

GLASS-STEAGALL NU!

Luk Wall Street ned, før den slår dig ihjel!

31. august 2016 (Leder) – Med betydningsfulde, internationale topmøder, der starter den 2. september, og med den amerikanske Kongres, der vender tilbage til Washington den 6. september, vil de næste to uger blive langt mere afgørende for USA's fremtidige skæbne, og for menneskehedens fremtidige skæbne, end det amerikanske præsidentvalg den 8. november.

Lyndon LaRouche har advaret om, at, med mindre Kongressen handler – og handler nu, i september – for at genindføre Glass-Steagall, som det første skridt i en langt mere omfattende omstrukturering af den økonomiske og monetære politik, så har hele det transatlantiske system direkte kurs mod en nedsmeltning.

I diskussioner med kolleger i dag sagde LaRouche følgende:

»Hvis de undgår spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall i særdeleshed, samt relaterede spørgsmål, så vil de personer, der beter sig således, bringe deres egen død over deres hoveder. Man kan ikke tillade sig at ignorere det, der står på spil her. Man vil få en masse pludselige dødsfald, fordi de ikke var opmærksomme og gjorde, hvad de skulle.«

Denne kommende weekend vil blive vidne til en fremmarch af tre på hinanden følgende, internationale topmøder for statsoverhoveder, i Asien – Ruslands Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok, Kinas værtskab for G20-topmødet og Laos' værtskab for ASEAN plus 6 – og disse topmøder vil kontinuerligt etablere den kendsgerning, at Kina, Rusland og Indien – og ikke Obama og NATO – er i færd med at skabe et nyt, globalt system. Og mens Kina tager føringen ved denne uges G20-topmøde for at skabe et nyt og retfærdigt, globalt

finansielt system, så har håndlanger for briterne, den amerikanske præsident Barack Obama, i sin sindsforvirrede tilstand, og som en del af sin agenda for krig mod Rusland og Kina, planer om at promovere sin ekskluderende handelsaftale, Trans-Pacific Partnerskab (TPP), der på forhånd er dømt til undergang.

USA holder søndag den 11. september en mindedag i anledning af 15-års dagen for terrorangrebene den 11. september, 2001, og denne årsdag er den første, hvor de virkelige, udenlandske sponsorer af terrorangrebene – det britiske og saudiske monarki – står afsløret, med de nu frigivne 28 sider af den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport fra 2002. Dette 28 sider lange kapitel afslører også nogle af de institutioner, der kørte mørklægningen, inklusive, men ikke begrænset til, FBI og CIA. I lyset af disse afsløringer vil New York City fejre denne weekend med en imponerende række koropførelser af Mozarts Rekviem, der opføres af Schiller Instituttets kor, inklusive en særlig messe den 11. september, til ære for New York City's Brandvæsen (FDNY), hvilket alt sammen indgår som en del af kravet om total juridisk retfærdighed for det afskyelige mord på mere end 3000 amerikanere og andre, for femten år siden.

Og der er klare og accelererende tegn på en umiddelbart forestående nedsmeltning af det transatlantiske system. Den aftale, der blev indgået i sidste øjeblik for at redde Italiens Monte dei Paschi-bank, er nu ved at smuldre, og JPMorgan Chase taler nu for at gennemføre en bail-in (ekspropriering) af den private sektor for at undgå, at hele den italienske banksektor bliver udslettet. CNBC rapporterede i sidste uge, at »bankerne forbereder sig til en økonomisk atomvinter« og er i færd med at udarbejde nødplaner, ifald det værste skulle indtræffe, planer, der forudser eurozonens totale opbrud og enden på den Europæiske Union gennem en hel række afstemninger over hele Europa til fordel for en exit.

Aldrig har den sandhed stået klarere, at, hvis befolkningen

skulle ønske at vende de seneste femten års, for ikke at sige de seneste halvtreds års tendenser omkring, så ville Obama blive fordømt som en tragisk skikkelse, og patriotiske kræfter ville gennemtvinge Glass-Steagall nu!

Lyndon LaRouche talte i diskussionen om denne befolkningens underliggende frygt:

»Og I ved, at FBI er en del af dette her. Andre institutioner er, som FBI, er ansvarlige for undertrykkelse af sandheden. Jeg tror, tiden nu er inde til at undertrykke FBI! I det mindste, indtil de lever op til deres ansvar ... Og alle de personer, der støttede ideen om at sætte mig i fængsel, var bedragere. I særdeleshed nogle af de højtplacerede folk i det juridiske system. De gjorde det. De begik en forbrydelse ... Problemet er, at folk ikke handler på det, som de erkender, er problemet! Så vi må mobilisere folk som sådan, til at mobilisere sig selv. Med andre ord, til ikke alene at mobilisere sig selv som sådan, men til rent faktisk at mobilisere deres egen indsats over for andre ... Problemet er, at folk bliver bange. De er bange for FBI og alle mulige ting, der foregår. De er intimideret.«

Tiden er inde til at handle

Som for eksempel med de igangværende topmøder, inklusive det forestående sammentræde af FN's Generalforsamling i anden halvdel af september, er stærke strategiske skift i gang. Putin har forpurret den amerikansk/britiske politik i Sydvestasien og har vundet Tyrkiet og nu endda førende røster i Tyskland til fordel for en politik, baseret på international lov, elimineringen af terrornetværk samt økonomisk udvikling på storstilet skala.

Det bliver nu med stadigt voksende klarhed åbenlyst, at Kinas, Ruslands og Indiens politik med nye infrastrukturkorridorer over hele Eurasien og Afrika er blevet en politik, der er langt mere magtfuld end Obamas forsøg på at fremprovokere krig

med Rusland og Kina.

Som Lyndon LaRouche sagde under diskussioner med kolleger tidligere i dag:

»Jeg tror, vi nu har det rette publicerede materiale. Det vigtigste er simpelt hen at holde fast i materialet om udvikling, og at forøge det. Vi får sandsynligvis den bedst mulige hjælp på baggrund af de nye angreb på 'gangsterne', som vi kalder dem. Og mange kongresmedlemmer tvinges nu til at forsvare vore borgeres rettigheder.

Det betyder, at vi simpelt hen vil mobilisere befolkningen. Vi vil mobilisere befolkningen til at gennemtvinge disse rettigheder – deres rettigheder, på baggrund af dette, blot denne simple overvejelse. Det vil ikke fungere på nogen anden måde.«

Glass-Steagall er det første, uomgængelige skridt i både USA og Europa, for at afvende et finansielt lavineskred. Der er fremsat Glass/Steagall-lovforslag fra begge partier i begge Kongressens huse, ligesom Glass-Steagall indgår i valgplatformene for både det Demokratiske og Republikanske Parti, og en vedtagelse af Glass-Steagall i de kommende uger vil sluttelig vende hele valgprocessen omkring, til fordel for det amerikanske folk som helhed.

Den nye, globale, finansielle arkitektur og en verdenslandbro med transkontinentale storprojekter, der nu er under opførelse, er blevet promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i over fire årtier. **Tiden er nu inde til at gennemtvinge en vedtagelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingen**, en eliminerings af de finansielle derivaters finansielle atombombe og implementeringen af Lyndon LaRouches tre andre hovedlove: skabelse af statslige kreditbanker; en definering af et kreditsystem, der sigter på en forøgelse af arbejdskraftens produktive evne gennem storstilet udvikling og infrastruktur; samt at fremskyde de videnskabelige grænser gennem udforskning

af det ydre rum og udvikling af fusionskraft.



Menneskeheden har et ubegrænset potentiale for økonomisk vækst og udvikling af kreative evner. Vi må nu hævde vores naturlige, menneskelige ret til fortsat fremskridt, der er ubegrænset, eller også stå ansigt til ansigt med vores egen frygt.

Er Tyskland intelligent nok til at gribe chancen med Den nye Silkevej? Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

I Hangzhou vil det tema stå på dagsordenen, som Friedrich Schiller engang kaldte »menneskehedens store skæbne«, nemlig spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt den menneskelige familie rettidigt vil være i stand til at erkende, at den netop er én familie, der er i samme båd og kun vil kunne overleve, hvis snævre, nationalistiske og geopolitiske interesser tilsidesættes til gunst for menneskehedens fælles mål.

Et stort problem, der udgør en forhindring for Tysklands konstruktive samarbejde med Kinas fremtidsorienterede perspektiver om at opbygge en ny model for samarbejde mellem verdens stater, er den nuværende tyske tendens til at satse alt på en »grøn økonomi«, der forsøger at finde løsninger udelukkende »inden for rammerne af planeten Jords miljømæssige grænser« – miljøbevægelsens mantra.

27. august 2016 – Mens forbundskansler Merkel i disse dage

farer fra det ene minitopmøde til det andet – den ene gang på et italiensk hangarskib, og derefter fra den ene europæiske hovedstad til den næste, hver gang og til ingen nytte i forsøg på at begrænse de skadelige virkninger af EU's disintegrationsproces – træder Kina ind i den sidste fase af forberedelser til G20-topmødet i Hanzhou, og hvor Kina denne gang selv har forårsaget. Dette kan gå hen og blive det mest lovende G20-topmøde nogen sinde, for den kinesiske regering agter at fremlægge et omfattende koncept for, hvordan den globale økonomiske og finansielle krise kan overvindes. Hvad der så siden måtte komme ud af dette topmøde – så vil det i hvert fald komme til at stå fuldstændigt klart, hvem, der arbejder konstruktivt med frem mod dette mål, og hvem, der holder fast ved den gamle, farlige geopolitik og mislykkede neoliberale monetære politik.

EU og Washington har ved denne anledning al mulig grund til at slå ind på Kinas og de med Kina samarbejdende staters succesrige kurs. Efter Brexit kappes Frankrig, Italien og Østrig om, hvem, der bliver den næste, der forlader EU. I Frankrig fører den konservative Nicolas Sarkozy sig frem som præsidentkandidat med et memorandum, hvor han kræver ophævelsen af EU's forrang over de franske love såvel som også en ophævelse af Lissabontraktaten. Den socialistiske kandidat Arnaud Montebourg lover at ville følge general de Gaulles »tomme stols politik«; det anti-europæiske parti Front National under Marine le Pen fik 55 % af stemmerne ved sidste kommunalvalg; og Jacques Cheminade fra »Solidarité et Progrès«, hvis kampagne er ved at udvikle en betragtelig gennemslagskraft, går ind for en alliance mellem suveræne stater i Eurasien; altså tager så godt som alle de relevante kandidater stilling imod EU. I Italien skælver statsminister Renzi for folkeafstemningen for en forfatningsændring i oktober, i hvis kølvand det anti-europæiske Femstjerneparti kan gå hen og vinde nyvalget, der vil følge kort efter. Den næste regering i Østrig bliver formodentligt ledet af det EU-kritiske FPÖ (Det Østrigske Frihedsparti).

Et yderligere aspekt af EU's opløsningsproces trådte tydeligt

frem under Merkels seneste besøg i hovedstæderne i de såkaldte Visegrad-lande: Ungarn, Slovakiet, Tjekkiet og Polen, hvis regeringer stærkt afviser EU's forordnede flygtningekvoter og hele flygtningepolitikken. Den østrigske forsvarsminister Hans Peter Doskozil betegnede Merkels politik som »uansvarlig« og understregede, at Østrig ikke var noget »venteværelse til Tyskland«. Den ungarske ministerpræsident Orban planlægger at udbygge det hegn, han har ladet bygge langs Ungarns grænser, til en »uoverstigelig mur«, der med ét ville kunne stoppe selv »flere hundrede tusinde mennesker«. Dermed er ikke blot Merkels »europæiske løsning« for flygtningekrisen endegyldigt strandet, men også Schengen-aftalen og dermed samtidigt grundlaget for den europæiske valutaunion.

I betragtning af alle disse forskellige centrifugalkræfter virker det stivsind, med hvilket pro-EU-grupperingen vil holde fast ved EU-politikken, dog yderst virkelighedsfjernt. Hellere end at vende sig mod årsagerne til den voksende opposition vil de respondere til Brexit-afstemningen med »mere Europa« og intrigerer endda bag lukkede døre for på en eller anden måde at annullere Brexit. Dette foranledigede fire af de fem »økonomiske vismænd« til i en fælles artikel den 26. august i *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* at fremkomme med den advarsel, at dette blot ville forstærke de kræfter, der vil flygte fra EU.

Men ikke engang på minitopmødet mellem Merkel, Hollande og Renzi, der patetisk var henlagt til øen Ventotene til minde om Altiero Spinelli, én af »Europas fædre«, og – meget symbolsk – på et italiensk hangarskib, herskede der enighed mellem »de tre store«. Hollande og Renzi gik ind for investeringsprogrammer, rettet mod den ødelæggende økonomiske situation i deres lande, mens Merkel stod fast på de sædvanlige nedskæringsprogrammer; som om disses tiltrækningskraft ikke for længst var udløbet. Og når det så tilmed kommer til gensidige offentlige beskyldninger mellem Draghi (hvis tvivlsomme rolle i diverse bailout-operationer for tiden undersøges) og Den europæiske Centralbank på den ene

side, såvel som John Michael Cryan fra Deutsche Bank (der af IMF beskrives som den mest risikofyldte bank i verden), men også Wolfgang Bosbach, Volker Wieland fra »de fem vise mænd« og forbundsbanksbestyrelsesmedlem Andreas Dombret på den anden side, og når så samtidigt Deutsche Bank pludselig, i betragtning af de »skæbnesvangre følger« af de negative renter, gør sig til talsmand for bankkunder og pensions-sparere, så bør én ting stå klart: Spillet om skyldsplaceringen er begyndt. Alle skyder skylden på de andre for det transatlantiske finanssystems sammenbrud, som de alle ved er nært forestående.

Og her har de førende repræsentanter for EU og EU's medlemsstater udviklet de typiske skyklapper, som er karakteristisk for dem, der er fortalere for de forældede modeller, de har investeret hele deres identitet i. EU's ydre anseelse har for længst ændret sig. Tidligere gjaldt EU som model for regional integration for organisationer som ASEAN og AU og også for sydamerikanske integrationsbestræbelser. Allerede med den behandling, Grækenland fik af Trojkaen, og senest med flygtningekrisen er dette forbi; for disse lande står EU kun som en mislykket model. Kun ekstremt forkalkede repræsentanter for EU eller EU-regeringerne vover i disse dage at tage begreber som »demokrati« og »menneskerettigheder« i munden, i betragtning af Frontex-indsatsen mod flygtninge og tvivlsomme aftaler i flygtningespørgsmålet.

For Det almene Vel på globalt plan

Under Obamaregeringens otte år har USA's årlige, økonomiske vækst næppe overskredet 1 %, hvorimod Franklin D. Roosevelt alene i hvert af sine tre første år i embedet opnåede lige så meget, som Obama i sine otte år. Og EU opnåede endnu ringere økonomisk vækst end USA i det samme tidsrum. Kinas økonomiske vækst udviklede sig i det samme tidsrum fra 9,2 % i 2009 til »kun« 6,9 % i 2015, og i modsætning til den transatlantiske sektors kasinoøkonomi, så udgør det realøkonomiske område langt den største del af den kinesiske økonomi. Den spekulative andel er ganske ubetydelig her.

Kina vil ved G20-topmødet i Hangzhou den 4. og 5. september præsentere et omhyggeligt forberedt koncept for, hvordan en stabil finansarkitektur kan skabes og G20 forvandles fra en mekanisme til krisestyring til et varigt forbund af stater, der samarbejder for Det almene Vel på globalt plan. Det er Kinas plan at erstatte kortsigtet profittænkning, der er til gunst for de få, med en solid økonomi, der hviler på vækst gennem innovation.

Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping har i de tre år, der er gået, siden han satte opbygningen af den Nye Silkevej på den internationale dagsorden, igangsat en succeshistorie uden fortilfælde, og som 100 nationer og internationale organisationer allerede samarbejder om. Præsident Xi har gentagne gange tilbudt alle de europæiske stater, og i særdeleshed USA, at arbejde med på den fælles opbygning af den Nye Silkevejs win-win-perspektiv. Den kendsgerning, at Kina har indbudt et stort antal udviklingslande til at deltage i G20-topmødet, er yderligere en henvisning til, at han er seriøs omkring skabelsen af en ny økonomisk og finansiel arkitektur, der repræsenterer hele verden.

I Hangzhou vil det tema stå på dagsordenen, som Friedrich Schiller engang kaldte »menneskehedens store skæbne«, nemlig spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt den menneskelige familie rettidigt vil være i stand til at erkende, at den netop er én familie, der er i samme båd og kun vil kunne overleve, hvis snævre, nationalistiske og geopolitiske interesser tilsidesættes til gunst for menneskehedens fælles mål.

Et stort problem, der udgør en forhindring for Tysklands konstruktive samarbejde med Kinas fremtidsorienterede perspektiver om at opbygge en ny model for samarbejde mellem verdens stater, er den nuværende tyske tendens til at satse alt på en »grøn økonomi«, der forsøger at finde løsninger udelukkende »inden for rammerne af planeten Jords miljømæssige grænser« – miljøbevægelsens mantra.

Men netop her er Kina langt forud for den indskrænkede tankegangs todimensionelle verdensbillede, der ikke ser Jorden

som en rude, et vindue, men derimod som et akvarium. Kina har det for tiden mest ambitiøse rumprogram, der med de kommende Chang-e-missioner ikke blot vil udforske Månens bagside, men også forfølger konkrete planer om at udvinde store mængder helium-3 på Månen, som brændstof for opbygning af en fremtidig fusionsøkonomi på Jorden.

EU's og USA's reaktion på dette G20-topmøde vil gøre det klart, om de er i stand til at tage ved lære. Det, som Kina og de med Kina forbundne asiatiske stater repræsenterer i dag, er til gavn for hele menneskeheden.

Til trods for, at de internationale organisationer, der er associeret med mig, måske rent talmæssigt kun udgør en lille styrke, så er vi dog vore kritikere langt overlegne, hvad analyse, ideer og løsninger angår. Og netop denne dygtighed vil vi bringe i spil for at bringe Europa over på den rigtige side.

Titelfoto: Den Nye Silkevejs nordlige og sydlige rute mellem Kina og Tyskland.

Overvind Obamas politikker nu; glem alt om valget 8. november

30. august, 2016 (Leder) – De næste par uger bliver langt mere afgørende for USA og menneskehedens fremtid, end det amerikanske præsidentvalg den 8. november.

I disse to uger vil vi opleve en fremmarch af tre, på hinanden følgende internationale topmøder, der afholdes i Asien, og som vil etablere den nye virkelighed, at det er Kina, Rusland og Indien – og ikke Obama og NATO – der skaber og former denne

fremtid.

Og USA vil ikke være det samme efter 15-årsdagen for 11. september-angrebene, den første årssdag, hvor de, der var de reelle, udenlandske sponsorer af disse terrorangreb, står afsløret. Den forrykte tåbelighed, som var Bush-Obama krigene, og som fulgte i kølvandet på disse terrorangreb, er således blevet gjort klar og tydelig; det samme er også den russiske præsident Putins medmenneskelighed, med hans omgående tilkendegivelser af solidaritet med USA på daværende tidspunkt. I de næste to uger vil New York håndtere disse afsløringer gennem en slagkraftig række af minde-korkoncerter, opført af Schiller Instituttet, i hele byen.

Der er vægtige strategiske skift i gang. Putin har forpurret de amerikansk/europæiske præmisser om terroristbekæmpelse i Sydvestasien, idet han har vundet Tyrkiet for sin tilgang til problemet og nu er i færd med at vinde toneangivende røster, selv i Tyskland. Kinas, Ruslands og Indiens politik med at bygge landbroer og korridorer med ny infrastruktur i hele Eurasien og Afrika er blevet mere potent end Obamas forsøg på at provokere Rusland med krig, og »udstede regler« for Kina.

Alle Obamas giftige bestræbelser på at gøre Kina til en fjende af de 10 ASEAN-lande er endt ud med, at Kina er *mere* indflydelsesrigt i ASEAN end før. ASEAN's årsmøde – efter weekendens Østasiatiske Økonomiske Forum og derefter G20-mødet i Hangzhou, Kina – vil være det tredje af de magtfulde topmøder, der alle fokuserer på at genskabe vækst og produktivitet for verdensøkonomien efter det sidste årtis sammenbrud, udløst af Wall Street.

Og Obamas anti-kinesiske »handelsaftaler«, TTP (Trans-Pacific Partnerskab) og TTIP (Trans-Atlantiske Handels- og Investerings-Partnerskab), bliver erklæret for døde, selv af deres tidligere tilhængere. Hvis vi optrapper vores indsats i løbet af disse to uger, er der bedre chancer for, at Kongressen snart vil gen-vedtage Glass-Steagall som lov, end

tilfældet er for Obamas TTP eller TTIP.

Den nye, finansielle arkitektur og Verdenslandbroens storslåede infrastrukturprojekter, som disse topmøder vil tage sigte på, er blevet promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche over fire årtier.

Vil de fremtvinge en accept af Glass/Steagall-bankregulering og en afskrivning af den finansielle atombombe, som de finansielle derivater udgør?

Det kræver, at vi nu optrapper vores mobilisering for det, som Lyndon LaRouche har kaldt sine Fire Kardinallove: Glass-Steagall; nationale kreditbanker; teknologiske fremskridt gennem infrastruktur-byggeri; fremme af videnskabens fremskudte grænser gennem udforskning af det ydre rum og udvikling af fusionskraft.

