæller dem, at menneskeheden kan blive til noget langt bedre, end den i øjeblikket er. De har gennem kultur uddannet deres intellekt, deres humane følelser, så de har kunnet blive forskere, kunnet erobre rummet, som vi netop nu ser det; kunnet konfrontere de store udfordringer, menneskeheden står overfor.

Vi mener således, at det er yderst passende, at vi har en dialog mellem kulturer; at vi, i stedet for at se andre kulturer, andre nationer og andre folkeslag som en trussel, ser det som en utrolig berigelse. Og at alle nationer fremdrager den bedste kultur, de bedste højdepunkter, de bedste bidrag, som de har at skænke menneskeheden, og gør dette tilgængeligt for verdens øvrige nationer samtidig med, at de modtager de bedste af alle disse kulturers skabelser retur. Og når det sker, så, som mange af jer ved, var dette i vid udstrækning, hvad den Gamle Silkevej drejede sig om; jo, der var handel, men der var også kulturel og videnskabelig interaktion, som i realiteten fik langt større konsekvenser end selve handelen. Det er præcist, hvad der nu må ske med dette store projekt, Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ, som resten af verden nu er ved at tilslutte sig.

Jeg håber således, at I vil nyde aftenens koncert, og jeg håber, at I vil se det som et bidrag til at få denne dialog mellem kulturer i gang, og at det er noget, vi vil komme til at se meget mere af på alle niveauer.

[Se videoen her.](#)

Vidunderlig koncert, »En Dialog mellem Kulturer«, et gennembrud i København

Video med danske undertekster:


Video with English subtitles:

Dansk: Klik her for en video, hvor sopran Gitta-Maria Sjöberg synger Rusalkas sang til Månen i en anden koncert (med en anden pianist)

English: Click here for a video where soprano Gitta-Maria Sjöberg sings Rusalka's Song to the Moon during another concert (with another pianist).

17. februar, 2017 – De kom fra hele verden. De bragte gaver. Ikke gaver, man kunne røre med hænderne. Men gaver, der rørte sjælen. Gaver, i form af skøn musik og skøn dans.

Og folk kom for at høre dem. De blev ved med at komme, indtil der ikke var flere af de 120 pladser tilbage. Og da der ikke var plads til ekstra stole, stod de i gangene, og de stod i forhallen, og de sad bag gardinerne. De var danskere, og de var diplomater, og de var andre mennesker fra mange nationer, måske 180-200 i alt. Værtinden sagde, at der aldrig før havde været så mange i salen.

 Dialogen mellem kulturer, mellem selve sponsorerne, førte til den store succes – Schiller Instituttet, organisationen Russisk-Dansk Dialog, det Russiske Hus i

København og det Kinesiske Kulturcenter (som står for snarlig åbning, og som også leverede mad i pausen). Koncerten afholdtes i det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur, som repræsenterer den Russiske Føderations myndighed for forbindelse til Fællesskabet af Uafhængige Stater (fra det tidligere Sovjetunionen), russere i udlændighed og det internationale humanistiske samarbejde (Rossotrudnichestvo).

Aftenens første punkt var Schiller Instituttets danske formand, Tom Gillesberg, der fortalte, at vi står ved et historisk øjeblik i verdenshistorien, hvor muligheden er til stede for, at USA tilslutter sig det nye paradigme med økonomisk udvikling, som nu fejer hen over verden.

Dernæst fortalte talskvinde for Russisk-Dansk Dialog, Jelena Nielsen, at en dialog mellem kulturer kan føre til fred i verden. Tom og Jelena skiftedes til at annoncere kunstnerne aftenen igennem.

Og som det tredje punkt i indledningen til aftenen bød direktør for det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur, Artem Alexandrovich Markaryan (ses i billedet ovenover), velkommen til publikum.

Dernæst begyndte processionen af gave-giverne.