Der er et ubegrænset potentiale for menneskehedens økonomiske vækst og udvikling af kreative evner. Obamas Hvide Hus vil sandsynligvis *modsatte sig* dette nye paradigme på G20-topmødet. Det er vores ansvar at lave om på *det*.

Foto: Vladimir Putin og Barack Obama holdt et bilateralt møde på sidelinjen af Fn's Generalforsamlings-møde. 29. september 2015 [kremlin.ru]

**RADIO SCHILLER den 29. august
2016:**

Det Østlige Økonomiske Forum i Vladivostok Rusland vil være optakt til G20-mødet i Kina

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Vi må afslutte den
geopolitiske krig mod Yemen
med en strategi for fred og
udvikling.**

**Tale af Schiller Instituttets
Ulf Sandmark ved
støttekonference for Yemen i
London.**

**Inkl. meget bevægende
videohilsen fra lederen af
Yemen-komiteen for**

koordinering med BRIKS, Fouad Al-Ghaffari

Følgende er en tale, som Ulf Sandmark, repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet, holdt ved en todages konference i London til støtte for det yemenitiske folk imod den anglo-amerikanske-saudiske imperiekrig. Han blev også interviewet på konferencen, og det blev vist på Yemen Tv. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CRcMfUoy19U>

Af Ulf Sandmark, økonom, Schiller Instituttet, Sverige. 20. august 2016.

Jeg vil gerne takke arrangørerne af denne konference. Jeg anser denne konference for at være en milepæl i hjælpen til Yemen for at hævde dets suverænitet, i særdeleshed, fordi konferencen faldt sammen med den overvældende demonstration i Sanaa i går, med 4 millioner deltagere. Jeg er så imponeret af det yemenitiske folks mod, hvor de løber risikoen ved at demonstrere under direkte trussel fra det anglo-amerikanske-saudiske bombardement.

Det var en storslået manifestation af den yemenitiske nations suverænitet under landets nye regeringsråd og valgte parlament. Det, vi ser, er et folk, der har rejst sig for at befri sig selv fra den mest brutale aggression. Med denne demonstration har de allerede gjort sig til et frit folk i deres indre sind.

Yemen kunne nu gå med i den igangværende verdensrevolution, som organiseres af BRIKS-landene med deres voksende antal allierede. Det er mere end halvdelen af verdens befolkning, der har befriet sig selv rent mentalt fra den vestlige, globale, økonomiske og militære dominans. BRIKS har indledt en proces for at erstatte den gamle, anglo-amerikanske verdensorden og er begyndt at opbygge verden i et hæsblæsende

tempo. BRIKS er nu i færd med at virkeliggøre de visionære infrastrukturprojekter, som allerede af Den alliancefri Bevægelse (NAM) og Bandung-konferencen i 1960'erne blev sat på dagsordenen. Hovedprojektet udgøres af Den Nye Silkevej [Det økonomiske Silkevejsbælte], der forbinder Eurasien over land, samt Det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, der fra Kina passerer Yemen på sin vej til den Nye Suezkanal.

BRIKS venter ikke. De opbygger deres egne finansinstitutioner, sikkerhedsorganisationer, infrastruktursystemer, industricentre, teknologi og videnskab. Dette betyder, at fredsbevægelserne har en ny måde, hvorpå de kan standse alle de geopolitiske krige, som krigen mod Yemen. Vi kan få Europa og USA til at gå med i projekterne i Den nye Silkevej. Dette ville gøre Europa og USA til BRIKS' allierede, og allierede udkæmper ikke krige med hinanden. Krigshøgene kan omgås og gøres impotente. Samtidig kan dette gigantprojekt sætte alle vore arbejdsløse unge mennesker til at producere maskiner og andre nødvendige midler.

Jeg er her for at være med til at grundlægge en international koalition for at standse krigen imod Yemen, som vi i går diskuterede i workshoppen. Ideen i min organisation, det internationale Schiller Institut med Helga Zepp-LaRouche som leder, er at udbrede måder at virke for freden på, med en politik for økonomisk udvikling. Konstruktionen af Den nye Silkevej er det største fredsprojekt nogensinde, der opbygger freden ved at forbinde nationer i praksis, rent fysisk med jernbaner, hovedveje, kanaler og alle former for infrastruktur.

Vi vil erstatte de geopolitiske krige med et nyt paradigme for relationer i verden, en multi-polær verden i stedet for den døende verden under anglo-amerikansk dominans og finansbobler. Det nye paradigme er formuleret gennem den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings »win-win«-koncept, som er et koncept for fredeligt samarbejde, baseret på en genoplivelse af visdommen hos Kon Fu Tse (Konfucius). Den åbner Silkevejene for en fornyet dialog

mellem civilisationer på det højeste filosofiske, kunstneriske og videnskabelige niveau, en dialog, hvori Yemen, »Visdommens land«, vil føle sig hjemme.

Blot inden for de seneste par måneder er Japan og Filippinerne blevet rekrutteret bort fra krigshøgene, der har presset på for at fremme en atomar konfrontation i det Sydkinesiske Hav. Japan begynder at samarbejde med BRIKS om gigantprojekter i det fjernøstlige Rusland, i Indien og Indonesien. Tyrkiet er i færd med at blive rekrutteret af Rusland og stabiliserer relationerne med Egypten, Israel, Kaukasus og den tyrkisktalende del af Centralasien og sandsynligvis med Syrien. Og Rusland har netop, hvad der er meget vigtigt, i FN blokeret en ny, saudisk resolution mod Yemen. Flere østeuropæiske lande, og ligeledes Grækenland, såvel som også det meste af Afrika og Latinamerika, er i færd med at orientere sig mod Den nye Silkevej og BRIKS. Selv her i London ønsker City [of London] at gå med i den kinesiske valutahandel, og der er således en modstand her, imod de krigshøge, der truer med atomkrig.

Dette kort over Verdenslandbroen (se *fodnote*) beskriver, hvorledes de Nye Silkeveje agter at nå ud til alle kontinenter. Forbindelsen over (under) Beringstrædet bliver en direkte forbindelse mellem Rusland og USA for at cementere deres fredelige samarbejde og opkoble de amerikanske kontinenter til Den nye Silkevej. Dette, sammen med opkoblingen af Afrika, vil skænke os en Verdenslandbro. Og Afrika kan opkobles, både i Egypten, til Spanien og Sicilien, men, hvad der er af afgørende betydning for Yemen, også under Bab El Mandeb-strædet til Djibouti. Dette kort er af Schiller Instituttet blevet udarbejdet på baggrund af diverse udviklings- og fredsprojekter, som vi har arbejdet med i løbet af de seneste 40 år. Det er en del af en Specialrapport med titlen »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. I år har vi udgivet den udvidede arabiske oversættelse af denne rapport.

Den fremragende kamp for håb i Yemen

Uden håb findes der ingen fremtid. Med en plan for genopbygningen af Yemen gøres håbet konkret, om virkeliggørelsen af det yemenitiske folks potentialer, dets produktive evner, dets videnskab og dets rige arv. Schiller Instituttet er i kontakt med fremragende kæmpere i Yemen, der gør dette på trods af de anglo-amerikanske-saudiske bombardementer. De har stiftet Yemen-komiteen for Koordinering med BRIKS. Hver tirsdag mødes de modigt ved møder i Sanaa for at studere og udvikle planerne for Yemens genopbygning.

Deres leder, Fouad Al-Ghaffari, sendte en videofilm som en hilsen til Schiller Instituttets konference i Berlin for blot to måneder siden. Videoen demonstrerede det mest bevægende mod og den mest bevægede optimisme med kamp for menneskehedens højeste værdier. Jeg vil gerne afslutte min fremstilling med at dele denne video med jer, der viser hans rapport over, hvad de gør for at mobilisere håb og værdighed i Yemen.

Schiller Instituttets konference i Berlin blev dybt bevæget af denne video og vedtog følgende resolution:

Schiller instituttets konference i Berlin 25. – 26. juni (2016) sender de varmeste hilsener til støtte for den store, yemenitiske nation og Fouad Al-Ghaffaris studiegruppe. Deres modige, intellektuelle lederskab, bogstavelig talt midt i sataniske kræfters bombardement, har været en inspiration for tusinder af mennesker i USA, Latinamerika og Europa. Vi aflægger en højtidelig ed om, at vi vil kæmpe for udvidelsen af den Nye Silkevej til genopbygningen af Yemen, således, at de mange myrdede mænds, kvinders og børns liv vil blive æret i en renæssance i Yemen, der ligeledes vil genopbygge de smukke, gamle byer og disses arkitektur. Yemen må og vil blive en perle blandt Sydvestasiens nationer, og i verden, meget snart!

fodnote: Udførligt kort med forklaringer findes i Specialrapport: **Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen**

Final Declaration of the International Conference to Support of Yemeni People

Report by Ulf Sandmark.

Over the span of two days tens of scholars, academics, experts, journalists and activists met to declare their support for and solidarity with the Yemeni people who are facing cruel war by the evil Saudi-led coalition. Held at the Pullman Hotel, in St Pancras, London, more than 150 of these concerned people dealt with the war whose bloody chapters continue to unfold with no one from the "Free World" venturing to call for a ceasefire. These people came from UK, US, Canada, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Lebanon, Iraq, Bahrain, Egypt, Sudan, Kuwait, Iran, Malaysia and India to express in one voice their demand to stop the blood-letting, attend the wounded and free the starving among the inhabitants of that country with its historic civilisation. They met for noble causes, ignoring political calculations or stands based on racial, religious or sectarian prejudice. They raised the banner of Peace, Justice, Love and Fraternity and shouted in one voice: Stop the War on Yemen".

Over the two days, Saturday and Sunday 20th and 21st August 2016, the sessions of the "International Conference to support the Yemeni People" were held to discuss various issues related to the war; political background and consequences. The Saudi policies towards Yemen, past and present, its regional ambitions, and the ideology it seeks to spread in the world were debated. The religious dimensions of the Saudi policy towards Yemen were also dealt with especially Riyadh's

insistence on spreading Wahhabism which is linked worldwide to extremism, exclusion and terrorism. The participants came from far afield to clear their conscience after they realised the direct complicity of several Western countries, especially the United States and the United Kingdom in the war which has now lasted over 17 months. It has led to the killing of more than 13 thousand Yemenis, mostly civilians and including over 3000 children. They have seen the comprehensive destruction which turned Yemen into rubble due to the persistent bombing by the F16s and Typhoon aircrafts. They shed light on the destruction of the human and Islamic heritage in Yemen and the implication for the history of mankind. The Sheba civilisation has been destroyed as well as the Ma'rib dam. This destruction is in line with the Wahhabi doctrines which have deep enmity to civilizational heritage, Islamic or otherwise. Their hearts were throbbing with anger as they saw images of destruction of the specific Yemeni architecture. They also dealt with the land, sea and air blockade imposed on Yemen and how the country is being throttled by the Saudi forces supported by American and British fleets in the Arabian the Red seas. They called for the immediate lifting of this blockade which is another form of war crimes. The international stands were reviewed by the participants who were horrified to remember how the United Nations was forced to remove Saudi Arabia from the list of countries that violate the rights of the children in Yemen. They also expressed outrage at the deafening silence that is preventing Western governments from calling for a ceasefire to spare the lives of Yemenis. They considered that allowing Saudi Arabia to continue its aggression on Yemen is dangerous hypocrisy and serious violation of the "war on terror". It is no longer secret to link this international terrorism as presented by AlQa'ida and ISIS to the sources of extremism, exclusion and terrorism enshrined the Wahhabi ideology which is promoted by Saudi schools and universities and supported with the petro-dollars.

After two days of extensive discussion the participants

presented the following recommendations:

1- Ceasefire has become an immediate need that cannot be delayed any longer. The world must not hesitate to raise its voice and call on the United Nations Security Council to pass a resolution to impose a ceasefire and stop the illegal aggression on Yemen. Failing to do this is tantamount to complicity in the cruel war and could be considered participation in war crimes.

2- The participants call specifically on the United States, the United Kingdom and the European Union to break the deafening silence and call for the ceasefire. They are also required to impose an immediate arms embargo on Saudi Arabia and other countries participating actively in killing the Yemeni people.

3- The participants urge the World community to respect the right of the Yemeni for self-determination and to choose their own political system through the adoption of the known democratic means. As they inaugurated their conference the participants saw for themselves the millions of Yemenis marching in the streets of Sanaa in support of the newly-formed Political Council. Their choice must be respected.

4- The files of destruction caused by the Saudi-led aggression were reviewed with bitterness at its cruelty and ferocity, especially in its huge human losses, the killing of children and women and the obliteration of the Yemen civilization. The scenes brought back to mind the devastation of the Second World War. An immediate ceasefire is thus necessary to spare the Yemenis further losses.

5- The blockade on Yemen's sea, land and air ports must be lifted immediately. Relief convoys must be allowed to reach the victims of war and famine which are in millions according to UN figures. More than half the Yemenis are in a state starvation and many will perish as a result. Diseases have

spread due to the lack of medical care resulting from the blockade.

6- The participants reviewed the Saudi policy of targeting civilian sites like schools, hospitals, factories and mosques. They called on the UNESCO to break its silence, condemn the Saudi aggression and call for ceasefire. They hailed the efforts of the human rights bodies especially those that have produced reports confirming the war crimes by the Saudis. Particular appreciation was made to the efforts of Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and Doctors Without Borders (MSF).

7- The guests affirmed their rejection of extremism, exclusion and terrorism, pointing to the links between those phenomena and the aggression on Yemen. They pointed specifically to the spread of Al Qa'ida in half the land of Yemen under the control of the Saudi-led coalition. This needs special attention from the World community due to its negative impact on international peace and security.

8- The participants urged the media, those active in the social networks and international NGOs to undertake campaigns to inform the public and break the news blackout imposed on Yemen and the destructive Saudi-led aggression. They expressed their unease about the indifference towards the bloodshed in Yemen. This aggression is unique; millions are spent only to keep it out of the television screens. That, in itself, is a war on the truth.

9- The Conference called for the creation of a special international commission to investigate the extensive war crimes committed in Yemen and confirmed by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and UN's experts. They also called for the creation of the "Yemen War Crimes Tribunal" to take care of any such crimes.

10- Finally, the participants expressed appreciation of the

stands of the countries that have helped the Yemeni people or worked to facilitate a ceasefire, especially the Sultanate of Oman, the State of Kuwait and the Islamic Republic of Iran. They expressed gratefulness to the media outlets that covered the war and highlighted the plight of the Yemeni people. They also thanked the management of the Pullman Hotel, that have provided excellent services to the delegates.

The International Conference to Support the Yemeni People

21st August 2016, London.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 21. august
2016:**

**Den nye Silkevejsalliance er
på vej til at sejre**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Tyskland og Frankrig skal deltage i opførelse af helt ny by i Kina, 'Ny Xi'an', under projekt »Porten til Silkevejen«

19. august 2016 – En delegation fra Würzburg, Tyskland, der netop er hjemvendt efter et besøg i Kina, rapporterer, at den havde møder i Xi'an med flere ledende kinesiske regeringsfolk og tyskere, der arbejder i byen, om planer om at opføre en helt ny storby ved siden af Xi'an. Dette projekt, »Porten til Silkevejen«, vil involvere deltagelse fra Frankrig og Tyskland, inklusive et museumselement, der skal fremvise udvalgte, vigtige, historiske bygninger i Frankrig og Tyskland, så som f.eks. en replika af Berlins Brandenburger Tor. Så meget for turistattraktioner.

Vigtigere er imidlertid det industrielle aspekt: Den Kinesiske Statskommissions afdeling i Xi'an har bedt et rådgivningsfirma med base i Würzburg, som Kina tidligere har arbejdet sammen med, om at udarbejde en køreplan for lovende investeringer i den nye by, som er attraktive for tyske selskaber, med vægt på den produktive Mittelstand. Selskabet vil især tage kontakt til de selskaber, der gerne vil gøre forretninger med Kina, men som ikke har det. Ud over at være forbundet til den Ny Silkevejs jernbanelinje til Europa vil den nye by også få en lufthavn.

Info: Xi'an er hovedstaden i provinsen Shaanxi i det nordvestlige Kina og én af Kinas ældste byer og én af de fire, antikke hovedstæder i Kina. Xi'an er begyndelsespunktet for den gamle Silkevej, som i århundreder var den tråd, der forbandt øst og vest. Fra så tidligt som år 200 f. Kr. rejste

købmænd med deres kamelkaravaner fra Xi'an (Chang'an), Kinas hovedstad dengang, mod vest, så langt som til Konstantinopel, for at sælge silke. Xi'an er hjemstedet for kejser Qin Shi Huangs terrakottahær. Desuden rummer Xi'an bl.a. centre for Kinas rumfartsindustri. Xi'an har 4,4 mio. indbyggere. De to kinesiske tegn i navnet Xi'an, 西, betyder 'Vestlig Fred'.

Würzburg: Med bl.a. Fraunhofer Institut for Forskning i Silikat, som er en del af Fraunhofer-selskabet, Europas største organisation for anvendt forskning. Det udvikler materialer for morgendagens produkter og tilbyder samarbejde med små og mellemstore virksomheder og med industriselskaber i stor skala.

Universitet for Anvendt Videnskab for Würzburg-Schweinfurt blev grundlagt i 1971 som et teknologisk institut med afdelinger i Würzburg og Schweinfurt. Det er med sine 8.000 studerende det næststørste universitet for anvendt videnskab i Franken i delstaten Bayern, med studiegrene inden for blandt andet arkitektur, civilingeniør, geodæsi og logistik. Würzburg har 125.000 indbyggere. (-red.)

**Hvorfor har vi alt for længe tilladt et Imperium at dominere vores eksistens?
LaRouchePAC Internationale fredags-webcast, 19. august**

2016

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Engelsk udskrift.

WHY HAVE WE ALLOWED AN EMPIRE TO DOMINATE OUR EXISTENCE FOR FAR TOO LONG?

International LaRouche PAC Webcast , Aug. 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's August 19th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden. You're joining us for our weekly broadcast here on Friday evenings of our LaRouche PAC webcast. I'll be your host tonight. I'm joined in the studio by Jason Ross, from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined, via video, by Kesha Rogers and Michael Steger, both leading members of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

As we broadcast this show here tonight, the second edition – newest copy – of the weekly publication, {The Hamiltonian} is going to press. This is going to be flooding into the streets

of

New York City close on the heels of the first edition, which came

out two weeks ago. Both Kesha Rogers and Michael Steger have articles that are on the front page of this week's copy of {The

Hamiltonian}. Michael Steger wrote an article called "LaRouche Was Right. End Wall Street, Now", and Kesha Rogers wrote a very

profound and beautiful article called "A Truly Human Culture – an Expression of the Creative Human Mind."

What Kesha addresses in this article is the inner relationship between the minds of Lyndon LaRouche, Albert Einstein, and Krafft Ehrlicke, and their conception of what a truly human culture is.

Joining us here today is Jason Ross, who has actually prepared a condensed presentation on the subject of some of the

unique discoveries of Albert Einstein, which will add to our discussion here today.

But before we get to that, we've agreed to begin today's

broadcast with a sort of travel back into time. Now that we are

on the verge of a total consolidation of this new Eurasian system, which is based around the original idea of the Russia-India-China Strategic Triangle, which was championed by Lyndon LaRouche and also championed by Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov of Russia in the 1990s, we are finding ourselves in a completely unprecedented situation. It's, I think, very clear, as

we approach the G-20 Summit, the Vladivostok Economic Forum, and

also the United Nations General Assembly, that the entire strategic geometry of the planet has shifted and has realigned.

As is rightly pointed out in the lead of today's

LaRouche

PAC website, this is not just a "practical" realignment of nations, but, since we are talking about Einstein here today, this is almost the "gravitational effect" of an idea which was introduced almost 20 years ago by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

The video that you're about to see is a very short excerpt of a speech that Mr. LaRouche made at a forum in Washington, DC in 1997 in conjunction with the release of the {Executive Intelligence Review} {first} edition of the special report on the subject of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was a presentation that was made as part of a series of so-called "development conferences" that were held in Washington during those couple of years – 1996, 1997, 1998 – and I think what you'll see in this video is the fact that it was Lyndon LaRouche's "marching orders." It was sort of his creative vision of what the role that China, with the New Silk Road, and also the role that Russia would play in completely reshaping the strategic geometry of the world.

So, this is a short excerpt of that speech from 1997:

LYNDON LAROUCHE: There are only two nations which are respectable left on this planet, that is, nations of respectable power: that is the United States, particularly the United States not as represented by the Congress, but by the President. It is the {identity} of the United States which is a political power, not some concatenation of its parts. The United States is represented today only by its President, as a political

institution. The Congress does not represent the United States;

they're not quite sure who they do represent, these days, [laughter] since they haven't visited their voters recently.

The President is, institutionally, the embodiment of the United States in international relations. The State Department can't do that; the Justice Department can't do it; no other Department can do it; only the President of the United States, under our Constitution, can represent the United States as an entity – its entire personality, its true interest, its whole people.

Now, there's only one other power on this planet which can be so insolent as that toward other powers, and that's the Republic of China. China is engaged, presently, in a great infrastructure-building project, in which my wife and others have had an ongoing engagement over some years. There's a great reform in China, which is a "trouble reform." They're trying to solve a problem. That doesn't mean there is no problem. But they're trying to solve it.

Therefore, if the United States, or the President of the United States, and China, participate in fostering {that} project, sometimes called the Silk Road Project, sometimes the Land-Bridge Project, if that project of developing development corridors across Eurasia into Africa, into North America, is extended, that project is enough work to put this whole planet into an economic revival. I'll get into just a bit of that, to make it more sensuously concrete.

China has had cooperation with the government of Iran for some time. Iran has actually been completing a number of rail links which are an extension of China's Land-Bridge program

(or Silk Road project). More recently, we've had, on the side of India, from Indian leadership which has met with the representatives of China, to engage in an initial route, among the land routes, for the Land-Bridge program. One goes into Kunming in China. I was in that area, in Mishana, during part of World War II. Out of Mishana we had planes flying into Kunming, "over The Hump," as they used to say in those days. I'm quite familiar with that area.

But if you have water connections, canal connections, and rail connections from Kunming through Mishana – that area – across Bangladesh into India, through Pakistan into Iran, up to the area just above Tehran, south of the Caspian – you have linked to the Middle East; you have linked to Central Asia; you have linked to Turkey; you have linked to Europe.

Then you have a northern route, which is pretty much the route of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was built under American influence and American advice, by Russia. You have a middle route, which is being developed, in Central Asia, with China and Iran.

India is working on a plan which involves only a few hundreds of kilometers of rail to be added – there were a lot of other improvements along the right-of-way – which would link the area north of Tehran through Pakistan, through India, through Bangladesh, through Myanmar, into Kunming, into Thailand, into Vietnam, down through Malaysia and Singapore, across the Straits by a great bridge, into Indonesia.

There's a plan, also, for the development of a rail

link

through what was northern Siberia, across the Bering Strait into

Alaska, and down into the United States. There's a Middle East link – several links – from Europe, as well as from China, but from China a Middle East link into Egypt, into all of Africa.

So, what we have here, is a set of projects which are not

just transportation projects, like the trans-Continental railroads in the United States, which was the precedent for this

idea, back in the late 1860s and 1870s. You have "development corridors," where you develop, on an area of 50-70 km on either

side of your rail link, your pipeline, and so forth. You develop

this area with industry, with mining, with all these kinds of things. Which is the way you {pay} for a transportation link.

Because of all the rich economic activity. Every few kilometers

of distance along this link, there's something going on, some economic activity. People working, people building things, people

doing things.

To transform this planet, in great projects of infrastructure-building, which will give you the great industries, the new industries, the new agriculture, and the other things we desperately need. {There is no need for anybody

on this planet, who is able to work, to be out of work.} That simple. And that project is the means.

If the nations which agree with China – which now includes

Russia, Iran, India, other nations – if they engage in a commitment to that project which they're building every day; if

the United States – that is, the President of the United

States,
Clinton – continues to support that effort, as he's been
doing,
at least politically, then what do you have? You have the
United
States and China and a bunch of other countries ganged up
together, against the greatest power on this planet, which is
the
British Empire, called the British Commonwealth. That's the
enemy!

 If on one bright day, say a Sunday morning, after a
weekend
meeting, the President of the United States, the President of
China, and a few other people say, "We have determined this
weekend, that based on our advisors and the facts, that the
international financial and monetary system is hopelessly
bankrupt, and we in our responsibility as heads of state, must
put these bankrupt institutions into bankruptcy
reorganization,
in the public interest. And it is in our interest to cooperate
as
nations in doing this, to avoid creating chaos on this
planet."

 The result, then, is that such an announcement, on a
bright
Sunday morning, will certainly spin the "talking heads" on
Washington TV. [laughter] But otherwise it means that the
entire
system, as of that moment, has been put through the
guillotine,
and the head is rolling down the street. Alan Greenspan's
head,
perhaps.

 That means we have at that point the impetus for
building,
immediately, a new financial and monetary system. Now, in
putting

a corporation which is bankrupt, into viable form, what do you do? You've got to find the business that it's going to do, which is the basis for creating the new credit to get that firm going again.

The Land-Bridge program, with its implications on a global scale, is the great project which spins off directly and indirectly enough business, so to speak, for every part of this world, to get this world back on a sound basis again.

OGDEN: As you can see, this is a very prescient speech, and in fact it was Lyndon LaRouche's active intervention, travelling to Russia, his wife travelling to China in this period, the publication of {EIR} Special Report about the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which has shaped the current situation we find ourselves in. One thing that's interesting to point out, is those maps that you were seeing. At that time many of those rail routes and other pipeline routes were merely proposals, but now many of them are actually in the process of being built.

I think it's clear, 20 years on, this is the emergent dominant system on the planet. At the same time, the trans-Atlantic system is in completely blowout mode. You have an oncoming implosion of trillions of dollars of non-performing debt and derivatives exposures, which are being projected into every major bank across the trans-Atlantic system.

In the meantime, in the build-up to the G-20 Summit and into

the United Nations General Assembly, you've got the role that especially President Putin is playing, in consolidating a series of alliances, mainly between Russia, China, and India; but also this emerging alliance between Russia and Turkey; and, very significantly, the very strengthened alliance between Russia and Iran, where Russia is now using bases in Iran as a point of departure for fighter jets to go in and fight against ISIS in Syria.

Putin, who is being honored as the Number One guest at the upcoming G-20 Summit in China, is certainly at the center of all of this. His career and Mr. LaRouche's career, over the past twenty years since that speech was delivered in Washington, have very closely paralleled each other.

I think we can open up the discussion with that as a basis.

KESHA ROGERS: Did you want to start, Jason?

JASON ROSS: You can go ahead Kesha, or Michael.

ROGERS: Okay. I think Michael might be having some technical difficulties, so I will go ahead and get started.

When we look at Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, first of all, going back to this video that you just showed, it's extremely important to look at this video as a characteristic of who Mr. LaRouche is, and his 40- to 50-year track record in economic development, and what he has been organizing around, from the standpoint of the center of economics being based on the human intervention, the human creative process. And what actually distinguishes him from all of the other so-called "economists"

out there, because as you just said Matt, what we're dealing with right now is a breakdown crisis in the society that Mr. LaRouche has recognized going back to his first forecast of the late 1960s, 1970s. What were these forecasts based on? They were based on the fact that if you went along with a mathematical idea about how society should function, then you were completely misunderstanding – or should I say wrong in your understanding of what actually fosters progress in society. What fosters progress in society is not money per se; and this has been Mr. LaRouche's focus on the role of Alexander Hamilton. [That's] why right now as many people have seen, we've already put out one edition of a new newsletter that you just showed Matt, called {The Hamiltonian}. This is extremely important because now we're putting out the second edition of {The Hamiltonian}, which is having reverberating effects, particularly throughout Manhattan; which is the center of the fight for the nation. That is the fight where Alexander Hamilton led the fight for the development of our US Constitution against the British criminals like Aaron Burr, and against those who wanted to destroy what the United States actually represented.

But it goes deeper than that; because I think what we've discussed a lot around Mr. LaRouche's current fight in Manhattan and what we're doing with this {Hamiltonian} is what has defined the mission for bringing about the new Presidency. Michael wrote an article last week on the question of the new Presidency

fostered by Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws and the bringing in of those
Four Laws. The article that's in this week's {Hamiltonian} is by
Michael around LaRouche's track record in economics and why Wall
Street has to be brought down now. It is followed by the article
that I wrote on the human creative process. I think we'll get more into that, but when we bring up this question of a New Paradigm for mankind and the identity of a renaissance, some of
it becomes in most people's minds because of the society and culture we live in, a little superficial. It is based on this idea that a renaissance has a different meaning to it. When we
speak of the idea of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, first
and foremost, it is the idea of creating something that has not
yet existed; something that the human creative mind has to bring
into existence. When you go back and you start to look at the idea of what the conception of the Italian Renaissance was based
on historically, it was the idea of putting mankind and the human
creative process at the center of the Universe.

I think it's important that we'll get into this; that this
is what has shaped the identity of Mr. LaRouche around his emphasis on the unique creative role of Albert Einstein and the
unique creative of others such as was mentioned earlier – Krafft
Ehricke. I think it's important for people to look at this, because the question now is that with the collapse of the

society

that we're seeing right now, the detrimental collapse of the culture, what we're seeing in terms of what's taken over the thinking of the population. The population is not capable of actually making decisions as human beings; they're making decisions based on what somebody tells them is possible or is not possible. I think this is a problem we're running into. How can you actually say that you have the ability to make decisions as a free citizen when you're making your decisions based on what you think is already possible and has been determined as precedents set and possibilities that are already a determining factor of what can and cannot happen.

So, I think that's important to look at as people are thinking about this insane election process. Instead of thinking about what is going to shape your future; is it going to be something that happens to you? Or something that you actually bring into existence? That's what Mr. LaRouche has been completely focussed on. The population has to have a sense that you're responsible for your future; you must bring that which does not exist into existence, based on your understanding that human beings are not animals. We don't have to go along with the insanity of what we're told we have to accept.

So, I'll start with those remarks for now, and let you guys go on with more.

OGDEN: Well, we just got Michael back, so maybe we should

hear him.

MICHAEL STEGER: Hi.

OGDEN: Great! Welcome back. We were just discussing some of the implications of going back and looking back at that video of Mr. LaRouche's speech in 1997. I think you actually had something to point out about the timing of that speech and what happened just immediately afterwards.

STEGER: Yeah, and part of the dynamic in organizing some of the layers of China at that time was that it was not clear to many in China at that time, or in Asia, that the western trans-Atlantic system had major failings and weaknesses. It was just two months after that speech was made that the Asian financial crisis erupted; dominating Southeast Asia and Japan — the so-called "Asian tigers". It really made it very clear that the entire financial system could go. It was just a year later that the whole LCTM crisis happened. So when Mr. LaRouche is referencing the bankruptcy of the financial system, that was very apparent in just months to come to almost everyone on the planet; as apparent as it was in 2008 when the financial system blew again. As we point out in the article in the new {Hamiltonian}, the level of insanity that now dominates 20 years later, creates what is clearly the largest financial breakdown in modern history. This is a kind of financial bankruptcy only

comparable

to perhaps the blow-out in Italy in the 1300s; which brought a Dark Age to Europe.

But what is remarkable is how much these nations like China

– it's just striking; and maybe this has already been stated – but the context of China and India collaborating on major routes

is an ongoing diplomatic process today. Far more engaged, far more serious than anyone can probably imagine; let alone the integrations of countries like Iran, Turkey. Everything that Mr.

LaRouche laid out about 20 years ago, is now on a far greater active collaborative effort among these nations. It is somewhat

a testament to the power of ideas and how that can shape history

at crisis moments; as we saw in '97 and what we see today.

OGDEN: I think one thing that is very clear from just looking at

Mr. LaRouche's role in the middle of this, is his emphasis on the

mission that has to bring nations together. In other words, this

is not just geopolitics in a cynical sense. This based around a

concept of what is the human species? What is real profit?

How

do we create a future for a growing population; and how do we establish the kind of optimism that mankind has a future towards

which the current generations can work? It's pointed out, I think a lot of what we're seeing right now is not just a projection of the past into the present. This is a reflection of

a future intention. You can look at what China is doing, for

example, in terms of their space program. The fact that two years from now, you're going to have a Chinese probe going to where no man has gone before; to the far side of the Moon, to discover things that perhaps we don't even know are questions yet, in terms of man's relationship to the Universe.

When we were discussing some of these questions with Mr.

LaRouche yesterday, he had one thing to say which I just would like to quote verbatim from him which I think can provide the basis for a furthering of this discussion. What Mr. LaRouche said was the following: "Mankind is not based on the limitations

of individual human behavior; but, in fact, man as a species is

based on the individual powers of the human mind to go beyond what mankind had conceived of prior. Giving mankind a power over

the Universe greater than anything achieved heretofore."

We've

been putting a lot of emphasis on the personality of Albert Einstein, but for what reason? For the very reason that Albert

Einstein is paradigmatic of exactly that sort of individual, revolutionary characteristic of genius. That the genius takes what was believed prior to that point and calls it into question,

and overturns major aspects of what mankind had believed and had

put into practice up to that point; and revolutionizes mankind's

understanding of the Universe and of himself. So, I think that's

sort of a window into why the emphasis on Albert Einstein right

now.

JASON ROSS: It's difficult to speak for LaRouche; and

he's got opportunities to speak for himself on this site, too, which he'll continue doing. But the example of Einstein as a real {mensch} you might say, a real human being, what it is to be a person is essential for a couple of reasons. One, if you think about the role of LaRouche in history and the economic breakthroughs he made several decades ago now, you look at the courage that he had to stick with what he knew was right despite whatever opposition might come his way; despite what was effectively a life sentence in prison, to not compromise in the face of that. An economic forecasting record that's unparalleled and proposals for polices that are now – as you heard in that video, and as is taking place right now with China's One Belt, One Road taking the world. So, in terms of how Einstein fits into that, I want to take up something that Kesha had brought up about popular opinion. Because where do you get a freedom in your thoughts from? How are you able to be a free thinking citizen; or how are you able to come to conclusions that are your own, as opposed to having a basis in their popularity. Or whether you think other people might think them, or whether you think you ought to look like you think them to get ahead somehow. Is there an actual standard for whether something is true or not? Yes, there is; and unfortunately and deliberately, that's really not part of our culture or our education right now.

So, LaRouche has emphasized that the general understanding

of Einstein is false; it's wrong. Most people's images of who Einstein is as a person, his work to some degree, it's just not true. And we've got to clean that up in order to make a case about what his approach was to the Universe, to mankind, to life; and how that was important, it made it possible for him to make the scientific breakthroughs that he did. But he was a whole person; he was an entire human being, including the role of his violin – something that LaRouche has referred to a number of times.

So today, I want to go through a few things – somewhat briefly. We're going to have a "New Paradigm for Mankind" Wednesday show this coming week on Wednesday after a hiatus of some period. So, we'll be able to get into this in a bit more detail then, but I want to take up three things. First is briefly, some thoughts from Einstein; quotes from Einstein. How did he think about things beyond his scientific work also. Second, I want to talk about his most famous discovery – relativity; and what that implies. And then third, talk about quantum mechanics as an example of Einstein's courage against popular opinion; which is something that he had from a very young age. Then we'll see how that plays into these other concepts.

When he was 67, Einstein was asked to write down a sort of an autobiography; which he felt was like writing an obituary before he had passed. He was a nice guy, so he still did it. I'm going to read some quotes from this; it's called his "Autobiographical Notes". He starts off very early; he says, "Even when I was a fairly precocious young man, the nothingness of the hopes and strivings which chases most people restlessly through life, came to my consciousness with considerable

vitality. Moreover, I soon discovered the cruelty of that chase;

which in those years was much more carefully covered up by hypocrisy and glittering words than is the case today." So, the

vain chase for success, this isn't a real identity. He says, "It

was possible to satisfy the stomach by such participation, but not a human being insofar as he is a thinking and feeling being.

Thus, I came – despite the fact that I was the son of entirely irreligious Jewish parents – to a deep religiosity; which, however, found an abrupt ending at the age of 12. Through the reading of popular scientific books, I soon reached the conviction that much of the stories in the Bible could not be true. The consequence was a positively fanatical free thinking,

coupled with the impression that youth is intentionally being deceived by the state through lies. It was a crushing impression. Suspicion of every kind of authority grew out of this experience. A skeptical attitude towards the convictions which were alive in any specific social environment; an attitude

which has never left me." It's not some popular opinion.

He wrote that, "The contemplation of the huge world, the

vast riddle of the Universe around us," this to him was the proper goal of life. And that by considering it, you could be really liberated from things that are merely personal or insignificant. He wrote: "Similarly motivated thinkers of the present and the past, as well as the insights which they had achieved, were friends that could not be lost. The road to this

paradise of knowledge was not as comfortable and alluring as the

road to the religious paradise; but it has proved itself as trustworthy, and I have never regretted having chosen it."

In his thinking process, Einstein – who was a musician with a deep love of Mozart in particular – didn't believe that thinking required words. He wrote: "For me, it is not dubious that our thinking goes on for the most part without the use of signs or words. And beyond that, to a considerable degree, it takes place unconsciously." He writes that "Through our experiences as we understand conflicts between our thought of how the world works and experiences which counter that, we develop a sense of wonder," which he says is the key to the development of new thoughts. So, how can that be developed? How can that be fostered? Well, he complained about the school in his day; he said there was too much testing and not enough freedom or actual thought for the students. I can hardly imagine what he would say about schools now. He wrote then that "It is, in fact, nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry. For this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom. It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and of searching can be promoted by means of coercion and a sense of duty."

On the kinds of thoughts that make true discoveries, he said that there are two requirements for such a theory. One, it can't be contradicted by observations; and second, he said it has to have an inner perfection. About that, he wrote – sounding very

much like Johannes Kepler, the first modern astronomer – Einstein wrote: "We prize a value more highly if it is not the result of an arbitrary choice among theories which – among themselves – are of equal value and analogously constructed." That is, to be right, an idea also has to be necessary; not just in keeping with observations.

In his life, he was a courageous man; he stood up against World War I; even when many great scientists like Max Planck had written a letter supporting the war, supporting Germany's cause in it. Einstein didn't; he wrote a letter opposing it, and even got Max Planck to rescind his support for the war. He stood up against racism in the US in many famous cases such as Marian Anderson, who when she went to perform in Princeton, wasn't able to actually spend the night anywhere; she was turned away by hotels. So, she stayed at Albert Einstein's house, which is where she'd stay whenever she visited that town. And his opposition to the FBI and the thought policing it was doing. When he was coming to the US, they had a list of questions for him; they wanted to do an interview, find out what kind of thoughts Einstein had. He said, I'm not going to answer these.

If this is the condition for coming to the US, I'm not going to come; forget it. They gave in. So, I'll let those brief words from Einstein stand for themselves.

Let's take a look at the second part, which is a few thoughts about his famous discovery of relativity. As far as the

context for this, ever since the general hegemony of Newton's outlook – which didn't have to happen, but it did – according to Newton, when we make observations, when we do science, things take place in a space that is indifferent to those things; it's just there. It existed before anything was in the Universe. According to Newton, space existed before God created everything; it was just the primordial space. Newton also believed that there was a time; a single time, a universal time that flowed on of its own accord, had no particular characteristics and was not dependent on or related to anything that actually took place over time. So, according to Newton, there was an absolute space, an absolute time; and objects in that space at various times. Now, this had already been shown to be wrong by Gottfried Leibniz, who in a debate with Newton, demonstrated that requiring an absolute space and then saying that God created everything somewhere in that space, as opposed to somewhere else; would be a decision without any good reason. And that God couldn't do something like that; everything in the Universe had a reason for it, and that therefore there couldn't have been this space in the first place. Newton used the same example to say that shows you how powerful God is, because He could do whatever He felt like. So, He put the Universe somewhere. Anyway, Leibniz had already shown that this Newtonian idea was wrong; but Newton gained hegemony.

So,

it has the result that people think of facts, of things taking place in locations at certain times. But Einstein showed that this actually isn't true; that there is no time that any event takes place. That the time an event occurs, depends on who is looking at it. Not in the way of uncertainties or anything like

that; but the time itself doesn't exist as one thing that's independent of who's doing the looking, or of their location. What he did was, he created a new concept that resolved the contradiction between two concepts that were actually mutually contradictory. So, these two concepts were, first off, relativity; which existed before Einstein as a concept or equivalence. Leibniz believed this, for example; which was that

no matter where you are, or how you're moving – any of those kinds of particular conditions – mind is universal. Mind is everywhere; mind is everywhere in the Universe; mind doesn't have

a speed or motion or anything like that. Concepts that govern how the Universe unfolds – true physical principles – are independent of how you look at any particular fact or observation

that's occurring. So, you can't change mind by moving something

physically – more on that in a minute.

The second concept was that the speed of light is the same

for any observer; and that's not something that was immediately

apparent. This was definitely debated. To contrast that, imagine that you're driving on a road and there's a car next to

you that's moving at a similar speed. To you, it looks like the

car isn't really moving; to a pedestrian, the car is moving at whatever speed you're driving. Light is different than a car

moving, where you can catch up with its speed and make it look like it's still. For light, no matter how you're moving, light beams to you all appear to move at the speed of light. So, you can't put those two concepts together; you can't have relativity and a constant speed of light if you have one time and one space. Instead, what Einstein said was that the time between events or the distance between locations can actually differ based on how you're looking at them. So that simply being in motion – it's not perceptible except at very high speeds – but simply being in motion changes the lengths of everything around you, the time between events that take place.