Fra Rusland kom børn, der spillede russiske folkemelodier på balalajkaer, ensemblet »Svetit Mesjac« (Den skinnende Måne) fra Det russiske Hus, med Igor Panich som dirigent, og som inkluderede 'Katjusha' med barytonsolist Valerij Likhachev, der har optrådt på 200 scener. Senere fremførte han også Leperellos »Listearie« fra operaen »Don Juan« af Mozart, og Mefistofeles' couplet fra Gounods opera »Faust« sammen med sin pianist, Semjon Bolshem.

Fra Kinas Indre Mongolia region kom en meget musikalsk ung videnskabsstuderende, Kai Guo, som spillede på mange fløjter, og Kai Guo og Feride Istogu Gillesberg fra Schiller Instituttet sang i charmerende duet, den kinesiske

kærlighedssang »Kangding«.

Fra Indonesien kom en traditionel danser, Sarah Noor Komarudin, der fyldte rummet med sin yndefulde Jaipong-dans.

Fra Ghana kom to unge mænd, Isaac Kwaku og Fred Kwaku, der sang og spillede en religiøs sang og en sang, der handlede om, at, når vi arbejder sammen, er vi stærkere, end når vi står alene.

Og fra Danmark og Sverige kom tre fantastiske, kvindelige operasangere, hvis toner og dramatiske intensitet bevægede publikum dybt. Deres gaver var sange og arier af Schubert, Verdi, Dvořák og Sibelius. Gitta-Maria Sjöberg, en international, lysende sopranstjerne, der for nylig trak sig tilbage fra den Kongelige Danske Opera, sang Rusalkas »Sangen til Månen« af Dvořák. Idil Alpsy, en fremragende mezzosopran med rødder i Ungarn og Tyrkiet, og som også er medlem af Mellemøstligt Fredsorkester, sang sange fra Sibelius' Op. 37 og 88. Og en sopran, som vi i årenes løb har hørt blomstre og blive en virkelig brillant kunstner, Leena Malkki, sang Schuberts »Gretchen am Spinnrade« (Gretchen ved spinderokken), samt Desdemones bøn »Ave Maria«, fra Verdis opera »Othello«. De to første blev akkompagneret af Christine Raft, en særdeles talentfuld, ung dansk pianistinde, og sidstnævnte akkompagneredes af Schiller Instituttets egen Benjamin Telmányi Lylloff. Han spillede sammen med sin mor Anika en gribende Romance for violin og piano af Beethoven, og fortsatte således det eftermæle, som de har fået i arv fra deres forfader fra Ungarn, violinsolisten Emil Telmányi Lylloff.

I aftenens finale sang alle sangerne (for nær én), og med yderligere deltagelse af fire medlemmer af Schiller Instituttets fremtidige kor, det hebraiske slavekors sang »Va pensiero«, hvor slaverne længes efter frihed, fra Verdis opera »Nabucco«.

(Se program nedenfor eller på:
www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17637)

☒ Og folk blev opløftet dels af den enkelte fremførelse, og dels af de successive musikstykker og danseoptrædener, det ene efter det andet, det ene land efter det andet, med traditionel musik i dialog med klassisk musik, der vævede en gobelin af lyd, syn og fryd, der ikke (kun) nåede sanserne, men sjælen.

Folk blev bedt om at holde kontakt med os og overveje at gå med i Schiller Instituttets kor, og nogle af dem skrev, at det ville de gerne.

Da de gik, gav de alle udtryk for den mest sublime glæde og taknemmelighed for at have fået det privilegium at modtage alle disse kostelige gaver, som de tog med sig hjem som et minde i deres sind, og som de kan åbne igen og igen.

Et musikalsk vidnesbyrd om det paradoksale mellem menneskehedens enhed og flerhed, udtrykt gennem menneskelig kreativitet, og et magtfuldt udtryk for dialogen mellem kulturer, blev proklameret.

Vi vil fortsætte med denne proklamation i form af professionelle video- og audiooptagelser, så dens ringe kan spredes i hele verden.

Kontakt venligst Schiller Instituttet, hvis du overvejer at gå med i vores kor i København. Michelle tel.: 53 57 00 51; Feride tel.: 25 12 50 33

Koncertprogram:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

English:

The following article was published in Executive Intelligence

Review, Vol. 44, No. 8, on February 24, 2017.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

(Corrections to the above article:

The China Culture Center in Denmark is independent of the Chinese Embassy.