I'll just briefly outline one example of this – we can get into it with some pictures and things on Wednesday. He shows a lot of examples of thought experiments using trains moving through train stations or embankments. He gives one example which is, let's say that as a train is moving, someone on the ground sees flashes of lightning hit both sides of the train at the same time. For them to say "at the same time", what it means is if you're standing in the middle, the light from both of those flashes reaches you at the same time. You say, "I'm in the middle between these two points, therefore they must have happened at the same time and then it took the light a little bit of time for me to see it." But you'd also recognize that if someone on the train was to see those same two lightning

bolts,
which to you occur simultaneously, as the train is moving this way and you picture light moving at a constant speed from your viewpoint, the light that was at the front of the train is going
to be observed first by somebody standing in the middle of the train. Someone on that train would say that those lightning flashes didn't occur at the same time; that one preceded the other. What that means is that there's no simultaneity; there's
no ability to say anything took place at a certain time. Time now depends on who's looking at it. If there's no simultaneity,
then there's nothing instant that can take place in the Universe;
because there's no instant for anything to occur instantly in. So, for example, gravitational pull can't occur instantly; there
can't be an instant action at a distance. In fact, nothing, no
effect could go faster than light; including gravitational changes. It meant a couple of things. One is that you can't separate space and time; but the other thing is that it makes you
really have to reconsider what makes up reality. The idea that
objects at places in times are facts; that's not reality. The thing that's most real is the principles that you're able to discover that don't change based on how you look at them, or how
you're moving. Something like the way that light moves – that's
a physical principle; no matter how you look at it, it's the same
thing. It's a principle. A distance between two things? That's
not a principle; that's not invariant. That can change,

depending on how you look at it. So that the naïve sense that we get of the world around us, of our very concept of space, is just not right. Even though it seems totally intuitive and very popular, you have to force a different kind of understanding.

Now, there's a lot more to relativity than that, that's just a component of it. But it's undergone many, many tests over the decades. Things like starlight being deflected as it passes around the Sun; atomic clocks going in airplanes and rockets; light made by stars being a different color by virtue of their gravitation. Gravity waves, recently discovered somewhat directly by the SLIGO experiment, but a paper written about them in the '70s; having discovered indirect evidence for them from a pulsar. So, his thoughts have definitely stood the test of time on this. Nothing shows that he was wrong. So that says something about how we think about the world.

Just to say something about Einstein's courage, on the third topic is the quantum world. In 1900, Einstein later colleague, Max Planck had made a discovery that he was able to explain the kind of light that hot bodies emit. Something that's hot and glowing like the filament in a light bulb; Planck was able to explain that based on an hypothesis that the way light was emitted from and absorbed by that hot body took place in pieces. That the light energy had to interact with that body in individually in quanta, the plural of quantum. A few years later, in Einstein's so-called "miracle year" of 1905, he generalized this and said that's just how light is; it comes

in pieces. Light is not purely a wave; light is also somewhat of a particle. The field developed, and one of the things that came out of it that Einstein had realized, was a phenomenon called entanglement. To say it very briefly, it's the characteristic where you're able to make two particles, say two photons that have characteristics that are shared. In the case of photons, they have opposite polarizations. Or maybe you can make two electrons that have opposite spins. After you make them, here's the thought experiment Einstein would say. Let's say you make two of them; you don't look at them, and they go to very different places. One's in Tokyo and one's in New York. According to the theory, once you measure one in Tokyo and you get some sort of number for whatever its spin is; the one in New York automatically has the opposite spin. So Einstein said, does this mean that measuring something in New York changed something in Tokyo, or vice versa? Could it have an instant effect somehow? How did it change the other particle that's so far away from it? Nothing can occur instantly anyway, because there are no instants. What's going on?

What it came to was a debate over decades, that was unresolved. Einstein believed that the way work in this field was going, was that people were giving up on reality; that they were saying that all we really ever know is an observation. That the world doesn't exist in a certain state independent of our measuring it. Not just because our measurements affect things

—

especially when they're very small; but that even God himself, so to speak, doesn't really know the state of say an atom. It simply doesn't have one; all that is really real is when you observe it later. So, Einstein made a lot of polemics against this, a lot of pedagogies about it, a lot of demonstrations; and although there have been experiments since the decades after his life that shed new light on it, I think the key thing to take from that is that Einstein recognized that there was something a bit unsettling about the way science was going. That people were willing to give up on the idea that things occurred for a reason. To Einstein, that was throwing away reality; bidding farewell to the idea that there is a real world. Some of his thoughts on that, you might have heard him say he'd like to think that the Moon is still there even when he doesn't look at it. But I think the thing to take from that is his courage; even when almost everyone was against him, he stuck to his guns on that.

So, in terms of concluding on that, or drawing a reflection from it, it's a constantly under-appreciated miracle that our minds are able to understand the Universe in a way that gives us power over it. That unlike a koala bear or a grasshopper, that are unable to use their understanding of nature to change their relationship to it to transform their species, we're able to do that. There's something coherent between the way our minds piece

together and understand the world around us through our thoughts,
through our concepts. There is a harmony between those concepts
and the way the Universe actually operates that gives us access
to act on those principles to bring about new states of existence;
and is the basis of economics. So, I think that in addition to a radical transformation and improvement in culture
that's needed, people like to think that they've got a lot of scientific knowledge these days; because you own a smart phone and you think you know something about science. Or you say that
everybody knows there's global warming and only anti-scientific
people disagree with that. That's not a basis of knowing anything; and there's a lot of room for a dramatic improvement.

A real renaissance of taking Einstein's identity as an example and really developing a fresh and powerful view of science to solve many of the problems that we're confronted with right now,
that without a different approach, might never be solved.

So, that's a very inadequate beginning about Einstein; but
it's a job for all of us to do. To figure out who is this man;
what can we learn from his approach? I think we'll be hearing more from LaRouche and his thoughts on how he views his importance as an individual for us today.

ROGERS: I think that's very important. What I think is important to go back to in terms of LaRouche's role and what he
said in the presentation that we showed earlier. And going to the understanding of what is actually happening with the role

that Russia, under President Putin, and the role that President

Xi Jinping is playing in relationship to what Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche had set into motion several decades ago with the development of the Productive Triangle, of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the Silk Road Development Plan. This coming into motion now, and at that very time, during that presentation that

we saw in the beginning of this program, made the point that these nations would be brought together in collaboration and form

a coalition of nations representing nations such as Iran, China,

Russia, India, and so forth, to put an end – once and for all –

to the British Empire. And the intentions of the British Empire

to destroy this very conception of what is the truly human identity; the identity of the creative human process. I think it's very important to look at that from the standpoint of the presentation you just gave, Jason. Because that's what missing.

What we're talking about is not a political fight from the

standpoint of how do you bring down one political candidate over

the other; but how do you destroy a system, particularly the British Empire, in all of its facets and what it represents, that

denies this creative human process. Right now, what we're looking at from the United States is that as the rest of these nations are moving in the direction of creating a New Paradigm for mankind, moving with the Silk Road economic development plan;

where is the United States right now? The United States is continuing to go along with the evils and destructive policies of

the British Empire. This has been the case for decades now; this has been the case under the murderous, insane agenda of President

Obama, who should have been removed a long time ago. Or the policies of the Bush administration, and the lies and the cover-up. Now, we have an opportunity. What we're discussing here is not just some nice scientific ideas, and let's look at Einstein and people think they have their different conceptions and understanding and "Oh, I studied this in elementary school."

No; the idea is, what has been taken away from society? Why have we allowed an Empire to dominate our existence and our nation and culture for far too long?

So, I think it is the case that in 1997, when Mr. LaRouche made the point that what we're dealing with is nations have to come together to bring about that truly human identity to destroy this empire once and for all; that's what we're going to use Einstein to do. I'll just make that point.

STEGER: Just to add, because I think it's worth considering; there are so many developments that we're on the verge of. This coming six weeks have such a dramatic nature that we've already seen a certain sense of in terms of a consolidated effort to end this British Empire system; the very key emphasis Lyn took up in 1997. That there is now an orientation to resolve the question of the Balkans, the Caucuses, Kashmir, the South China Sea; even North Korea are essentially on the agenda of

these major nations. To end the potential of world war, and to really consolidate a new economic system. So, it is kind of striking that Lyn's emphasis is, as Matt you raised, on Einstein.

Why the emphasis now? But it's clearly because in the minds of

this collaborative effort among these nations and among any patriotic Americans, as we see in the performances we're developing in New York around the 9/11 anniversary, the question

has to be the long-term development of mankind. Not one's children, not one generation ahead, but the actual ongoing development that now is possible to embark upon as a human species on this planet. And I think Einstein craved and desired

no less. His discoveries and passion unleashed that kind of potential, which he probably saw as a young man himself, and that

quality. It's not just simply a liberal emotion; it is of a scientific endeavor which Einstein really captured. I think Lyn's comments then and today also do as well.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's with a full amount of confidence

that we can move forward and understand that the epic era-changing kinds of developments that are occurring around us

right now, are things that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have been in the

middle of for decades, literally. They've had their fingers on

the pulse of history right up to this point. Helga LaRouche pointed out yesterday that the speech that she gave at the Rasina

Dialogue in India just a couple of months ago, seems like it's exactly what is now being undertaken by the Indian government

in terms of their collaboration with China and Russia to project the Silk Road into the Middle East to resolve this terrible crisis that exists there. And Mr. LaRouche's continuing role in terms of the intellectual sounding board around which the rest of history is continuing to move. It's with confidence that we can look back at that speech and everything else that is on the record in terms of their role. It's an identity which we need to maintain within ourselves and those who are collaborating with us, that yes, your finger is on the pulse of history; the imagination of what the future can become is what is continuing to shape the actions in the present. And it's a moment of decision; it's the {punctum saliens} moment in terms of which direction does mankind go right now. We have a rich potential, and I think it's extremely clear; but it's also extremely dangerous.

I'd really like to thank Jason for giving a little bit of a foretaste of what's going to be elaborated much more, I'm sure, on the show next Wednesday. That's going to be broadcast, and we would ask you to tune in to that. I also want to encourage people to continue to participate in the process of inundating Manhattan with this new publication, {The Hamiltonian}. This is issue 2, and it continues to be the center of our intervention into shaping the United States and answering the question that Kesha asked: Why is the United States not yet a part of this emerging dynamic on the planet? What must be done to cause that

to occur?

So, I'd like to thank all of you for tuning in; and encourage you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com. And we'll see you next week.

En orientering mod Stillehavsområdet: Det Eurasiske System. Video

Alt imens de asiatiske Stillehavsnationer har brug for den videnskabelige viden, teknologi og fordele ved vores form for regering, såsom et statsligt kreditsystem efter Alexander Hamiltons principper, så står det klart, at, med hensyn til inspiration, så må vi nu se hen til Stillehavsområdet.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

Video, 5 minutter:

Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

Den 28. juli 2016, v/næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

»Jeg inviterer dig til at lære Schiller Instituttet at kende og til at kontakte os.

Verden er i en dyb krise, en civilisationskrise. Det er en brydningstid. Det kan blive meget værre, med et fuldt finanssammenbrud, måske sat i gang af de italienske banker, som er i krise, eller sågar af Deutsche Bank, som står øverst på listen over de store, systemiske krisebanker, og som teknisk set faktisk er bankerot.

Det kan også være krig med Rusland og Kina, ført af dem, som gerne vil forhindre, at disse nationer fører an i skabelsen af en alternativ økonomisk politik.

Vi oplever efterdønningerne efter Brexit-afstemningen i Storbritannien, og det har rystet hele EU. Men det giver os nogle muligheder. En ting, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Lyndon LaRouche har krævet, er en redningsplan for Deutsche Bank, men på betingelse af, at Deutsche Bank vender tilbage til den ånd, der var, da Alfred Herrhausen var chef i 1989, hvor han havde en produktionsbaseret politik for banken, og hvor han kom ud med et krav for gældssanering for de fattigste lande og for udvikling af Østeuropa. Dengang var Berlinmuren endnu ikke faldet.

Vi kan takke ja til samarbejde i stedet for krig med Rusland og Kina, om at bygge en Ny Silkevej hele vejen fra Asien til Europa. Vi kan udvide det til at blive en Verdenslandbro, en bro over land, gennem Sydvestasien og hele vejen ned til Afrika. Vi kan følge den tråd, der for nylig er kommet frem, med Saudi-Arabiens rolle bag angrebene den 11. september 2001, og følge denne tråd helt til det nuværende Britiske Imperiums

fraktions rolle bag terrorisme; og så kan vi takke ja til samarbejde med Rusland om at bekæmpe terrorisme.«

Præcisering: Chefen for Deutsch Bank, Alfred Herhausen, blev dræbt af terrorister den 30. november 1989. Berlinmuren faldt den 9. november 1989. Hvis han, som var en ledende rådgiver til den tyske kansler Helmut Kohl, havde levet, ville verden have set anderledes ud.

Denne video blev lavet i forbindelse med omdeling af Schiller Instituttets materiale i jyske og fynske byer.

Kontakter i Jylland:

Kolding: Preben Samsøe, 4146 4714

Aarhus: Hans Schultz, 4841 4096; 6016 4096

Randers: Poul Gundersen, 2082 0350

Her er nogle vigtige links:

NYHEDSORIENTERING JULI 2016: Sidste chance for at stoppe europæisk bankkrak og krig

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

Hovedtale på Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Berlin, 25. – 26. juni, 2016

Baggrundsmateriale:

Lyndon LaRouches 3-punktsprogram for genopbygning af realøkonomien:

1. Hvorfor en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling ville løse finanskrisen og ødelægge Wall Street
2. Hvordan man skaber ikke-inflationære kreditter gennem et

nationalt kreditsystem

3. Infrastrukturprojekter og fusionsøkonomi

»Med Verdenslandbroen vil alle have et job.« Lyndon LaRouche

Det følgende videoklip er et meget kort uddrag af en tale, som hr. LaRouche holdt ved et forum i Washington i 1997 i sammenhæng med *EIR's førsteudgave* af specialrapporten om den Eurasiske Landbro. Denne præsentation var en del af en række af såkaldte »udviklingskonferencer«, der blev afholdt i Washington i løbet af disse år – 1996, 1997 og 1998 – og jeg vil mene, at det, I får at se i denne video, er Lyndon LaRouches »marchordre«. Det var på en måde hans kreative vision om, hvilken rolle, som Kina, med den Nye Silkevej, og ligeledes hvilken rolle Rusland ville komme til at spille i den totale omformning af den strategiske geometri i verden.

Her følger det korte uddrag:

Lyndon Larouche: Der er kun to respektable nationer tilbage på planeten, dvs. nationer med en respektabel magt: det er USA, nærmere bestemt ikke det USA, der repræsenteres af Kongressen, men af præsidenten. Det er USA's identitet, der udgør en politisk magt, ikke en eller anden sammenkædning af dens bestanddele. USA repræsenteres i dag udelukkende af dets

præsident, som en politisk institution. Kongressen repræsenterer ikke USA; de er ikke helt sikre på, hvem, de repræsenterer nu om stunder, eftersom de ikke har besøgt deres vælgere for nylig.

Præsidenten som institution er legemliggørelsen af USA i internationale relationer. Det kan Udenrigsministeriet ikke gøre; Justitsministeriet kan ikke gøre det; intet andet ministerium kan gøre det; kun USA's præsident kan, under vores forfatning, repræsentere USA som en enhed – hele dets personlighed, dets sande interesse, dets hele folk.

Der findes kun én anden magt på denne planet, der kan være ligeså respektløs (arrogant) over for andre magter, og det er Den kinesiske Folkerepublik. Kina er i øjeblikket engageret i et stort projekt for konstruktion af infrastruktur, i hvilket min hustru og andre i en årrække har haft et uophørligt engagement. Der finder en stor reform sted i Kina, som er en »reform af vanskeligheder«. De forsøger at løse et problem. Det betyder ikke, at der ikke er et problem. Men de forsøger at løse det.

Hvis derfor USA, eller USA's præsident(skab), og Kina, deltager i at begunstige *dette* projekt, der undertiden kaldes Silkevejsprojektet, undertiden Landbro-projektet, som, hvis dette projekt med udviklingskorridorer over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika, ind i Nordamerika, udvides, så er dette projekt tilstrækkeligt til at sætte hele denne planet på en kurs for økonomisk genrejsning. Jeg vil gå lidt i detaljer med dette for at gøre det mere konkret.

Kina har i nogen tid haft et samarbejde med Irans regering. Iran har faktisk været i gang med at fuldføre en række jernbaneforbindelser, der er en forlængelse af Kinas Landbro-program (eller Silkevejsprojekt). For nylig har vi fra Indien set, at det indiske lederskab er mødtes med repræsentanter for Kina for at påbegynde en indledningsvis rute, blandt landruterne, under Landbro-programmet. Én rute går ind i

Kunming i Kina. Under Anden Verdenskrig, i dette område, Myitkyina (Burma/Myanmar), havde vi fly, der fløj ind i Kunming, »over Knolden«, som de plejede at sige dengang. Jeg er ganske godt bekendt med dette område.

Men, hvis man har vandvejsforbindelser, kanalforbindelser, og jernbaneforbindelser fra Kunming gennem Myitkyina – dette område – tværs over Bangladesh og ind i Indien, igennem Pakistan og ind i Iran, op til området lige over Teheran, syd for det Kaspiske Hav – så har man en forbindelse til Mellemøsten; man har forbindelse til Centralasien; man har forbindelse til Tyrkiet; man har forbindelse igennem til Europa.

Dernæst er der den nordlige rute, der stort set er den samme rute som den transsibiriske Jernbane, der blev bygget under amerikansk indflydelse og amerikansk rådgivning, af Rusland. Så har man en mellemliggende rute, der er i færd med at blive udviklet, i Centralasien, med Kina og Iran.

Indien arbejder på en plan, der blot involverer at tilføje nogle få hundrede kilometer jernbanelinje – der var mange andre forbedringer langs med den lige linje – og som ville forbinde området nord for Teheran, gennem Pakistan, gennem Indien, gennem Bangladesh, gennem Myanmar og ind i Kunming, ind i Thailand, ind i Vietnam, ned gennem Malaysia og Singapore, over stræderne via en stor bro og ind i Indonesien.

Der er ligeledes en plan for udviklingen af jernbanelinjen gennem det, der var det nordlige Sibirien, over Beringstrædet og ind i Alaska, og herfra ned og ind i USA. Der er en forbindelse til Mellemøsten – flere forbindelser – fra Europa, og også fra Kina; men fra Kina en forbindelse til Mellemøsten og ind i Egypten, ind i hele Afrika.

Så hvad vi har her er en række projekter, som ikke blot er transportprojekter, ligesom den transkontinentale jernbane i USA, der var forløberen for denne idé tilbage i slutningen af

1860'erne og 1870'erne. Man har »udviklingskorridorer«, hvor man i et område, der strækker sig 50-70 kilometer på hver side af jernbaneforbindelsen, har olie- og gasledninger, og så fremdeles. Man udvikler dette område med industri, minedrift, alle sådanne ting. Og det er sådan, man *betaler* for transportforbindelsen, pga. al den rige, økonomiske aktivitet, der skabes. Med en indbyrdes afstand på nogle kilometer langs hele denne forbindelse foregår der noget, en eller anden økonomisk aktivitet. Folk, der arbejder, folk, der bygger ting, folk, der gør ting. For at transformere denne planet ved hjælp af store projekter for byggeri af infrastruktur, som vil skabe store industrier, nye industrier, nyt landbrug og de andre ting, vi har så desperat brug for. *Der er ingen som helst grund til, at noget menneske på denne planet, der kan arbejde, skulle være arbejdsløs.* Så enkelt er det. Og dette projekt er midlet til dette mål.

Hvis nationerne – som nu omfatter Rusland, Iran, Indien og andre nationer – kommer overens med Kina, og engagerer sig i en forpligtelse til dette projekt, som de bygger hver dag; hvis USA – dvs. USA's præsident, Clinton – forsætter med at støtte denne indsats, som han har gjort, i det mindste rent politik, hvad får man så? Man får USA og Kina og nogle andre lande, der går i samlet flok op imod den største magt på denne planet, som er Det britiske Imperium, kaldet det Britiske Commonwealth (statssamfund). Det er fjenden!

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Resultatet vil så være, at en sådan meddelelse en skønne søndag morgen med sikkerhed vil få »snakkehovederne« på Washington Tv til at 'spinne'. Men bortset fra det, så betyder det, at hele systemet, fra dette øjeblik, har været en tur i guillotinen, og at hovedet ruller hen ad gaden. Alan Greenspans hoved, måske.

Det betyder, at vi nu har tilskyndelsen til omgående at opbygge et nyt finansielt og monetært system. Når man skal genrejse et selskab, der er bankerot, til en levedygtig form, hvad gør man så? Man må finde de erhvervsaktiviteter, som selskabet skal gøre, hvilket danner grundlaget for at skabe den nye kredit, der skal få firmaet til at køre igen.

Programmet for Landbroen, med sine globale implikationer, er det store projekt, der direkte og indirekte vil afkaste tilstrækkelig med aktivitet, så at sige, i alle dele af verden til, at vi atter kan få denne verden tilbage på et sundt fundament.

Matthew Ogden: Som man kan høre, så afslører denne tale stor forudviden; og det er i realiteten Lyndon LaRouches aktive indgriben, med rejser til Rusland, med hans hustrus rejser til Kina i denne periode, og med udgivelsen af *EIR's* specialrapport om den Eurasiske Landbro, der har formet den nuværende situation, vi befinder os i. En ting, der er interessant at fremhæve, er de kort, I så. Dengang var mange af disse jernbanelinjer og andre olie/gasledninger blot forslag; men nu er flere af dem faktisk under opførelse.

Jeg mener, at det, 20 år senere, står klart, at dette er det dominerende system, der er ved at vokse frem på denne planet. Samtidig står det transatlantiske system foran en umiddelbar nedsmeltning. En umiddelbart forestående implosion af gæld og eksponering til derivater i betalingsstandsning til milliarder af dollars projiceres nu ind i alle storbanker i hele det transatlantiske system.