Picture caption and text: Chinese musician Kai Guo is from China's Inner Mongolia region.

The correct name for Anika and Benjamin's ancestor is Emil Telmányi.

The picture of Leena Malkki is a video grab.)

Wonderful Musical Dialogue of Culture Concert Breakthrough in Copenhagen

by Michelle Rasmussen

COPENHAGEN, Feb. 17, 2017 (EIRNS) – They came from around the world. They came bearing gifts. Not gifts you could touch with your hands. But gifts that touched your soul. Gifts of beautiful music, and beautiful dance.

And the people came to hear them. And they kept coming, and they kept coming till none of the 120 seats were left. And after there was no more room for extra chairs, they stood in the aisles, and they stood in the lobby, and they sat behind the curtains. They were Danes, and they were diplomats, and other people, from many nations, maybe 180-200 in total. The hostess said that there had never been so many there before.

The dialogue of cultures between the sponsors of the concert, itself, led to the great success – The Schiller Institute, The

Russian-Danish Dialogue organization, The Russian House in Copenhagen, and the China Culture Center of the Chinese Embassy (about to open, which also provided intermission food). And the concert was held in The Russian Center for Science and Culture, representing the Russian Federal agency for the Commonwealth of the Independent states (of the former Soviet Union), compatriots living abroad, and the international humanistic cooperation (Rossotrudnichestvo).

Firstly, the people were told by Schiller Institute chairman Tom Gillesberg that we have a unique moment in world history, where the potential is there for the U.S. to join the new paradigm of economic development sweeping the world. Secondly, they were told by the spokeswoman for Russian-Danish Dialogue, Jelena Nielsen, that a dialogue of culture can lead to peace in the world. They were also the interchanging hosts for the evening. Thirdly, the director of The Russian Center for Science and Culture, Artem Alexandrovich Markaryan, welcomed the people.

Then the procession of gift-givers began.

From Russia came children playing Russian folk songs on balalaikas, (the "Svetit Mesjac" (The Moon is Shining) ensemble from The Russian House, conducted by Igor Panich), including Katjusha, with soloist Valerij Likhachev, baritone, who has sung on 200 stages. He also later performed Leperello's list aria, from the opera Don Giovanni by Mozart, and Mephistopheles' couplets, from Gounod's opera Faust, together with his pianist Semjon Bolshem.

From China's Inner Mongolia region came a very musical young science student, Kai Guo, who played many flutes, and he and Feride Istogu Gillesberg from The Schiller Institute charmingly sang the Kangding Chinese love song, as a duet.

From Indonesia came a traditional dancer, Sarah Noor Komarudin, who filled the room with her graceful Jaipong

dance.

From Ghana came two young men, Isaac Kwaku and Fred Kwaku, who sang and played a religious song, and a song about when we work together, we are stronger than when we stand alone.

And from Denmark and Sweden came three outstanding female opera singers, whose tones, and dramatic intensity, moved the audience profoundly. Their offerings were songs and arias from Schubert, Verdi, Dvořák and Sibelius. Gitta-Maria Sjöberg, an international bright star of a soprano, who recently retired from The Royal Danish Opera, sang Rusalka's Song to the Moon by Dvořák. Idil Alpsoy, a fantastic mezzo soprano with roots in Hungary and Turkey, who is also a member of the Middle East Peace Orchestra, sang songs from Sibelius' Op.37 and 88. And a soprano, Leena Malkki, we have heard for many years blossoming into a truly magnificent artist, sang Schubert's Gretchen am Spinnrade (spinning wheel), and Desdemona's prayer Ave Maria, from Verdi's opera Othello. The first two were accompanied by Christine Raft, an extremely talented young Danish pianist, and the later by The Schiller Institute's own Benjamin Telmányi Lylloff.

He, and his mother Anika, poignantly played Beethoven's Romance for violin and piano, continuing the legacy bequeathed by their ancestor from Hungary, the violin soloist Emil Telmányi.