For et engelsk udskrift af hele fredags-webcastet, se <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14279>

Europa er ude af trit med tidsånden: Den nye Silkevej viser vejen! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Tyskland og de andre europæiske nationer må omorganisere deres rådne finans- og banksystem og derefter, med perspektiverne for den Nye Silkevej, samarbejde om at opbygge verden. For at dette kan lykkes, må vi alle se ud over vores egen, europæiske næsetip og ærligt med hinanden diskutere spørgsmålet om, hvorfor vi er havnet i denne krise, og åbne os for den vision, der ligger i samarbejdet med Den nye Silkevej.

I Friedrich Schillers ånd: Alle kan bidrage med noget!

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Når mennesket konfronteres med et stort onde, findes der en evne i det, som kalder et endnu større gode frem

– Leibniz

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: »Jeg mener, at vi må mobilisere befolkningen til at blive aktiv; for tiden er ikke til at sidde på stakittet og blot kigge på, hvad disse såkaldte 'eliter' foretager sig ... befolkningerne har mistet tilliden til disse eliter, der repræsenterer dette globaliseringssystem. Ansvar for at finde løsninger på situationen må derfor gå over til dem, der har ideer om, hvordan vi kommer ud af situationen. Hvilket er, hvad vi gør i New York med Manhattan-projektet; det, som det Internationale Schiller Institut gør; men jeg mener, at vi har brug for jeres støtte – I, som ser dette lige nu. Jeg vil gerne appellere til jer om at blive aktive sammen med os og være med til at gennemføre disse løsninger.«

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Kina: »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdens-Silkevejen«

For at give håb om en bedre fremtid for hele menneskeheden, et håb, der er gået tabt i mange dele af verden, må G20-topmødet fremkomme med en vision, der kan tilbyde en løsning, en vej til at overvinde de nævnte kriser, og en etablering af et højere niveau af fornuft for at realisere menneskehedens fælles mål.

4. august, 2016 (Leder) – Følgende tale blev holdt af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger og forkvinde for Schiller Instituttet, den 29. juli ved »Tænk 20 Forum« i Beijing. Forummet var arrangeret af tre kinesiske tænketanke: Instituttet for Verdensøkonomi og Verdenspolitik (IWEP) ved det Kinesiske Akademi for Samfundsvidenskaber (CASS), Shanghai Instituttet for Internationale Studier (SIIS) og Chongyang Instituttet for Finansielle Studier ved Kinas Renmin Universitet (RCDY), med deltagelse af 500 eksperter fra tænketanke og politikere og repræsentanter for internationale organisationer fra 25 lande, med det formål at formulere forslag til statsoverhoveder og regeringsledere i G20-medlemslandene. Fr. Zepp-LaRouche talte på det første panel under den to dage lange konference, dedikeret til »Global Ledelse: Systemforbedring og opbygning af Kapacitet«.

Eftersom G20 repræsenterer den mest magtfulde kombination af industrilande og fremvoksende lande på planeten, er der i øjeblikket ingen anden organisation, der kan adressere de eksistentielle udfordringer, som civilisationen står overfor, og i tide gennemføre løsninger på disse. De fleste landes befolkninger har den meget reelle oplevelse af at være opslugt af frygtindgydende kriser – en international terroristtrussel, der er ude af kontrol, en folkevandring af millioner af mennesker, der prøver på at undslippe krig, sult og død; den resulterende flygtningekrise, der ryster EU i sit fundament; fremgang for anti-etablissement-partier i mange lande: Brexit, som et advarselsskud for den potentielle disintegration af EU;

det voksende gab mellem de rige og de stadig flere lag af samfundet, der har mistet deres velfortjente status som middelklasse, eller som lever i fattigdom; oplevelsen af virkningerne af »uortodokse monetære foranstaltninger« på livsopsparinger og forventninger til fremtiden; grænserne for samfundets acceptabilitet af bailout og bail-in; samt den voksende frygt for, at verden nu er gået ind i en ny kold krig og en atomoprustnings-spiral. Kort sagt, et voksende tab af tillid til etablissementet, i det mindste i den transatlantiske sektor.

Hvis det forestående G20-topmøde afviser at anerkende denne situation; hvis man forsøger at skjule den fremherskende politiks fiasko, i særdeleshed siden 2008, bag retorikken i den offentlige propaganda; samt hvis man ikke bruger det forestående topmøde som en anledning til at fremlægge reelle løsninger på disse kriser, vil det ikke få nogen indvirkning i en virtuel reality, men det vil derimod få en indvirkning på det reelle historiske forløb og milliarder af menneskers liv og lykke.

Umiddelbare løsninger er forhånden, men de kræver, at de ledende institutioner er villige til at revidere den nuværende politiks aksiomer og vende tilbage til en politik, der ikke alene har vist sig at være effektive i tidligere situationer, men som også repræsenterer et nyt paradigme, der kan udgøre grundlaget for den menneskelige art i de næste hundrede år, og længere.

For at give håb om en bedre fremtid for hele menneskeheden, et håb, der er gået tabt i mange dele af verden, må G20-topmødet fremkomme med en vision, der kan tilbyde en løsning, en vej til at overvinde de nævnte kriser, og en etablering af et højere niveau af fornuft for at realisere menneskehedens fælles mål.

1. Det eneste »praktiske« udtryk for denne vision – og dette er ikke en selvmodsigelse – perspektivet for den Nye Silkevej, som den kinesiske regering nu i tre år har fremlagt og ført ud i livet. Foreløbig deltager over 70 lande i forskellige aspekter af dette program, samt i programmets infrastruktur- og udviklingsprojekter. Det, som Kina kalder for et »win-win« -

samarbejde om sådanne fællesprojekter er ikke alene den eneste effektive måde, på hvilken geopolitiske konfrontationer kan overvindes, der har været roden til to verdenskrige i det 20. århundrede, og ligeledes den underliggende fare for en tredje global krig i dag, som, givet eksistensen af kernevåben, ville blive en tilintetgørelseskrig. »Win-win«-perspektivet er også i overensstemmelse med principperne for den Westfalske Fred, ifølge hvilken enhver succesfuld fredsorden må baseres på »den anden parts interesse«. Konceptet for den Nye Silkevej må derfor udstrækkes til alle verdens områder, som en »Verdens-Silkevej«, som et konkret tilbud om at overvinde underudvikling. Hvis G20-medlemmerne ville afgive et sådant løfte, med en højtidelig forpligtelse til at overvinde sult og fattigdom og tilvejebringe rent vand til alle inden for få år, hvilket rent teknologisk kan gennemføres – så ville det skabe en revolution af håb og optimisme i verden.

2. For at eliminere både årsagerne til massemigrationen fra Sydvestasien og Afrika og grobunden for rekruttering af terrorister, må der i begge disse områder iværksættes en omfattende industriel udvikling, som ikke blot genopbygger de krigshærgede områder, men som også fremlægger en integreret plan for infrastruktur, industri, landbrug og uddannelse, for at transformere disse dele af verden til at blive områder med høj produktivitet af arbejdskraft og fremstillingskapaciteter. Generelt må Verdens-Silkevejens projekter defineres således, at de får optimal indvirkning på befolkningens kognitive evner i de respektive lande, for derved at muliggøre den bedst mulige forøgelse af verdensøkonomiens produktivitet. Fokus må derfor ikke alene ligge på innovation, men på kvalitative gennembrud i forståelsen af kvalitative, nye fysiske principper i vort univers. Eksempler herpå er forcerede programmer for udvikling af termionuklear fusionskraft, der vil tilvejebringe forsyningssikkerhed for energi og råmaterialesikkerhed for menneskeheden, såvel som også udvikling af nye vandressourcer gennem den fredelige udnyttelse af kernekraft til afsaltning af store mængder havvand, ionisering af fugtighed i atmosfæren og andre former for innovativ teknologi. Internationalt samarbejde

om rummet, mht. forskning, rumfart og kolonisering, definerer vejen for de kommende, nødvendige gennembrud inden for videnskab og teknologi. Det repræsenterer også en fremtidsorienterede platform for en fredsorden for det 21. århundrede. Og vigtigst af alt, så markerer det transformationen af den menneskelige art hen imod en større bevidsthed om dets egen identitet som den eneste, hidtil kendte, kreative art i universet.

3. Et ukontrolleret kollaps af den transatlantiske sektors finansielle system ville true med at kaste store dele af verden ud i kaos, med uforudsigelige konsekvenser. Den såkaldte »værktøjskasse« med finansielle instrumenter, som man besluttede at bruge efter krisen i 2008 fremfor at gennemføre reelle reformer, er nu opbrugt. De efterfølgende »uortodokse monetære instrumenter,« såsom kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), negative rentesatser, og 'helikopterpenge', har for en stor dels vedkommende produceret det modsatte af de ønskede virkninger. Den kendsgerning, at genindførelsen af Franklin D. Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingslov er blevet vedtaget i både det Demokratiske og Republikanske partis valgplatform i USA, samt den kendsgerning, at der er en voksende diskussion i flere europæiske lande om at reducere de fremtidige risici i det finansielle system ved at indføre Glass/Steagall-kriterier også i Europa, skaber en meget favorabel forudsætning for at indgå aftale om en global Glass/Steagall-lovgivning ved det kommende G20-topmøde. Hvis G20-topmødet sætter Verdens-Silkevejen på dagsordenen, ville den kinesiske drøm blive til en verdensdrøm.



USA: Borgmesterkonference fordømmer Obamas atomkrigsprovokationer

3. juli 2016 (Leder) – Den årlige borgmesterkonference i Indianapolis, USA, fra 24. – 27. juni, udstedte en sønderlemmende kritik af Obamaregeringen, som direkte angreb de massive NATO-øvelser, der nu finder sted på Ruslands grænser, Obamas 1 billion dollar store modernisering af atomvåben, det faktum, at han ikke har taget initiativ til at reducere atomvåbnene, hans krigsgale politik over for Rusland og Kina, og hans negligering af det drastiske kollaps, der kendetegner USA's basale infrastruktur og befolkningens almene vel. Det er værd at bemærke, at end ikke én eneste af de større amerikanske aviser så meget som har rapporteret om denne aktion.

Borgmesterkonferencen fandt sted samtidig med den historiske Schiller Institut-konference i Berlin, hvor Helga Zepp-Larouche indledte sin tale med at sige, at

vi oplever en systemisk og eksistentiel civilisationskrise, der er absolut uden fortilfælde. Vi har sammenfaldet af en fare for krig, hvor NATO konfronterer Rusland på en meget, meget aggressiv facon – hvilket kan føre til en tredje verdenskrig. Vi har en amerikansk konfrontation mod Kina i det Sydkinesiske Hav. Der er risikoen for en ny finanskrisen af samme type som i 2008, og som kan sprænge det finansielle system.

Borgmestrenes resolution erklærer dernæst, alt imens den kommer med en svag ros for Obamas besøg i Hiroshima og hans indgåelse af en aftale med Iran:

Samtidig har Obamaregeringen reduceret USA's lager af atomvåben mindre, end noget præsidentskab efter den Kolde

Krig, og den har lagt fundamentet til, at USA skal bruge en billion dollars hen over de næste tre årtier for at vedligeholde og modernisere sine atombomber og sprænghoveder, produktionsfabrikker, affyringssystemer og kommando og kontrol, og de øvrige atombevæbnede stater følger trop ... De atombevæbnede lande kommer stadigt nærmere til randen af en direkte militær konfrontation i konfliktzoner i hele verden, og det største NATO-krigsspil i årtier, der involverer 14.000 amerikanske tropper samt aktivering af amerikanske missilforsvarssystemer i Østeuropa, bærer ved til bålet af voksende spændinger mellem atombevæbnede giganter, og iflg. tidligere forsvarsminister William Perry: 'Sandsynligheden for en atomar katastrofe er større i dag, mener jeg, end den var under den Kolde Krig.'

Denne fare og dette enorme spild af ressourcer står i direkte kontrast til den kollapsende, amerikanske økonomi:

»Den stadigt mere forværrede infrastruktur udgør en fare for befolkningens sikkerhed og livskvalitet, og den voksende ulige fordeling af rigdom tvinger folk til at forlade Amerikas byer, og vore lokalsamfund har et desperat behov for statslig investering til opførelse af billige boliger, jobskabelse til lønninger, man kan leve af, forbedring af offentlig transport og udvikling af bæredygtige energikilder«. Resolutionen kræver en omfordeling af de midler, der bruges på atomoprustningen, for at »løse vore byers presserende behov og genopbygge vor nations smuldrende infrastruktur.«

Resolution fremkommer ikke med det krav (der turde være åbenlyst), at denne præsident omgående må fjernes for den beskrevne forbrydelse – dvs., for at skabe en umiddelbar eksistentiel trussel mod menneskeheden gennem atomkrig. I stedet kræver den, at »den næste præsident« må gribe til handling. Ikke desto mindre kræver den, at »der tages nye, diplomatiske initiativer, som en hastesag, for at nedbringe spændingerne med Rusland og Kina.«

Det, som mangler, er selvfølgelig løsningen, og heri ligger den afgørende forskel mellem Borgmesterkonferencen og Schiller Instituttets konference i Berlin. Zepp-LaRouche sagde til tilhørerne i Berlin:

Denne konference har ét emne, eller ét underliggende emne, og det er at definere løsninger på disse kriser: at diskutere, hvad det nye paradigme skal være, og hvorvidt menneskeslægten er i stand til at løse en sådan eksistentiel krise. Vi har fremtrædende talere fra fire kontinenter og fra mange lande, og dette er selvsagt mennesker, eller repræsentanter for mennesker, der er fast besluttet på, at en løsning skal findes.

Og næsten hver eneste af talerne talte vitterligt om, at det hastede med at gennemføre de løsninger, der længe har været knyttet til Lyndon og Helga LaRouche – nemlig reorganiseringen af det bankerotte, vestlige finansielle system gennem vedtagelse af en Glass/Steagall-lov i USA og Europa, samt udvidelsen af Kinas projekt for Den Nye Silkevej til at omfatte hele verden, et projekt, der vil gøre en ende på geopolitik til fordel for udviklingsprojekter, der imødekommer menneskehedens fælles mål.

Det mod, der udvistes på USA's Borgmesterkonference, en upartisk institution, der repræsenterer alle byer i USA med flere end 30.000 indbyggere, og hvor den igangværende trussel om en global atomkrig blev identificeret, pålægger alle amerikanere et endnu større ansvar – for at mobilisere disse borgmestre og deres vælgere til at gennemføre LaRouches program, før Obama kan trykke på knappen.

Foto: Præsident Barack Obama holder sin første, større tale, hvori han erklærer sit forpligtende engagement over for at søge at opnå fred og sikkerhed i en verden uden atomvåben, foran tusinder af tilhørere i Prag i den Tjekkiske Republik, 5. april 2009. [flickr/whitehouse]

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Menneskehedens skønne fremtid

–

**hvis vi undgår dinosaurernes
skæbne.**

**Hovedtale på Schiller
Institutts
internationale konference i
Berlin,
25. – 26. juni, 2016**

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

28. juni 2016 – I historiens løb har Aleppo været vidne til mange øjeblikke af storhed, så vel som også nedgang og urolige tider, men byen har altid igen rejst sig af asken, som Fugl Fønix. Det syriske folk og den syriske regering har holdt denne samme ånd i live, konfronteret med den værste krise i landets historie.

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

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

**Se også: En fredsplan for
Sydvestasien, af Helga Zepp-**

LaRouche. EIR-Pressemeddelelse i anledning af udgivelsen af den arabiske version af rapporten "Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen".

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

Barske ord; Hvem kan høre dem?

**(Lyndon LaRouche) –
Hovedtale ved konferencen i
San Francisco
(v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche)**

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det

9. juni 2016 (Leder) – I går lykkedes det næsten indgriben fra FBI at forhindre Lyndon LaRouches deltagelse via internet i en

stor konference i Nordcalifornien, arrangeret af hans medarbejdere. Hvis ikke lederskabet dér havde grebet ind i tide, ville LaRouche ikke have kunnet deltage.

Da LaRouche endelig kunne tale, var hans udgangspunkt den aktuelle, akutte trussel mod den menneskelige eksistens.

»Det væsentligste spørgsmål, jeg bekymrer mig om, er truslerne mod den menneskelige arts eksistens, i det totale område, lige nu. For, lige nu, på dette tidspunkt, står hele den menneskelige arts eksistens på den yderste rand, og vi må derfor være lydhøre over for at forstå, hvad det er for problemer, der er involveret i det her, og hvad det er for midler, der kan sikre en udvej for menneskeheden generelt.

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det.«

Men fra dette øjeblik og fremefter – lad os sige det ligeud – rev hovedindholdet i LaRouches bemærkninger slemt i nerverne på mange lyttere. Han blev ved med at komme tilbage til spørgsmålet om personlig identitet, men især spørgsmålet om hans egen personlige identitet. På et spørgsmål om, hvordan det individuelle sind overvinder forhindringer for at vinde en kamp for menneskeheden, svarede han:

»Lad mig sige, at jeg har temmelig gode levnedsegenskaber. Jeg er en aktiv person i samfundet, og jeg er en ældre person, og en erfaren, ældre person, en af de mest erfarne af alle personer i denne kategori. Så jeg tror ikke, nogen ville have nogen vanskeligheder med at forstå, hvem jeg er, hvad jeg er, hvor jeg kom fra og hvad jeg gør.

Andre personer holder måske fast ved en idé om en anden identitet hos en anden person, som jeg ikke kender, men sådan

synes det at være.«

LaRouche drejede næsten hvert spørgsmål rundt på denne måde. Dette her irriterer dig måske, men det første spørgsmål, du skal stille dig selv, er: er det sandt? Er det sådan, at »tingene bare sker«, eller er det sådan, at »tingene bringes til at ske« af mænd og kvinder, der, som LaRouche sagde, er »kvalificeret til at skabe historie?« Da MacArthur blev tvunget ud af Filippinerne den 12. marts 1942, var det da rigtigt af ham at sige, »Jeg vender tilbage«, eller burde han have ændret det til »vi vender tilbage«? Ville mennesket have klaret at komme til Månen i 1969 – eller nogensinde – hvis det ikke havde været for den enlige skikkelse, den første og største tyske rum pioner, Hermann Oberth (1894-1989). Oberth var fattig det meste af sit liv. Efter at have kæmpet for rumrejser i årtier, havde han næppe mødt en eneste person, der både var enig i, og forstod, disses betydning. Men det er takket være denne »næppe en eneste person«, såsom Werner von Braun, at vi fik den revolution, som var rumprogrammet.

På et spørgsmål om, hvordan vi kan afgøre, hvorvidt vore forestillinger er fantasteri eller er sandfærdige, svarede LaRouche:

»Hvorfor siger vi simpelthen ikke, lad os identificere et sandfærdigt eksempel, en sandfærdig identitet. Jeg er. Og enhver, der vil benægte dette, ville tage fejl, ville være tåbelig.

Jeg er kendt som, identificeret som en historisk skikkelse igennem det meste af det 20. århundrede, og de fleste mennesker fra det 20. århundrede bør vide, hvem jeg er, og de bør vide, hvad jeg gør. De kender måske ikke alle detaljer omkring, hvad jeg gør, men sådan er det: Jeg er en prominent, en særdeles prominent, skikkelse på denne planet, blandt de mest prominente.«

Den senere del af det 20. århundrede ville have været

uigenkendelig, hvis det ikke havde været for LaRouches sejr over det britiske, økonomiske system i en debat i 1971 på Queens College, New York, som dernæst, ad indirekte veje, førte til hans sejr med det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i Reaganregeringen i 1983**.

Dette banede igen vejen for hans og hans hustru Helgas initiativ, som nu er blevet til den Eurasiske Landbro og den Nye Silkevej, og som er det 21. århundredes hovedudvikling frem til i dag.

Hvorfor er det så irriterende at lytte til det indlysende: at LaRouche er en hovedskikkelse i det 20. og 21. århundrede? Fordi vi i skolen lærte om demokratiets dyder? Er det den virkelige årsag, eller skyldes det snarere, at vi lukker ørerne, fordi vi finder det mere beroligende for os personligt at benægte, at nogen mand eller kvinde rent faktisk kan være ansvarlig for menneskets tilstand og menneskehedens skæbne?

Læs her Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedindlæg på konferencen i San Francisco, Californien, den 8. juni:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

“Vi må atter blive sande amerikanere”.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 10. juni 2016

Jeg vil indlede vores diskussion med at påpege, hvad hr. LaRouche i de seneste dage meget klart har sagt: Vi befinder os i en ekstraordinært farlig periode i verdenshistorien. Det kan ikke ses tydeligere end af disse militærmanøvrer, der finder sted på de østeuropæiske grænser (Ruslands vestlige grænser). Disse kombinerede NATO-øvelser, der finder sted hele vejen op og ned langs Ruslands grænse, fra De baltiske Stater, ind i Polen og derfra mod syd. Dette er en kombination af fire forskellige, angiveligt uafhængige krigsspil, men det involverer live troppemanøvrer, af hvilke den største hedder "Anaconda 2016". Denne manøvre involverer 30.000 tropper fra 24 forskellige lande, inkl. 14.000 amerikanere, 12.000 polakker, 1000 faldskærmstropper og den virkelige krydsning af nøglefloden dér, Vistula-floden; samt træning af natlige angreb, tungt militærisenkram, 35 helikoptere, 3.000 militærkøretøjer, flådemanøvrer osv.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST BECOME TRUE AMERICANS AGAIN!

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast; June 10, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's June 10th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. As you'll notice, we're taking a little bit of a different format than customary

today. We have a roundtable format, joined in the studio by Megan

Beets and Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC basement science team; and also Kesha Rogers and Mike Steger are both joining us

from the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee via video. So, we're going to have a little bit of a freer kind of roundtable discussion here.

I'd like to begin our discussion by just pointing out, what

I think has been said very, very clearly in the recent days by Mr. LaRouche, that we're in an extraordinarily dangerous period

of world history. This couldn't be made more clear than seeing these military maneuvers which are happening on the eastern border of Europe (the western border of Russia). These combined

NATO maneuvers which are happening all the way up and down the border of Russia, from the Baltic States, into Poland, and then

south from there. This is a combination of four different, supposedly independent, war games, but it involves live troop maneuvers, the largest of which is called "Anaconda 2016."

That

one involves 30,000 troops from 24 different countries, including

14,000 Americans, 12,000 Polish soldiers, 1,000 paratroopers, the

actual crossing of the key river there, the Vistula River; and the exercise of nighttime assaults, military hardware, 35 helicopters, 3,000 military vehicles, naval maneuvers, and so forth.

If you take that, together with the three other maneuvers

that are happening right now, you have approximately 60,000 troops that are engaged in military maneuvers all along the

border of Russia. As Helga LaRouche pointed out, this the greatest troop and military hardware maneuver that you've had on Russia's border since World War II – the mobilization by Hitler of the Nazi forces prior to the invasion of what was then the Soviet Union. Obviously, this many troops engaged in live military maneuvers, not only creates a very strong possibility for some accident occurring, which could trigger a rapid escalation towards a very hot war, which could escalate very quickly; but also it's very clearly a provocation, which is being taken by NATO with Obama in the leadership, directly towards Russia. And it's being seen as such in the context of other things, by the Russian President and other leading members of the Russian military. It's also being recognized as such by various forces within Europe. {Der Spiegel}, one of the leading news magazines in Germany, put out a story on Wednesday, saying these war maneuvers along the Russian borders, are "going too far", and "are playing at real war". Clearly, any war that were to break out between NATO and Russia would very quickly lead to not a limited, not a tactical, but an all-out strategic, thermonuclear war.

If you combine this with Obama's upcoming to trip to attend the NATO Heads of State Summit in Warsaw, Poland, while these war games are actively taking place, along with his refusal to sit down with President Putin to discuss the deployment of these AEGIS anti-missile systems along the Russian border, which have been characterized as a "Cuban Missile Crisis in Reverse,"

along
with the trillion dollar allocation that Obama has recently
signed off on, to modernize the U.S. military arsenal,
including
these B61-12 nuclear warheads, and the long-range LRSO [Long
Range Standoff] cruise missiles; all of these, taken together,
along with the simultaneous provocations that are happening by
U.S. forces against China in the South China Sea.

Any sane person should be asking themselves, "Why are
we
driving the world towards the point of a war of extinction,
when
we could be taking up Chinese President Xi Jinping's offer to
engage in a new strategic and economic architecture for the
planet, based on win-win cooperation?" This danger, and also
the
very real possibility of a paradigm shift, were both put on
the
table at a very significant seminar sponsored by the Schiller
Institute that occurred on Wednesday in San Francisco,
California. Both Kesha and Mike were participants. It was
titled,
"Will the U.S. Join the New Silk Road? Global Scientific
Development, or Nuclear War?" Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave an
extensive and very thorough overview of this war danger in her
keynote address; and Mr. LaRouche, in his remarks, said very
clearly – this is the very beginning of what Mr. LaRouche
said,
"The key thing I'm concerned about, is the threats to the
existence of the human species in the total area right now;
because right now, at this time, the existence of the entire
human species continues to be on the edge of jeopardy. And
therefore we have to attune ourselves to understanding what
the
problems are that are involved in this, and what are the
remedies
for which we can get an escape for humanity in general.

Humanity

in general right now is under serious threat of jeopardy on a global scale." So, that's very clearly said by Mr. LaRouche.

Also, I consider very significantly, in response to a question which was posed from former United States Senator Mike

Gravel, who was also a participant, a speaker in this seminar. He

posed a question to one of the other participants, Sergey Petrov,

the Consul-General of the Russian Consulate in San Francisco, to

which Mr. Petrov said that there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war, as some as some people would be delusional enough to

believe. What the Consul-General of Russia said at the Schiller

Institute gathering in San Francisco, is the following: "I share

the understanding that we are very close to a major conflict. And

I add that there is no possibility of a 'limited nuclear war.' If

that starts, it will be the end of the world."

I think the starkness of this statement, combined with what

Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche both had to say, really underscores the sobriety with which we have to approach the discussion which we will have here today. Since both Kesha and Mike were participants in that seminar, I'm going to leave a little bit of the further discussion of the proceedings of that

event until a little bit later in the show. The seminar also involved Mr. Howard Chang, an internationally renowned expert on water projects.

But before we open up the discussion, I would like to

play a
short – approximately 10 minute – excerpt from the keynote
speech that Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave. This is the concluding
excerpt of her remarks. She asked two questions: (1) How did
we
get here?; and (2) What is the solution to the crisis we now
face? I just want to underscore, what you'll hear Mrs.
LaRouche
say in this excerpt, is what Mr. LaRouche reiterated, and I
think
is the subject that we have to pay attention to here today:
that
both the LaRouche movement in general, and Mr. and Mrs.
LaRouche
as individuals, {have played the crucial, central, historical
role} in not only creating the possibility for a solution to
this
crisis, going all the way back to their proposal for the
Eurasian
Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, in the aftermath of the
collapse
of the Soviet Union; but also continued to play the crucial
role
in providing the possibility for humanity to escape this
crisis.

This seminar in San Francisco was a crucial element of
that,
but it's part of an ongoing series of interventions
internationally, which include a very prominent conference in
Europe that the Schiller Institute is sponsoring, coming up
within the next two weeks. So, we'll have more discussion on
all
of that after we hear this short except from Mrs. Helga
LaRouche's keynote speech.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Okay, now, let me introduce the third
[subject I want to talk about]. The solution to all of this

would

be a piece of cake. It is already there! A New Silk Road is integrated. We called it at that time, first, the Productive Triangle; in 1991 we called it the Eurasian Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, which was the idea that when the

Iron Curtain had fallen, [to integrate] the populations in the industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. This New Silk Road program would have changed the world in the direction of a peace order already in '91, but, unfortunately, you had Bush, Sr., you had Margaret Thatcher, you had François Mitterrand, who all had completely different ideas. They [wanted to reduce Russia] from a superpower

into a Third World, raw-material-producing country, and they imposed the "shock therapy" in the Yeltsin period. They dismantled the Russian potential in three years , and they had no intention to allow Germany to have any kind of economic relation with Russia. So it did not happen.

You had the '90s, which were genocide against Russia.

You

had all of the consequences of the Bush period. You had the eight

years of Clinton, which was a certain interruption; but then with

Bush, Jr. and Obama, you went back to the old project of an American Century doctrine and the idea of a unilateral world.

Fortunately, in 2013, President Xi Jinping announced a New

Silk Road to be {the} strategic objective of China. In the almost

three years which have passed since, this idea to end geopolitics, to establish in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, a win-win cooperation among all nations on the planet, is

progressing extremely quickly. Remember, the ancient Silk Road was a fantastic cooperation in terms of exchange of culture,

goods, paper, technology, porcelain, silk, silk-producing, and many other cultural manifestations. It led to a tremendous benefit for all the countries which participated, from Asia to Europe.

The New Silk Road, obviously, is doing exactly that. The amount of projects which have been concluded between China and ASEAN countries, China and Latin American countries, China and Europe, China and African countries, China and East European countries, and now, in a very clear fashion, the economic integration between the Eurasian Economic Union, headed by Russia, and the New Silk Road, [is progressing very well. An alliance] has been formed between Russia and China, with India being the third factor in the situation. Many, many other countries have been joining.

Contrary to what you read and hear in the mass media, China is not doing badly. They are shifting their economic orientation from an export orientation, because the export markets in the trans-Atlantic sector are shrinking. They are now going more in infrastructure investment in many countries in the world, and to develop the inner region of China. [To raise the] consumer [to a] higher standard of their own population, since they have lifted 600 million people out of poverty, [into a] decent living standard in China. This is indeed the absolute correct policy, to say we will uplift the remaining people who are still poor, and also make them participate in the Chinese economic miracle.

Xi Jinping has [offered] to President Obama that the United States [should] not only by helping to ,

which I think is the moral obligation of the United States, given the fact that they were the key reason why these countries are now in such disarray; by participating in the building of Africa, which I think the West has an absolute moral obligation. The reason why you have millions of people as refugees, not only risking their lives, drowning in the Mediterranean, dying in the Sahara, which has even more victims than even the Mediterranean. Fifty years of IMF policy has denied economic development to Africa! The reason why people are taking a risk of a 50% chance that they will die, to cross the Mediterranean, is because they are running from war, from hunger, from epidemics, and this is the result of Western policy denying this continent economic development! We have a moral obligation to join hands to develop southwest Asia, to develop Africa.

The United States also needs a Silk Road. If you look at the figures of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, productivity has collapsed over seven years in a row. All the indexes are going down. The United States population is in a terrible condition, or at least in the poorer parts; while the rich become more rich and Wall Street is having a heyday with cocaine parties and plotting destruction for the rest of the world.

The United States needs an infrastructure project. The roads are bad, the traffic is ridiculous. People spend hours and hours

every day in commuting, risking to disappear with their cars into a pothole. They have no rail system. China has built 20,000 km fast train system up to the end of last year; they plan to have 50,000 km by the year 2020, uniting every major city in China through a fast train system, which are fantastic – they're smooth, they're fast, they're quiet. How many kilometers of fast train systems has the United States built? Zero!

So, for the United States to build its own Silk Road, to connect with the global development perspective is a question of its own best self-interest. We have to get the United States off this confrontation course, and simply say, we have to shift this policy and all this trillion-dollar investment in modernization of nuclear arsenals and the largest military budget in the world, trying to maintain an empire which is collapsing anyway. Rather, shift, get rid of Wall Street, impose Glass-Steagall, get back to a policy of Alexander Hamilton, a credit policy; invest in infrastructure and go in the direction of a win-win cooperation with the other nations of the world – with Russia, China, European nations, India; build up Latin America, build up Africa and Southwest Asia.

This is really the choice before the United States. I know this is very difficult for you to think how this should be done,

but you know, think about Kennedy; think about the kind of optimistic country the United States used to be. Think about the idea that America was built to be "a beacon of hope and a temple of liberty," where people from the whole world would go and try to be free. The U.S. singing the National Anthem, "the land of the free." Is the United States the land of the free today? I don't think anybody who is in their right mind would say that today.

Go back to the values of the American Republic, as it was founded by people like Benjamin Franklin, or George Washington; go back to the policies of Alexander Hamilton, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King. I think if the United States could mobilize itself to bring back that nation, the whole world would love to be friends of the United States again. Right now, I can tell you, the rest of the world has almost given up on the United States, and when they look at the election process, the choice between a very, very irrational Donald Trump and unfortunately a very, very predictable Hillary Clinton, given her statements about confrontation against Russia and China. I think you have to really mobilize now. And I think the 28 pages, Glass-Steagall – these are flanks which can derail the situation long before this election is going to take place.

We have to have a completely new world. Remember, mankind is not a beast, and mankind is not bound to do what seems to be

inevitable. Mankind is the only species capable of reason, capable of free will, of defining and designing a beautiful future, and then going to implement that. The last time was with

Kennedy, the Apollo Project. I think we can absolutely do it again! I think you have a great possibility in front of you. I would encourage you – be American! Be true Americans again, and

the whole world will be the most happy and embrace you!

OGDEN: So, that was a short excerpt from Helga LaRouche's opening remarks at the San Francisco seminar; and the full proceedings of that seminar will be made available as they are processed. The first panel is available on YouTube now. And as

I said, both Kesha and Michael Steger were participants in that

event; so maybe I can just throw the discussion open to one of the two of you guys right now, to follow up on what we just heard

from Helga.

MICHAEL STEGER: Sure, thanks Matt. One of the most interesting, one of the key aspects of this whole process and what our organization does, was demonstrated at the discussion process in San Francisco on Wednesday. You have key people in their areas: Obviously, Senator Mike Gravel represents what is a

true American political tradition; to recognize that you fight for what's true, you go against popular opinion and peer pressure. And he was very clear on that question; you don't go

along to get along. As Lyndon LaRouche often says, "You can't fight politically and go along with the popular opinion."

Dr. Howard Chang is a leading civil engineer; obviously the Consul-General of Russia was someone who spoke on behalf of

his country. But the key question is that the standards our organization represents in this existential crisis is something unique; it gives these individuals an opportunity to wage a political fight at the level necessary that inspires them towards what mankind can accomplish, and also addresses the real crisis in the world today. It's far too often that people who want to address the economic crisis, people who want to address the increasing and escalating war danger, fall far short of the necessary to want to work with us. And two, to recognize the quality of method which is necessary to address these problems. These problems are of great scope and magnitude; it's not fixing a pothole, although we have many potholes to fix as Helga points out. And apparently, the Chinese won't even be allowed to build – they wanted to build a small segment of high-speed rail between Los Angeles and Las Vegas; very easy. Actually, east of Los Angeles in the desert. And I guess apparently they won't even be allowed to build that in the United States. So, we can't build any high-speed rail; it's just been outlawed basically. This just came out.

But the size and scope of these problems cannot be – steps cannot be taken that simply alleviate one's guilt; or the tension on one's own identity regarding the dangers of nuclear war, or the increasing crisis that the economic collapse presents to many

Americans. Too many people want to look for a quick solution; an easy mechanism that "Maybe I can vote for this person, or that person." At this point, I think most people realize they can't vote for either of these people; yet you'll still find them consumed to discuss "Well, who do you vote for, though?" They're not willing to recognize that there's a higher method which is required to act to address this kind of crisis. And I think if you look at Lyndon LaRouche's comments at the discussion, he makes this somewhat clear in his remarks. Because there is something unique towards mankind's ability to advance. Mankind does not advance – unlike any other animal species on the planet – simply because it doesn't like the problems it sees. It's able to advance and evolve because of a unique creative capacity; essentially to become more beautiful, to become more creative. To make the discoveries about the Universe that have not been discovered before. And that commitment, that approach is oftentimes what's lacking; and as Helga said, we need real leadership in the United States, we need leadership in Europe today. The problem can be solved so easily.

The New Silk Road, the Eurasian development projects are so extensive, they're ongoing; there are collaborations between China, India, and Russia. And then the nations of central Asia, of Southeast Asia; the strategic intervention in the war domain in Southwest Asia; all of these are now being addressed in a fundamentally different way than they were by the United States

and NATO for the last 15 years since the 9/11 attacks. Which has just been ongoing war and destruction.

So, there's a comprehensive picture that the United States and Europe could participate in. So, why aren't we? Why don't we take those steps? Simply raising red flags that we're near nuclear war, or simply complaining and trying to figure out which of the lesser evils you vote for, are just obviously insufficient. So, why does that remain the discussion? The discussion has to take on a higher standard; and I think that's what Lyn has already recognized over these 50 years. Because if you think of it, 50 years ago, there was a quality of leadership of this nature. John Kennedy recognized that the way you uplift and strengthen a country is to set out on a mission that's never been accomplished before; but it wasn't just the Moon. It was the largest water projects, and the development of Africa. John Kennedy's view of the world and of the Universe had a great scope and magnitude to it, to help uplift the population; it wasn't a practical campaign. Someone like Martin Luther King had a similar outlook; and you saw that inspire people like Bobby Kennedy and Malcolm X, but there was a resonance. You saw the same thing from the great scientists like Krafft Ehricke; the visionaries in the space program didn't look at it as kind of fun engineering projects. They saw it as something of a cultural advancement of the human species. And there was a resonance

with

this quality of leadership politically, that unfortunately, I think what was made clear by the seminar, is that many people are

attracted, they gravitate towards this quality of leadership if

they have a sense of honesty; but that the ability to demonstrate

this method, to act upon that quality of the human mind and human

creativity is a challenge for much of the population in the United States and Europe today. And the standard that they have

to come up to, is not just acknowledging the dangers, but a standard of operating to embolden and strengthen the population

to solve these problems and to move our civilization upwards.

And I think that really was the culminating nature of the

discussion on Wednesday at the seminar; and it really is to bring

more people into this quality of an organization. Of what we are

as a political organization, but that we are must become what the

nation is. And that requires our population must become better;

they must become more courageous, more intelligent, and more beautiful if we're actually going to address these problems.

Because they're not going to be addressed from any simple mechanisms; and I think that really was the fight we waged here

for the seminar, and I think the only way to deal with the current crisis you presented at the beginning.

KESHA ROGERS: I want to continue with that theme, and add that I

think what we have to look at is the unique role of Mr. LaRouche over these years to identify a science of physical economy; which characterizes him in a way that was the understanding of both Krafft Ehrlicke and other leaders from the standpoint of the rejection – shall we say people that Michael brought up, such as John F Kennedy, such as Lincoln, Martin Luther King. A rejection of a limits to growth policy. And this is what Mr. LaRouche has organized as the founding principle of his economic policy in terms of what is the essential role of the advancement of mankind.

During the presentation, I had an opportunity to actually work with Michael and others there for the conference that was just held in San Francisco. And I presented on the unique role of Krafft Ehrlicke, the German space pioneer; and what he represented from the standpoint of putting forth the epistemology and the philosophy on human nature's identity in terms of creating an open world system. Which was this idea that you reject the Club of Rome meadows and foresters limits to growth population reduction; the Malthusian policy that human beings are nothing more than small lily pads, mindless beings. That they have no conception of advancing human creativity. And this is what was the unique role defining Krafft Ehrlicke from the standpoint that he knew that is was not just a matter of promoting technological advancements; but what do these technological advances do to improve upon the conditions of human life and the progress of mankind overall.

And this has been something that Mr. LaRouche

understood is crucial in his science of physical economy, from the standpoint that you're not just looking at technological advancement from speaking of just one leap. But you're talking about a succession of leaps in economic progress in society. And during the relationship that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche developed with the identity and role of Krafft Ehrlicke as a scientist and genius of his time, is really exemplified in what Mr. LaRouche continued to develop around his policy for a Moon-Mars colonization program. I think that people who have not actually studied the significance of Mr. LaRouche and why he became a threat to this zero-growth policy, because he continued to push the limits, push mankind beyond the so-called limitations that have been put on mankind; just as Krafft Ehrlicke understood that our extraterrestrial imperative was to actually remove all limitations and barriers from the progress of mankind. And the best way to do this was through the advancement of man into the colonization of space.

And I think it's important to note, that some people start to put themselves into this smallness of thinking, in this mindless thinking. "Well, how are we going to travel into space if we can't actually solve the problems here on Earth?" And Mr. LaRouche made it a priority to actually organize an understanding of what real technological advancement is; this was exactly the thinking of John F Kennedy in the progress of the commitment of

the Moon landing, of sending a man to the Moon and bringing him safely back to Earth. That this was going to lead to technological advancements that would pay themselves off several times over; but what was going to be essential for it, is that you had to have breakthroughs as Mr. LaRouche called for, in several categories of technology that was actually going to be essential for bringing about an increase in the productivity of society. You take the example; you look at this massive undertaking of what Krafft Ehrlicke did in the design and development of what took men to the Moon, in terms of the Saturn V rocket. It wasn't something that was just thrown together on the cheap; you couldn't have just Wall Street and Elon Musk going in there and saying, "OK, let us just throw a spacecraft up." This took some real engineering; it was a total transformation in terms of the economic conditions of society. Thousands, millions of people were put to work; the spin-off technologies that went into it. Mr. LaRouche called for the advancement of four categories of technology, in thermonuclear fusion and related plasma technologies; or development of electromagnetic radiation of high energy density. Basically promoting new synthetic materials or the production of the colonization of Mars; that you were going to actually have to have flotillas in developing low-Earth orbit. And putting materials on the Moon to actually lead to the colonization of Mars. How are we going to get there?

We had to have engineers, we had to have astrophysicists.

The technical considerations are all laid out very prominently, but I think what it really represents is a transformation of the human species; and that's what Mr. LaRouche was very crucial in, saying that you had to actually have a different identity of who we are as human beings. That we are actually distinct from the animal species; and that no limitations can be put on mankind to keep them in a state of bestiality. And the question of technological advancement is, are these advancements being made in a so-called barbaric society that wants to keep human beings down and keep them enslaved; and promote a policy of limitations on growth and population reduction so these policies would not be advanced. Or, are we talking about a cultural Renaissance, where these advancements are made as Krafft Ehrlicke understood, from the standpoint of a new conception of mankind. This is what has really brought together the minds, and why Mr. LaRouche sees Krafft Ehrlicke as extremely fundamental to how we overcome the threats facing us today in society.