For the finale, all the singers (but one), sang Verdi's chorus of the Hebrew slaves longing for freedom, Va, pensiero, with the addition of four members of The Schiller Institute's future chorus. See the program at: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17965

And the people were uplifted, with each presentation by itself, and with the succession of one piece of music, or dance, after the other, one country after another, traditional music in dialogue with classical music, weaving a tapestry of

sound, sight and delight, not reaching their senses, but their soul.

And the people were asked to be in contact with us, and to consider joining The Schiller Institute's chorus, some of whom wrote that they would.

As they left, they all expressed the most sublime joy and thankfulness for having had the privilege to have received all of these precious gifts, which they took home in the memory of their minds, to be opened again, and again.

A musical testament to the paradox of the unity and diversity of mankind, expressed by human creativity, and a powerful statement of the dialogue of cultures was declaimed.

We will go forth with this statement, in the form of professional video and audio recordings, to spread its ripples throughout the world.

(Hopefully ready this week.)

Hvis Trump slutter USA til Kinas Nye Silkevej, vil han huskes som en af historiens store ledere

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. februar, 2017 – Alle medlemmer bør i dag lytte til vores nationale aktivistbriefing (pr. telefon), så vel som også til **Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale** på Manhattan-konferencen lørdag, og især **hendes kommentarer efter dr. Patrick Hos tale**, hvor hun foreslår en international

konference for i dybden at adressere de historiske misforståelser i Kina og Vesten omkring den anden parts sande, storslåede kulturer. Lige såvel som briterne løj vildt om arten af den konfucianske kultur til den vestlige verden, så arbejdede de samtidig flittigt for at inducere kineserne til at tro, at den degenererede, britiske imperieideologi var den vestlige tankegangs karakteristiske ideologi.[1]

I søndags understregede Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, at den afskyelige »farvede revolution«, der føres imod den nye Trump-regering, både i USA og i Europa, må afsløres som de britiske/Obama-ondskab, som den er, men at man ikke behøver blive dér, og slet ikke blive trukket med ind i de fabrikerede, splittende debatter, der faldbydes i pressen. Befolkningen har fået en brat opvågning – det, Renée Sigerson kaldte en »optøning« fra 16 års intellektuel dybfrysning – både gennem det økonomiske og kulturelle sammenbruds virkelighed, men også gennem valget af en person, der afviser krig – både krige for regimeskifte og global krig med Rusland – så vel som også den perverse »offentlige mening«, der repræsenteres af mainstream-medierne, og det 'grønne' vanvid, der bruges til at retfærdiggøre globalisering (læs: Det britiske Imperium) og sammenbruddet af industri i indland og udland.

Dette er et historisk øjeblik for revolutionært, kreativt lederskab

– det øjeblik, for hvilket Lyndon LaRouche opbyggede denne organisation. Der er ingen tid til frygt eller forkrøblende bekymring over, hvad »de« kunne gøre. Som Lyndon LaRouche i dag sagde: »Ikke bekymring, bekymring, bekymring, men win, win, win.«

[1] Se: »The British Role in the Creation of Maoism«, http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1992/eirv19n36-19920911/eirv19n36-19920911_048-the_british_role_in_the_creation.pdf

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche foreslår
en stor,
international konference til
udbredelse af
gensidig, vestlig-kinesisk
kulturforståelse.
Fra Schiller Institutets
konference i
Manhattan, New York, 4.
februar, 2017**

Denne tradition i europæisk filosofi, som vi kalder humanisme, er fuldstændig i opposition til liberalisme, og den er langt, langt mere i overensstemmelse med konfucianisme, end det generelt antages.

Problemet med vestlige bøger og vestlig universitetsuddannelse er, at det i meget lang tid har været optaget af de mennesker, der vandt krigene, af oligarkiet; af de mennesker, der forsøger at undertrykke denne kreativitet i befolkningen. Jeg mener, vi ville gøre den Anden Renæssance en meget stor tjeneste ved at arrangere et symposium, der skulle udarbejde disse paralleller i langt højere grad. Jeg mener, at dette faktisk er afgørende for forståelsen af folk fra de forskellige kulturer.

(Her følger først en opsummering af dr. Patrick Hos præsentation på konferencen, som efterfølges af Helga Zepp-LaRouches respons, inkl. et spændende forslag.)

Patrick Ho er leder af China Energy Fund, der er anerkendt i FN, og han har været en fremtrædende person i at bringe Bælt-og-Vej-politikken til FN, men også til den amerikanske befolkning. Dette er anden gang, han taler for Schiller Instituttets i løbet af den seneste to en halv måned. Første gang pointerede han, at han var glad for at tale for et publikum med forskellige slags amerikanere. Denne gang fokuserede han mere på de kulturelle aspekter; han sagde, at han ønskede at kommunikere, hvad det vil sige at være kineser ... »kinesisk-hed« ...; dens mere end 5000 år gamle historie. Han mente, at det, der definerede landet, var folkets kulturelle sammenhæng; fælles sprog; civilisationens kontinuitet. Han dækkede en meget lang periode, men fokuserede især på de tre 'bank på døren'; da Kina bankede på Vestens dør, og de reaktioner, de fik, gode og knap så gode; de tre perioder med Silkevejen – den ene i det andet århundrede f. Kr., da Zhang Qian rejste til Vesten; dernæst foretog admiral Zheng He rejser, hvor han nåede østkysten af Afrika og den arabiske verden i det 14. århundrede og bragte aspekter af vestlig kultur med tilbage (inkl. giraffer, som gjorde et stort indtryk!). Dette blev lukket ned. Dernæst, efter Det britiske Imperiums angreb i det 19. århundrede med to opiumkrige, besluttede kineserne at gå i gang med en vis modernisering, så de kunne bevare en nation. Han gennemgik hurtigt Sun Yat-sen; revolutionen i 1911; Nixons møde med Mao i 1972; Deng Xiopings »Socialisme med kinesisk karakter« i 1979; og Xi Jinpings Ét Bælte, én vej-initiativ.

I en anden del diskuterede han især relationen til Vesten gennem nogle jesuitermissionærers forsøg på at bringe kristendommen til Kina; igen gik det godt på et bestemt tidspunkt, men brød så sammen. Disse missionærer var i kontakt med Leibniz. *I Ching* havde en stor virkning på Leibniz: det

binære system, som er basis for computersystemerne i moderne tid, og også DNA-koden.

Han satte kinesiske værdier i disse perioder op i kontrast til vestlige synspunkter. For eksempel: vægt på det individuelle i Vesten som vigtige værdier, men som gav diverse problemer. Hvorimod vægten i Kina ligger på familie, sociale relationer, kultur.

Der var en hel del mere, det ikke giver mening at forsøge at opsummere, men det var del af en dialog mellem dr. Ho og Helga Zepp-LaRouche og publikum.

(Efter dr. Hos powerpoint-præsentation gav fr. Zepp-LaRouche et svar, der omfattede et vigtigt forslag.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Dette er et meget spændende perspektiv, men jeg vil faktisk foreslå, Patrick, at vi arrangerer en stor begivenhed, måske en international konference, for jeg mener, at kendskab til kinesisk kultur, men også til vestlig kultur, faktisk ikke er tilstrækkelig kendt af den anden part.

Jeg var f.eks. en gang i Kina, og jeg søgte efter lærde (akademikere), der kendte Nicolaus Cusanus (Nikolaus von Kues), som er den vigtigste lærde person og store tænker fra det 15. århundredes Europa.[1] Jeg fandt en enkelt professor, der var bekendt med Nicolaus Cusanus. Dette er typisk, for det, du sagde om forskellen mellem vestlige værdier og kinesiske værdier, for jeg mener, at, på grund af den britiske indflydelse i universiteterne – i hele verden, men, mener jeg, også i Kina på et tidspunkt – så, mange gange, tager folk fejl af humanisme og liberalisme. Og det er virkelig ikke sandt.