OGDEN: Well, I think that's something that certainly you elaborated very clearly in your speech at the conference, and I think as we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche yesterday; everybody who is on this show was engaged in that discussion. Mr. LaRouche put a very emphatic emphasis on the personality of Krafft Ehrlicke and his courage in fighting for a vision which was not a popular vision even among the people in the space community. And Mr. LaRouche asked that more research be done

on

this; and I know that both you, Ben, and Megan have been immersed

in this a little bit in the recent few days and weeks. So, maybe

you want to give people a broader idea of some of this.

MEGAN BEETS: Well, I can say something briefly. I was just looking back at comments that were made by both Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche at the memorial conference that was held in

honor of Krafft Ehrlicke in 1985, following his death in 1984.

And

both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche reflect something which I think really does go to the essence of the importance of the personality of Krafft Ehrlicke in what we were able to achieve in

the space program. And what they both reflected was the fact that his life made a contribution to moving the species as a whole forward; but why? It's exactly because he was not motivated by the kinds of practical considerations that were impinging on most of the population at the time; and both Lyn and

Helga reflected the fact that Krafft Ehrlicke was motivated by a

total cultural optimism. That not only was it necessary, but it

was also possible to move mankind forward into the Age of Reason;

to move man into a paradigm where we completely left the cultural

vestiges of the beast behind us. And if you look at Krafft Ehrlicke's work, which ranges from extremely technical papers on

the use of liquid hydrogen fuel to fictional stories which are envisioning the first manned mission to Mars; but all of them

I

think are motivated by this passion and vision for a better mankind as a whole. And he came to the conclusion himself as a young man, that the way to realize that had to be space travel; had to be space colonization.

Just to add one more thing, Mrs. LaRouche was reflecting on a speaking tour that Krafft Ehrlicke did with the Schiller Institute in the 1980s in Germany. And what she reported was, that at that time, the resistance from the Greenie movements was so intense at some of these meetings, the police had to be called in. What Krafft Ehrlicke reflected on at the time was that these Greenie movements were very reminiscent of the fascist movements of the 1930s; and that's why the only way to move forward had to be by addressing exactly what you just raised, Kesha. The essence of the cultural morality of mankind; is mankind a culture of beasts, or is mankind actually representing a culture of what Schiller would call beautiful souls?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think highlighting the fight for that; he fought for that. He went against the opposition even within the scientific community for that kind of idea; and I think that also goes back to something that Michael was saying about what's needed today. It's people like that; it's people who are going

to fight for what's true. Not because they think it's what their neighbors will like, or because they think it's what will make them popular; it's because they have an internal drive that they know that's what's needed. You pulled up this quote – it's just one thing among many – I just thought it was indicative; this quote of Krafft testifying in Congress in, I believe it was in 1960, the early '60s. And really emphatically pushing the need for nuclear power for space; he said, the Universe runs on nuclear power. The stars are run by nuclear power; this nuclear power is an inherent part of the Universe and mankind is going to be obsolete in his attempt to be part of the Universe more broadly – go beyond Earth, fulfill this extraterrestrial imperative – if we reject nuclear power. That's one thing. Already in the early '60s, he said, if we don't do this by the end of the decade, we're going to be obsolete in terms of our space efforts. Nuclear power is one issue; one critical issue, obviously, for mankind as a whole, for space development. But you see this visionary quality of fighting against the opposition to these breakthroughs; and being the force that says, "No, this is what's needed," against massive opposition. The tragedy is that the opposition has taken over.

We had, under the leadership of Krafft Ehrlicke and people working with him, we had a nuclear rocket pretty much built by the early '70s; it was basically a few steps away from being ready to go, and it was just cancelled. It was not found to be too difficult; it was not found to be some failure; it was not

found to be too expensive; it was just cancelled. And we've had this zero-growth policy take over at that crucial pivot point — the late '60s, early '70s — when Lyn really came on the scene and started to continue this fight. Obviously, Krafft resonated with that, and came to work with the LaRouches directly based on that; but you see the failure of departing from this visionary quality and this fight to move into the future. But I think he exemplifies what's needed from the US population right now; you're not going to find solutions from the existing cultural, social framework. It's failed; that's expressing the failure of society.

We heard at the beginning, one of the things that strikes me in discussing this whole war danger and the fact that we're taking steps towards nuclear war, which I think it's important, it was stated clearly. There's no limited nuclear war; there's no small nuclear war, you don't take small steps. If it happens, everything's over; it's gone. But what's potentially even more striking than that actually being a reality on the table? Who's talking about it? We have a Presidential election; are these candidates raising this as an issue? Is there any discussion about this? I think it just underscores the importance of that quality of leadership needed; and exemplified by what was done in San Francisco. We're going to be having, coming out of the

Schiller Institute conference in Germany coming up; and what really this movement represents in the United States.

And I think this should also be an appeal to our viewers.

Really, this is a time when we need escalation; we need increase;

we need more support; we need more people to be these type of creative leaders like Krafft Ehrlicke, like Lyndon LaRouche.

That's the only thing that's going to save the country at this point.

OGDEN: Yeah, Michael made a point which I thought was very significant. That, at a time like this, when it's very clear how

huge the dangers are, you cannot allow yourself to be any less than the magnitude of the crisis challenges one to be. And the

magnitude and scope of thinking which is necessary to solve a crisis of this sort, of a civilizational scale, must be huge in

those terms. And I think one thing out of this discussion about

Krafft Ehrlicke, that occurred to me is, when you're thinking about where the entire idea of the geopolitics of the last 70 years has been rooted; it is rooted in the zero-growth

technology, no development kind of paradigm. The idea that there

are limited resources that a growing population is fighting over,

and these territories and so forth; that is the fundamental tenet

of the geopolitics that has dominated this paradigm which has now

failed. When you talk about a New Paradigm, when you talk about

"win-win" as Xi Jinping says it, instead of winner take all, all

are winners. That fundamentally requires, it begs a new attitude towards our concept of growth; that there is no idea of limits to growth, of fixed natural resources. But that you have an ever-expanding possibility of ever-increasing potentials of growth. I think as very demonstrated, China, in a certain way, does understand that in the way that Krafft Ehrlicke understood it; is a central element of their current policy, is not only the One Belt, One Road policy, but it is also this exploration of the Moon. Now just going to the Moon, as a sort of space race or setting your foot on a foreign body or something like that; but saying we're going to discover fundamentally new about the Universe. And as Mr. LaRouche has been emphasizing, this Chang'e mission to explore the far side of the Moon and everything that is there to be discovered. We don't even know; we don't know the extent to which we will discover brand new things about the structure of the Universe when we explore this new territory. That, I think, speaks to this idea that the idea of a New Paradigm, a new "win-win" system, is rooted in overturning the last 70 years of this Malthusian concept of zero-growth, zero technological development, and fixed resources.

And it's only natural that Krafft Ehrlicke understood it in those terms.

DENISTON: Anything else just goes to the longer legacy of the Zeus vs. Prometheus fight. You talk about this zero-growth

paradigm; where did this come from? The British; the British royal family. People like Prince Philip; people like Prince Bernhard. This oligarchical mindset. These guys are so explicit, their view of mankind is just disgusting cattle to be managed. Zeus would just pal up with these guys; they wouldn't even need to introduce themselves. They would just get together like they've know each other for ages. That mentality of this imperial conception of the management of mankind as a bestial species; that's where this zero-growth paradigm came from in this recent period, but it stretches back through history. You look at the writings of Aeschylus on the Prometheus vs. Zeus fight; the attack on Prometheus. And you see that as a reflection of a true negative principle of society at the time, which is carried through to today. This hatred of human progress; this hatred of creative development; this desire to keep mankind suppressed to this lower level. What angered Zeus wasn't just that he had something stolen from him; it's that he had a whole class of people he was managing, that Prometheus then gave an ability to uplift and realize their own humanity. And for that, Zeus punished him.

It's the same fight today; but today, Zeus has thermonuclear arsenals at his fingertips. We're at a clear, and I think this was very well expressed even in the discussions back in the '80s that we're talking about, with the need to move to the Age of

Reason. We're at the point where mankind has developed technologically to the point where if we allow that type of process to continue, you're talking about mankind annihilating himself; and that's what we're talking about right now, with these NATO deployments. It's complete insanity. But again, as we're saying, it's not going to be solved in the negative, by just saying, "Stop that. Don't do that." It's going to have to be resolved in the higher realization and actualization of the true nature of mankind as a Promethean force; as Krafft Ehricke represented. Today, as much as then, this need for an Age of Reason is the imperative; and space is emblematic of the Age of Reason, the age of mankind, really.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's important in the context of everything that we've discussed, also to note that we really are on the edge of a meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It was noted this week that now major European banks are beginning to cease their investment into the ECB, because of the ECB's negative interest policy. They said, why should we be putting money into the ECB if they're just going to be charging us for putting our money there? So, Helga LaRouche said, there's a lot of European bankers who are sleeping with billions of dollars underneath their pillows in the current days. But this is, even without the instability of what could happen in the build up to the Brexit vote at the end of this month. I know our institutional question for this week, which we haven't addressed; was on the subject of the Brexit. And Mrs. LaRouche said, if

this means that Ireland and Scotland are going to leave the UK,
and the UK will break up; then sure, I welcome this. But in seriousness, we are on the verge of the meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system; the productivity of the United States is through the floor; unemployment in this country is unbelievable, especially youth unemployment. It's at levels that are unprecedented in the modern history of this country. And at the same time, you have the possibility of an entirely economic paradigm presenting itself in the form of the New Silk Road; everything that's coming out of the BRICS. We have the visit by Narendra Modi to the United States this week; he spoke to a joint session of Congress. There's a lot that could just happen; as Helga LaRouche said, it would be very easy. It would be a piece of cake for the United States to join this New Paradigm; and I think that's the ongoing of the LaRouche Movement internationally, is making that possibility very, very real. It requires a policy revolution in the United States to bring that about; but as was clear from the seminar in San Francisco this week – and I think will continue to be clear in our interventions in New York City around the Manhattan Project that Mr. LaRouche has initiated; and then this upcoming conference that's being sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Europe in the coming weeks. The activities of the LaRouche Movement internationally are crucial; and it's very significant that we're

at the breaking point in terms of several aspects of this.

Mrs. LaRouche also put a big emphasis on the continued fight around the declassification of the 28 pages, because of what this would imply in terms of the potential to bring down the entire Anglo-Saudi empire. And also everything that was contingent on the lies that were told in the aftermath of 9/11; and what that has led to in terms of the perpetual war policies, the refugees who are coming into Europe from North Africa and the Middle East.

So, all of these things taken together, represent a situation which is dynamic, it's changing very rapidly, and it is fertile ground for the types of interventions that the LaRouche Movement is making internationally right now.

So, let me invite Kesha or Mike, if you want to say anything more, in terms of reflections at the conclusion of this discussion, you're welcome to.

STEGER: I'd say, let's get rid of Obama and join the New Paradigm.

ROGERS: Yeah. I think it's true; we are at the end of an era of representation of barbarism, war, and these limits to growth consequences that Krafft Ehrlicke was very well aware of. We're seeing the emergence of a new system of cooperation, a new collaboration and dialogue among civilizations that's being

led

by Russia and China. And I think the continued question being presented by our activity is, will people actually join with LaRouche and join with the nations who are representing this new

direction for mankind? And that means doing what Krafft Ehricke

did, and breaking with all practicality, and as you said Ben, popularity; and actually going out and doing that which is seemingly impossible. I think China gives us the light and the

inspiration as to human beings; that is our mission, that is what

we do. We do those things which seem almost impossible. And we

do those things that actually help to bring about the solutions

that are going to lead to a greater condition for mankind.

So, I

think that's what we're representing right now, and we're on the

brink of a total breakthrough; unlike anything that's been seen.

But also, as Mrs. LaRouche said in her opening remarks, this breakthrough is going to come with rejecting the absence of any

discussion on the threat of this thermonuclear war and what mankind really faces. Because the question is, what kind of society are we going to actually demand be brought into existence? What kind of future are we going to actually bring about for those generations not yet born? And Mr. LaRouche is committed to that, and many more people as we've stated, need to

do the same.

OGDEN: OK. Well, thank you very much, Kesha. With that,

I'm going to bring a conclusion to this webcast here this evening. I'd like to thank both Kesha and Michael for joining us; and also thank you to Megan and to Ben. So, please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and as I think you can tell, we have a very busy few weeks ahead of us, and a lot of responsibility. So, thank you very much; good night.

Rapport fra Schiller Institut-seminar i San Francisco, USA: Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej?

Schiller Instituttets Strategiske Seminar i San Francisco den 8. juni tiltrak 70 gæster og eksperter for at diskutere det presserende nødvendige spørgsmål: »Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller atomkrig«. Denne plan går ud på at tilslutte sig en plan for infrastruktur i hele verden, med navnet Ét bælte, én vej, og som Kina har fremlagt, eller også blive sammen med de kollapsende, vestlige økonomier, hvis bankerot leverer ved til det bål, som er en global atomkrig. **Listen to the entire seminar on SoundCloud**

De højtplacerede talere inkluderede Lyndon LaRouche, berømt strategisk og økonomisk tænkter; Helga Zepp-LaRouche, også kendt som »Silkevejsladyen« pga. sin verdensomspændende

kampagne for at skabe den »Silkevejspolitik«, som Kina nu har fremlagt, og for at få denne politik vedtaget på verdensplan som alternativet til krig; den amerikanske senator Mike Gravel (senator 1969-1981), der indlæste de hemmeligstemplede »Pentagon Papers« ind i Kongresprotokollen i 1971; honorære konsul Sergei Petrov, generalkonsul for det Russiske Konsulat i San Francisco; dr. Howard Chang, internationalt kendt ekspert i vandsedimentering, samt Kesha Rogers, to gange demokratisk kandidat i Houstons 22. C.D. (kongresdistrikt) – hjemsted for NASA. De stedlige russiske, kinesiske, japanske og filippinske lokalsamfund var repræsenteret blandt publikum.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche præsenterede tilhørerne for det faktum, at NATO's deployering på Ruslands grænser, med AEGIS-systemet i Rumænien, og krigsskibet USS Ross i Sortehavet, efterlader russerne i en position, hvor NATO-missiler kunne nå Moskva på fem minutter – hvilket nødvendiggør en politik med »Affyr ved varsel«. Ulig i 1980'erne, hvor tusinder af mennesker demonstrerede imod atommissilerne i Europa og Rusland, der var sat til »affyring ved varsel«, så har de neokonservative i Obamaregeringen genskabt denne fare, uden nogen protester i Vesten. Faren for en konfrontation med Kina i Det sydkinesiske Hav er også til stede.

I dette klima traf Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i 2013 beslutningen om at gøre en ende på geopolitik og at genetablere den Nye Silkevej, og at bygge infrastruktur for vand, elektricitet og transport i hele verden. Zepp-LaRouche påpegede Kinas 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer, som er bygget i løbet af 2015, hvorimod der ikke findes *nogen* hurtigtog i USA. Hun konkluderede: »Gå sammen med Kina i jeres egen interesse, eller stå over for atomkrig.«

Fr. LaRouche adresserede problemet med, at Obama fortsat er præsident, ved at påpege den presserende nødvendige frigivelse af de klassificerede »28 sider« af Den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september, 2001, og Obamas afvisning af at frigive disse sider, der vides at indeholde

bevis for saudiernes finansiering og sponsorering af terrorangrebet 11. september, hvilket kunne sprænge hul i amerikansk politik og gøre det muligt at vælge en kvalificeret kandidat, af samme støbning som Franklin D. Roosevelt eller præsident Kennedy. Herefter fulgte spørgsmål fra tilhørerne.

Efter Helga Zepp-LaRouche kom et indlæg fra den russiske konsul i San Francisco, Sergei Petrov: »For et stort land som USA, er det gavnligt at se på verden.« På et spørgsmål fra senator Mike Gravel om, hvorvidt han (Petrov) var enig i Helga LaRouches vurdering, svarede han: »Jeg er enig i den forståelse, at vi er meget tæt på en storkonflikt. Og jeg tilføjer, at der ikke er nogen som helst mulighed for en 'begrænset atomkrig'. Hvis den begynder, bliver det verdens ende.«

Hr. Petrov beskrev USSR's opløsning i Statssamfundet af Uafhængige Stater, med alvorlige, økonomiske problemer, og trinnene i den lange proces med at opbygge den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union. EAEU søger nu at indgå aftaler med Mercosur, SCO og EU om økonomisk og humanitært samarbejde. Næste skridt bliver at indgå forbindelse til Nordamerika. På denne dag, sagde hr. Petrov, »vil jeg føle, jeg har været en god diplomat«.

Show Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynote and Q&A

Show Lyndon LaRouche Q&A

»Vil USA gå med i Den Nye

Silkevej? Global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller atomkrig«; Helga Zepp-LaRouches åbningstale ved Schiller Institut- seminar i San Francisco, USA. Video, engelsk.

Jeg tror, at, hvis man ser på verdenssituationen, især på den amerikanske offentlighed, der næsten intet ved om situationen; folk i Europa ved lidt mere, men, hvis man sammenligner den umiddelbart forestående fare for en eskalering af konfrontationen mellem NATO, USA og Storbritannien og så Rusland og Kina på den anden side, så er viden om det så svag, at dette for mig står som det mest skræmmende aspekt; for, fraværet af en offentlig debat om den mulige udslettelse af hele civilisationen, om det så skyldes mange folks ligegyldighed, fordi de simpelt hen er ligeglade, eller det skyldes, at de er for bange til at tænke tanken til ende, men manglen på en offentlig debat er det, vi må ændre.

Stop 3. Verdenskrig:

NATO's Krigsspil i Baltikum kunne udløse en meget virkelig 3. Verdenskrig – Underskriv og cirkuler appellen: »Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig – Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«

7. juni 2016 (Leder) – Hvis Obama får sin vilje, kan menneskeheden meget vel blive drevet ud over klippekanten i form af en fremprovokation af atomkrig fra USA's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, advarede Lyndon LaRouche i dag. NATO-manøvrerne i stor skala, der begyndte i går i Polen og De baltiske Stater, og som involverer 31.000 tropper fra 24 lande i en 10 dage lang øvelse, der simulerer en angivelig russisk invasion af området, udgør i sig selv en umiddelbar, potentiel udløser af krig. Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, Alexander Grushko, forklarede i går faren ligefremt, i bemærkninger, som hr. LaRouche vurderede i høj grad gik lige til sagens kerne:

»Det, vi i dag ser i De baltiske Stater, er rent faktisk ikke andet end forsøg på en magtudvikling, med den fjendtlige politik, som NATO har forfulgt i den seneste tid. Jeg ville ikke sige, at dette udgør en direkte trussel mod Rusland, men det skaber selvfølgelig alvorlige risici i takt med, at vi ser en absolut ny, militær virkelighed danne sig langs vore grænser.«

Grushko uddybede, at NATO-advarsler om non-eksisterende russiske trusler kan materialisere sig til handlinger.

»(NATO's) politik lever i en surrealistisk virkelighed, og det farligste er, at det nu begynder at tage form af militær planlægning og militære forberedelser, der finder sted på territorier langs vore grænser.«

LaRouche understregede, at Rusland under præsident Putin vil træffe sine egne beslutninger på sin egen måde, som respons til disse forsøg. Hvis briterne, Obama og NATO ønsker krig, får de det, og det vil blive forfærdeligt: en atomar 3. Verdenskrig – det er, hvad vi taler om.

Der findes en strategi, som LaRouche længe har identificeret, til at overvinde denne »surrealistiske« politik for folkemord, som udgår fra Det britiske Imperium. Den nødvendiggør den omgående fjernelse af Obama fra Det Hvide Hus, både for at få hans finger væk fra atomknappen, så vel som også for fuldstændigt at vælte det skakbræt, som er det vanvittige præsidentvalg i USA, der i øjeblikket tilbyder amerikanere valget mellem cyanid og stryknin. Og det kræves også, at USA og Europa går med i det Ny win-win-paradigme, med økonomisk udvikling med videnskab som drivkraft, og som forfægtes af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, og som fortsætter med at gå aggressivt frem i hele Eurasien.

Det spørgsmål, der ligger for os, indfanges af titlen på en stor Schiller Institut-konference, som LaRouche-bevægelsen vil afholde i San Francisco den 8. juni:

»Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Et valg imellem global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller en atomar verdenskrig«.

Underskriv og cirkuler appellen:

**»Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig
– Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«**

Foto: Enhver af disse konflikter ville kunne udløse en global atomkrig.

Dump Obama nu – Verden er parat til at gå med i det Nye Paradigme

7. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Lederskabet af verden er, med rette, blevet overtaget af det voksende samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien, og med andre eurasiske nationer, der entusiastisk går med i de nye udviklingsplaner, der er legemliggjort i programmet med 'Ét bælte, én vej'. London, Wall Street og Obama er alle desperate over dette ægte, igangværende paradigmeskifte.

I sin kommentar til dette skifte advarede Lyndon LaRouche om, at Obama er ved at blive afsløret som intet andet end en svindler og et falsum. Faren er, at et sådant falsum kan detonere på en farlig måde. Udfordringen består i fuldt ud at konsolidere skiftet over til udviklingsparadigmet, der ledes af Rusland/Kina/Indien, uden at fremkalde, at Obama og kompagni flipper voldeligt ud. Det betyder, understregede LaRouche, at »Obama og kompagni må forkrøbles«, så de ikke er i stand til at leve deres desperation ud i handling.

Dette står mere og mere klart: Verden har ikke brug for Obamas, eller briternes, eller Wall Streets klovneshow. Det, der behøves, er en virkningsfuld, økonomisk organisering, der erstatter disse desperate svindlere og dræbere. Vi befinder os ved et punkt, hvor hele det britiske system er i færd med at gå ned, netop nu. Det er oprindelsen til krigsfaren, og intet andet. »Dump disse elendige karle«, erklærede LaRouche. »Giv disse ledende, eurasiske nationer, sammen med de sydlige nationer, lederskabet, og støt dem i deres udviklingsplaner.«

Frem for alt andet, som Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange har understreget i løbet af den seneste uge, så byg Kra-kanalen! Det ville markere en revolutionerende forandring for verden, der i enorm grad ville forøge handel og udvikling over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika og videre endnu. Kra-kanalen ville skabe et fuldstændigt nyt billede af verden som helhed.

Flere og flere nationer er parate til at deltage i denne fremtid. Japan er nu i færd med at genoplive koordineringen med de andre hovednationer – Rusland, Indien, Kina – for eurasisk udvikling, at genoplive programmer, der tidligere blev legemliggjort i Mitsubishi Global Infrastructure Fund (GIF), der arbejdede for Kra-kanalen tilbage i 1980'erne. Kina er hen over de næste seks år parat til at investere \$3,5 billion i store infrastrukturprojekter, der rækker langt ud over det umiddelbare asiatiske Stillehavsområde, iflg. en nylig undersøgelse fra Asia Society. Japan har annonceret sin egen, \$110 milliard store investeringsplan for det asiatiske Stillehavsområde.

Den russiske præsident Putin kommer til Kina senere i denne måned for at indgå de sluttelige aftaler om 52 rapporterede fællesprojekter; og russisk-kinesiske forhandlinger skrider nu frem om den planlagte bygning af en 7000 km lang højhastighedsjernbaneforbindelse mellem Moskva og Beijing. Indien er i færd med at udvide sine planer for handelskorridorer, der strækker sig fra Iran gennem Afghanistan, og med nyligt annoncerede planer om også at bygge

en dybvandshavn i Bangladesh, tillige med Chabahar-havnen i Iran ved Oman-golfen. Indien og Kina støtter alle disse investeringer, der vil udvide hele det asiatiske Stillehavsområdes produktive evner, hvor Kina og Indien alene udgør en tredjedel af verdens befolkning.

Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel skal besøge Kina i næste uge. Den netop færdiggjorte Gotthard Tunnel gennem de Schweiziske Alper, verdens længste jernbanetunnel, åbnede officielt den 1. juni, og projektet, som det tog 17 år at færdiggøre, har udløst entusiasme over hele Europa. Denne entusiasme for store projekter må videreføres til, at ledende, europæiske nationer går med i fremtiden med 'Ét bælte, én vej'-programmet, på en langt mere seriøs måde. Det betyder at bryde med de britiske royale og med Obama.

Projekterne, der fremmes af Kina og Indien, vil samlet set accelerere udviklingen og legemliggøre ideen om det »win-win«-samarbejde, der er et varemærke for skiftet væk fra geopolitikkens imperiekrige og til ægte, menneskelig udvikling. Vi har ikke brug for krig. Faktisk ville endnu en storkrig betyde udslettelse. Det ved og forstår Putin, lige såvel som også Kina.

Titelfoto: Premierminister Narendra Modi med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og førstedame Peng Liyuan, der fejrer deres nationers voksende samarbejde og løsning af tidligere konflikter. [flickr/narendramodiofficial]

Gammel vin på nye flasker?

Del II,

af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Selve ideen om, at AfD skulle være opstået som en reaktion på euroens krise, flygtningekrisen eller "politisk islam", er fuldstændig fejlagtig. Den Konservative Revolution, den tradition, som det Nye Højre udtrykkeligt går ind for, og hvis tekster Götz Kubitscheks publikation Antaia udgiver, har eksisteret i en ubrudt fortsættelse, lige siden dens fremkomst som en reaktion imod "Ideerne fra 1789" – således i 225 år gennem manifestationer, der i heldigste fald kun tilsyneladende ændrede sig.

GDE Error: Requested URL is invalid

[Læs del I her](#)

27. maj 2016 – Horst Seehofers påstand om, at Angela Merkels fejlagtige immigrationspolitik forklarer den hastige vækst af *Alternative für Deutschland* (partiet Alternativ for Tyskland), er totalt simplificeret, og derfor forkert. Selvfølgelig var stigningen af antallet af flygtninge præcis det, som visse politikere ventede på, såsom "leder" af AfD, Björn Höcke, der opildnede befolkningens sociale ængstelse ved hjælp af demagogiske argumenter. Flygtninge har selvsagt ikke tidligere indbetalt bidrag til sundhedsforsikringsfonde eller den sociale sikkerhedspulje, sådan, som et af AfD's favoritmantraer lyder, for hvordan skulle de have kunnet det? Skulle de måske for nogen år siden have henvendt sig til den amerikanske eller britiske ambassade i deres land for at oprette en kredit som kompensation for den fremtidige ødelæggelse af deres hjem i geopolitisk motiverede krige?

Dette eksempel tydeliggør, at man kan tage en udtalelse, der, snævert anskuet, ikke i sig selv er falsk – nemlig den, at

"flygtningene aldrig har indbetalt noget til det sociale sikkerhedssystem" – og videreformidle en falsk information herigennem, falsk, fordi den reducerer en kompleks situation, såsom hvorfor, flygtningene i det hele taget blev flygtninge, ned til et meget snævert aspekt af situationen. Den første impuls bag fr. Merkels flygtningepolitik – da hun sagde, "Vi kan klare det!" – var korrekt og i overensstemmelse med Genève-flygtninge-konventionen. Dér, hvor hun til syvende og sidst gik forkert, var, at, alt imens, hun igen og igen sagde, at man måtte eliminere årsagerne til flygtningekrisen, så sagde hun aldrig, hvad disse årsager var.



Antiislamisk Pegida-demonstration den 12. januar, 2015, i Dresden, efter skudepisoden på bladet Charlie Hebdo i Paris.

For at gøre dette måtte man være opmærksom på den rolle, som Saudi-Arabien spillede i angrebene den 11. september, 2001, såvel som også de krige, der var baseret på løgne, og som USA førte i Sydvestasien som angivelige repressalier for disse angreb, samt også det "allierede" Saudi-Arabiens rolle i Tyrkiet, i finansieringen af diverse wahhabi-islamistiske organisationer, fra al-Qaeda til al-Nusra og ISIS, snarere end at forlade sig på disse to nationer for at dæmme op for flygtningestrømmen.

I lyset af det ramaskrig, der nu raser i USA over Saudi-Arabiens veldokumenterede støtterolle for terrororganisationer – man erindrer sig det amerikanske Senats enstemmige vedtagelse af Loven for Retfærdighed imod Terrorsponsorer (JASTA), og kampen for ophævelse af hemmeligstemplingen af de berømte, endnu hemmelige 28 sider fra Den fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport over 11. september – i lyset af dette er det sigende, at fr. Merkel fortsat er tavs omkring skandalen med saudiernes rolle. For, de faktiske "årsager til flygtningekrisen" ligger i hele dette begivenhedskompleks.

Den anden fejltagelse, som fr. Merkel begår, er at nægte, sammen med Rusland og Kina at fremlægge et funktionsdygtigt perspektiv for genopbygningen af de befriede områder – indledningsvis Syrien, og dernæst hele Sydvestasien – og som kun kan gennemføres inden for den større ramme af Den Nye Silkevej.

Ifølge FN findes der allerede 60 millioner flygtninge eller fordrevne mennesker i hele verden. Lederen af Det Verdensøkonomiske Forum, Klaus Schwab, sagde for nylig i Davos, at, i tilfælde af, at der finder et yderligere fald sted i prisen på råmaterialer, kunne en milliard mennesker fra de sydlige lande begive sig ud på rejsen mod nord. I tilfælde af, at et ukontrollabelt kollaps af det transatlantiske finanssystem finder sted – hvilket er en reel mulighed i betragtning af centralbankernes negative rentesatser, samt debatten om 'helikopter-penge' (ubegrænset pengetrykning, -red.), kunne dette tal stige endnu mere pga. den globale indvirkning heraf.

De europæiske forholdsregler, som fr. Merkel gik med til – nemlig at beskytte EU's ydre grænser gennem Frontex-organisationen og forhandlingen af en hestehandel med den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan – er derfor ikke alene totalt ude af stand til at fungere, men de nægter også flygtningene den beskyttelse, de har ret til iflg. international lov. Disse forholdsregler afslører, at de "europæiske værdier", som EU konstant reklamerer højlydt med, for længst er blevet forvandlet til barbarisme. Det er sådan, resten af verden ser det. Kendsgerningen er, at hele verden lægger mærke til og diskuterer EU's foragtelighed i dette spørgsmål.

For at understrege pointen: Den eneste måde, hvorpå vi kan afhjælpe den største, humane katastrofe, siden 2. Verdenskrig, er igennem en omfattende, økonomisk udvikling – en Ny Silkevejs-Marshallplan, om man vil – for hele Mellempøsten og Afrika, og som opbygger disse ødelagte lande, såvel som også de totalt underudviklede lande, og som giver de

mennesker, der lever dér, et perspektiv for en bedre fremtid. For at gøre det, må vi gøre en ende på konfrontationen med Rusland og Kina og samarbejde med Rusland, Kina, Iran, Egypten og mange andre lande om sådanne udviklingsperspektiver. Rammen hertil er allerede på plads med Kinas Nye Silkevej og tilbuddet om et win-win-samarbejde.

Det er netop dette unikke perspektiv for en løsning, som AfD udelukker, på grund af partiets mildt sagt chauvinistiske ideologi. Frem for alt gør partiets tilknytning til neoliberale, monetaristiske dogmer det totalt ude af stand til at søge løsninger, endsige finde dem.

Den konservative revolution

Selve ideen om, at AfD skulle være opstået som en reaktion på euroens krise, flygtningekrisen eller "politisk islam", er fuldstændig fejlagtig. Den Konservative Revolution, den tradition, som det Nye Højre udtrykkeligt går ind for, og hvis tekster Götz Kubitscheks publikation *Antaia* udgiver, har eksisteret i en ubrudt fortsættelse, lige siden dens fremkomst som en reaktion imod "Ideerne fra 1789" – således i 225 år gennem manifestationer, der i heldigste fald kun tilsyneladende ændrede sig.

Blandt de omfattende skrifter om dette emne finder vi Armin Mohlers let redigerede afhandling fra 1949, som første gang blev udgivet i bogform i 1950 med titlen, *Den konservative revolution*. Den udløste en storm af vrede på det tidspunkt, for den var, kun fire år efter afslutningen af Anden Verdenskrig, et forsøg på at behandle fascistiske ideer kvasi-akademisk, som om de ikke direkte havde forårsaget katastrofale resultater for Tyskland og for verden. I sin bog forklarede Mohler, at den "Konservative Revolution" er et synonym for det, der almindeligvis kendes som fascisme.

Ifølge Mohler er de, der udtænker dette, små, intellektuelt livlige celler, højeksplosive sekter og løse kombinationer af

eliten, der forbliver i baggrunden. De udarbejder programmerne "oppefra", som dernæst præsenteres med simple ord til masserne, der ser sig selv som nogen, der har fået en rå skæbne. Mohler beskrev forholdet mellem de intellektuelle og det jævne folk på følgende måde:

"Den overordnede gruppe holder sine masser sammen gennem organisatorisk tilknytning til en doktrin, der er tilpasset den jævne mand og indskrænket til kun at omfatte slagord, og giver kun mulighed for en plads til mere overlegne hjerner i det omfang, de tager del i at tæmme masserne og begrænse disses mentale evner til det esoteriske område. Men flertallet af dem, der besidder et intellekt over det gennemsnitlige, samles i små cirkler, der skaber genklang i form af en konstant, mental spænding, mener, at de selv er de eneste, der besidder den ægte viden og anklager den store gruppe for *realpolitik*, for at forråde 'ideen'".

(Kursivering tilføjet)[1]

Mange ledende medlemmer af AfD ser Instituttet for Statspolitik (*Institut für Staatspolitik*), det Nye Højres tænketank, som Götz Kubitschek og Karlheinz Weissmann stiftede i 2000, som en form for sted, der "skaber genklang i form af en konstant, mental spænding". Opføringskurser afholdes her med jævne mellemrum og er blevet taget af 5000 mennesker. Björn Höcke refererer til dette institut som sin "spirituelle manna".

En opdateret nationalsocialisme

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung citerede en e-mail, som Bernd Lucke, der for nylig blev smidt ud af AfD, skrev til partiets eksekutive komite på det tidspunkt, hvor Kubitschek og hans hustru, Ellen Kositzka, søgte at blive optaget som medlemmer. Kubitschek var dukket op ved Pegida- og Legida-begivenheder[2] iført en sort skjorte og brun jakke, skrev han. "Enhver, der ikke ser en henvisning til de fascistiske bevægelser i Europa

i 1920'erne og 1930'erne, er et fjols." På det tidspunkt blev de begge nægtet medlemskab. I dag er Lucke ude, og Kubitschek anses af mange AfD-medlemmer som det intellektuelle lederskab.

I slutningen af sidste år gav Höcke et slående foredrag på instituttet, hvor han med forbløffende oprigtighed fremlagde den radikale, biologiske determinisme, der er typisk for det Nye Højre. Han sagde, at fr. Merkels vanvittige asylpolitik havde igangsat en "selvforstærkende malstrøm", og at vi måtte forsvare os imod asylansøgere, fordi Afrika producerer "et befolkningsoverskud" på 30 millioner mennesker om året. Der må sættes grænser ved at nægte asyl således, at Afrika kan opnå en miljømæssig bæredygtig rate af befolkningstilvækst.

Ifølge Höcke er problemet, at Afrika og Europa har to forskellige strategier for reproduktion. Afrika har den livsbekræftende form for reproduktion, som der refereres til med et "lille r", mens Europa har en negativ strategi for elementær befolkningserstatning, som der refereres til med et "stort K". De har derfor to totalt forskellige strategier for reproduktion, der nu støder sammen over den optimale brug af *Lebensraum*. (Levesteder)

Enoghalvfjerds år efter afslutningen af det nationalsocialistiske herredømme er det utænkeligt, at nogen skulle vove at påkalde en bestemt befolkningsgruppes "overskudsbefolkning" og *Lebensraum*. Og at underkaste folks demografiske udvikling til "miljømæssigt bæredygtige" niveauer, er nøjagtig den samme, inhumane holdning, der karakteriserer den grønne bevægelses miljøfascisme.

Höcke lånte tilsyneladende termerne "lille r" og "store K" fra de amerikanske miljøforkæmpere Robert MacArthur og Edward O. Wilson og deres teorier om koloniseringen af levesteder.[3] Den tankegang, der her kommer frem, er værre end racisme; den nægter en stor del af den menneskelige race sin faktiske menneskelighed, den egenskab, der adskiller menneskelige væsner som en skabende art fra alle andre livsformer, i

betragtning af deres evne til at udøve skabende fornuft.

Tyske borgere, der er bekymret for vort samfunds udhuling, for vort lands sikkerhed, deres egen personlige fremtid og meget andet, bør under ingen omstændigheder begå den fejl at falde for "doktrinen reduceret til slagord". For skjult bag disse sætninger findes der et billede af mennesket, der er uforeneligt med europæiske eller tyske værdier (for så vidt som man forstår disse som omfattende humanismen hos Nicolaus Cusanus (Nikolaus von Kues), Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Felix Mendelssohn, Friedrich Schiller og Albert Einstein), men som i stedet er i overensstemmelse med den racisme, der engang kastede vort land ud i katastrofen.

Fortsættelse følger.

[1] Se "The Historical Roots of Green Fascism" (Den grønne fascismes historiske rødder), af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, en artikel i to dele i *EIR*, 13. og 20. april 2007: http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2007/eirv34n15-20070413/28-34_715_green.pdf og http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2007/eirv34n16-20070420/29-38_716_helga.pdf

[2] Pegida (Patriotiske Europæere imod Islamisering af Vesten) og Legida (Leipzig-europæere imod Islamisering af Vesten) er antimuslimske bevægelser, der har afholdt massedemonstrationer, især i det østlige Tyskland, imod immigration fra Sydvestasien.

[3] Miljøforkæmperne Robert H. MacArthur og Edward O. Wilson udviklede en teori om økosystemets stabilitet i 1950'erne, hvor de modstillede to former for fremgangsmåder, som befolkninger kunne tage for deres overlevelse. "K"-strategien vedtoges af nationer, der ansås at have opnået, eller være tæt

på, deres "bæreevne", som ansås at være den maksimale befolkning, som kan bæres af et givent miljø; "r"-strategien karakteriserer nationer, der søger at forøge deres befolkning i henhold til deres biotiske potentiale. MacArthur døde i 1972, men Wilson er fortsat en yderst indflydelsesrig, akademisk fortaler for "sociobiologi", et felt, der understreger den menneskelige adfærds genetiske determinisme (såvel som også myrers ditto, idet myrer er den art, der har udgjort objektet for hans akademiske undersøgelser), og han foreslår en politik, der er baseret på disse angivelige genetiske forskelle.

Foto: PEGIDA- demonstration i Dresden, Tyskland, 12. januar 2015, efter terrorangrebet mod det franske, satiriske blad "Charlie Hebdo" 7. januar 2015.

USA og Europa har mere brug for samarbejde om Den Nye Silkevej end Asien har – Interview med Helga Zepp- LaRouche

Onsdag, 1. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttets grundlægger Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der i Kina har fået tilnavnet "Silkevejsladyen", og som, sammen med Lyndon LaRouche, er den fremmeste promoter af denne politik i Europa, blev interviewet

af TASS den 31. maj 2016 om at træffe valget mellem enten en ny, global krig, eller økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde.

TASS: Hvordan vurderer De det aktuelle, internationale samarbejde?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Der er to radikalt modsatrettede bevægelser på planeten netop nu. På den ene side mødes kombinationen af præsident Putins meget succesrige militære flanker, såsom hans intervention i Syrien, der skabte potentialet for fred, og så hans forskellige diplomatiske interventioner i Asien, parallelt med Kinas initiativer for Den Nye Silkevej.

Disse indsatser repræsenterer allerede et win-win-perspektiv for flere end 70 lande.

På den anden side finder der en ekstremt farlig konfrontation sted fra USA's, Storbritanniens, EU's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, der har bragt verden ind i multiple kriser, der er farligere end på højden af den Kolde Krig.

TASS: På hvilke områder er dette mere aktivt, og hvor er det ikke?

Zepp-LaRouche: Med hensyn til Syrien, så er samarbejdet mellem [den russiske] udenrigsminister Lavrov og [den amerikanske] udenrigsminister Kerry, såvel som også Genève-samarbejdet mellem Rusland og USA, meget positivt. Men så længe USA imidlertid ikke opgiver sin politik for 'regimeskift', er situationen fortsat farlig. Præsident Putin har vist sig at være en fremragende strateg.

Dette giver tiltro til, at det ikke vil lykkes krigshøgene i NATO at lokke Rusland ind i en fælde og give NATO et påskud til et lancere et førsteangreb.

TASS: Omkring hvilke spørgsmål må vi optrappe samarbejdet mellem Vesten og Rusland, og hvorfor?

Zepp-LaRouche: Kendsgerningen er den, at hele den transatlantiske sektor er bankerot og tæt på at eksplodere på en større måde end i 2008. Den japanske premierminister Abe understregede, efter et meget vigtigt besøg i Rusland, klart dette ved det nyligt afsluttede G7-møde, men blev afvist af præsident Obama, der hævdede, at "den økonomiske genrejsning går fremad", hvilket er absurd i lyset af centralbankernes negative rentesatser og debatten omkring "helikopter-penge" (ubegrænset pengetrykning, *-red.*).

Vesten har derfor mere end Asien brug for den form for økonomisk samarbejde, som samarbejdet om Ét bælte, én vej/den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union byder på, og som integrerer Eurasien fra Vladivostok til Lissabon, men som også inviterer USA til at deltage i dette perspektiv. Vi kan kun undgå en katastrofe, hvis det lykkes os at overvinde geopolitik og nå frem til et nyt paradigme, baseret på et partnerskab for global udvikling og menneskehedens fælles mål.

TASS: Hvorfor forhindrer Vesten i den grad samarbejde med Rusland, på trods af den åbenlyse terrortrussel, cyberkriminalitet og andre internationale udfordringer?

Zepp-LaRouche: Næsten alle betydningsfulde konflikter stammer fra det anglo-amerikanske imperiums indsats for at bevare en unipolær verden, på et tidspunkt, hvor denne verden de facto allerede er ophørt med at eksistere. Flere og flere kræfter i verden indser, at de må træffe eksistentielle beslutninger, og at deres nationers interesser er meget bedre tjent med at standse sanktionerne og konfrontationen imod Rusland og Kina.

Den kendsgerning, at Rusland og Kina har skabt et meget stærkt, strategisk partnerskab, med Indien som en tredje partner, har flyttet den strategiske balance i verden. Flere og flere lande ser det som langt mere gavnligt at samarbejde om fælles udvikling end at befinde sig under åget af en militær konfrontation. Vi befinder os på et punkt i historien, hvor der må vælges, og det, der tæller, er lederskab af den

art, som vi har set komme fra præsident Putin.