Vi taler ikke om Aristoteles-traditionen. Vi taler ikke om

visse traditioner i Europa, som dernæst førte til visse former for Oplysningstiden, den franske oplysningstid, den engelske oplysningstid, der, som du rigtigt sagde, er stærkt centreret om individets rolle og liberalisme og så fremdeles.

Men det er netop den tradition, der blev afvist af det, vi anser for at være den positive, præ-sokratiske tradition; Platon; Augustin; Cusanus; Kepler; Leibniz; Schiller; og inden for videnskab, Riemann; Einstein og ligesindede tænkere. Så der har foregået en langt større kamp i den europæiske traditions civilisation, end de fleste mennesker faktisk ved. Hele fremskridtet inden for videnskab, kultur og klassisk kultur kommer som følge af afvisningen af den liberalistiske tradition. Oligarkiet har benyttet sig af en bevidst krigsførelse i forsøg på at få folk væk fra ideen om menneskelig kreativitet.

Jeg og også nogle andre i Schiller Institutet sammenlignede ideerne hos Konfucius og Mencius med visse ideer og filosoffer i vesten, og dér finder man langt større enhed. For eksempel har denne Nicolaus Cusanus, som jeg nævnte, ideer, der absolut stemmer overens med *Li* og ideen om *Ren* hos Confucius[2]; såsom, han har denne idé – hvis *Li* er »at gøre det rette på rette tid og rette sted [som dr. Ho tidligere havde nævnt], så har Nicolaus Cusanus denne idé om, at hvert mikrokosmiske element, hvert menneske, kun fuldt ud kan udvikles, hvis man bidrager til harmonien i det makrokosmiske element gennem at udvikle alle de andre mikrokosmiske elementer, og vice versa. Dette er præcis [ideen om] »win-win-samarbejde« blandt mennesker. Det er ideen, der lå til grund for den Westfalske Fred: denne fred er kun mulig, hvis man respekterer den andens interesse.

Og Leibniz var jo så lydhør over for kinesisk filosofi, fordi han selv var fortsættelsen af denne Nicolaus Cusanus, og Leibniz havde denne idé om, at hvert menneske er en monade (enhed); hvert menneske indeholder sit eget, skabende intellekt i universets helhed, og overensstemmelse er kun

mulig, hvis der er en harmonisk udvikling af alle disse evner; og dette førte til [USA's] Uafhængighedserklæringen og 'stræben efter lykke', som ikke er »lykke« i betydningen held, men som netop er opfyldelsen, udviklingen, af alle potentialer, der er indlejret i det menneskelige væsen. Så dette er altså indlejret i mennesket.[3]

Denne tradition i europæisk filosofi, som vi kalder humanisme, er fuldstændig i opposition til liberalisme, og den er langt, langt mere i overensstemmelse med konfucianisme, end det generelt antages.

Problemet med vestlige bøger og vestlig universitetsuddannelse er, at det i meget lang tid har været optaget af de mennesker, der vandt krigene, af oligarkiet; af de mennesker, der forsøger at undertrykke denne kreativitet i befolkningen. Jeg mener, vi ville gøre den Anden Renæssance en meget stor tjeneste ved at arrangere et symposium, der skulle udarbejde disse paralleller i langt højere grad. Jeg mener, at dette faktisk er afgørende for forståelsen af folk fra de forskellige kulturer.

Nicolaus Cusanus sagde, at, den eneste grund til, at folk fra forskellige kulturer kan forstå hinanden, er, at de hver frembringer videnskabsfolk og kunstnere, der udvikler universelle principper, som man kan videreformidle. Det er grunden til, at musikere fra forskellige nationer kan være i samme orkester; eller grunden til, at videnskabsfolk kommer til de samme konklusioner i en videnskabelig opdagelse, præcis, som man udviklede det binære system. Jeg mener, at der er langt flere skatte at finde både for Vesten ved at lære fra Kina, så vel som også, at det kinesiske folk forstår, ikke den liberale undervisning af historie og idéfilosofi, men ved virkelig at gå til de originale kilder, som de var, og som de var drivkraften bag Vestens fokus. Så dette er meget spændende, og jeg håber, vi kan arrangere noget langs disse retningslinjer. [applaus]

□(Video og engelsk udskrift af Helgas hovedtale vil snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden).

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche på Kinas kyst, »Den Eurasiske Landbros Terminal Øst«, 1996.

[1] Se: Specialrapport: Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

»En hyldest til Nicolaus af Cusa; En dialog mellem kulturer«.

[2] Se: Temaartikel: »Xi Jinpings Nye Silkevej: En genoplivelse af konfuciansk kultur«.

[3] Se: Temaartikel: »Gottfried Leibniz – et fantastisk, optimistisk geni«.

Koncert: En musikalsk dialog mellem kulturer

I en tid, hvor der er alt for meget politisk splid i verden, og verdens lande i stedet burde arbejde sammen om menneskehedens fælles mål, er det ekstra vigtigt, at vi på alle måder bygger bro mellem verdens nationer og de mange forskelligartede kulturer. Når vi oplever det skønne i andre kulturer, skaber det gensidig forståelse og et grundlag for

samarbejde og fred. Klassisk kunst er derfor en vigtig nøgle til en sådan dialog mellem kulturer, og det er grunden til, at vi afholder denne koncert!

Fredag den 17. februar, 2017, kl.19.

Gratis adgang.

Sted: Russisk Center for Videnskab og Kultur, Vester Voldgade 11, København.

Kinesiske forfriskninger i pausen.

Invitér også din familie, venner og kollegaer, og hæng gerne plakaten op forskellige steder.

Information: 25 12 50 33

Program

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**»Indvielse af et Nyt
Paradigme:
En dialog mellem
civilisationer«
Helga Zepp-LaRouches**

hovedtale på Schiller Instituttets konference i New York City, 14. januar, 2017

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Xi Jinping til FN i Genève: Intet er for vanskeligt

18. jan., 2017 – Præsident Xi Jinping holdt i dag en hovedtale i FN-bygningen i Genève efter et møde tidligere på dagen med dr. Margaret Chan, direktør for Verdenssundhedsorganisationen, og med chefen for den Internationale Olympiske Komite. Man afventer et udskrift.

Xis præsentation skitserede de højeste mål for verden af nationer, på en måde, der var rig på metaforer. Han sluttede med at fastslå sine fem, vigtige prioriteter.

Blandt de understregede ideer var nødvendigheden af at opgive krig og gå ind i en diplomatisk og politisk dialog for at løse problemer. Han fik spontan applaus, da han sagde, 'Selv den tykkeste is kan brydes'.

Da han sagde fra over for nejsigernes idé om, at visse problemer er for umedgørlige, og at et forsøg på at løse dem blot medfører ballade, sagde han, at kinesernes overbevisning er den, at »man skal ikke opgive at spise, fordi man tror, man måske får maden galt i halsen ... «

I en smuk behandling af verdens forskellige kulturer og religioner, citerede han igen et gammelt, kinesisk ord, der siger, 'den rigeste suppe er lavet af det højeste indhold af forskellige ingredienser' ...

Før Xi afsluttede med sine fem punkter, udtrykte han sin egen metafor for at fokusere på, hvordan man skal tænke på økosystemet, når der med sikkerhed vil opstå problemer, selvfølgelig, med forurening og andre lignende ting i takt med, at menneskeheden gør fremskridt med nye teknologier. Xi

sagde, at han husker, da han fik sin første schweizerkniv, og hvordan den kunne gøre så mange forunderlige ting. Han sagde, »Ville det ikke være vidunderligt, hvis vi havde en schweizerkniv, og når der opstår et problem, så tager vi bare kniven frem og fikser det ...«

Xi blev varmt introduceret af FN's generalsekretær Antonio Guterres og af generalforsamlingspræsident Peter Thomson.

Foto: Xi Jinping taler i FN, 18. jan., 2017. (Hele talen kan, med engelsk speak, høres her: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=voSm7E7UP0o>)