

Efter Biden-Putin-topmødet sidder vi stadig på en krudttønde Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 8. december 2021

Helga Zepp-LaRouche præsenterede en nøgtern vurdering af den globale strategiske situation efter det virtuelle topmøde den 7. december mellem præsidenterne Biden og Putin. Hun advarede om, at det der gik forud for topmødet – en krigstidslignende propagandakampagne, der beskylder Rusland for at forberede sig på at invadere Ukraine – fortsætter med potentielt katastrofale konsekvenser. Fremstødet for yderligere udvidelse af NATO mod øst, med et medlemskab for Ukraine, blev identificeret af Putin som at krydse en »rød streg«. Dette blev afvist af Biden, på trods af løfter givet af USA i 1990 om, at der ikke ville forekomme udvidelse mod øst. Truslen om atomkrig bliver rejst af andre end Schiller Instituttet, herunder Tucker Carlson, mens krigshøge som har mistet forstanden, såsom Senator Wicker fra Mississippi, opfordrer til, at USA overvejer muligheden for et første-atomvåbenangreb.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche gentog, hvordan hendes initiativ for at håndtere den forfærdelige krise i Afghanistan, Operation Ibn Sina, er en vej til samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina. Det andet valg, at øge geopolitisk konfrontation, gennem den falske opdeling af verden i "demokratier mod autokrater" – som er idéen bag Bidens kommende demokrati-topmøde – efterlader

menneskeheden "siddende på en krudttønde".

To kontrasterende paradigmer: Moralsk anløben ligegyldighed kontra folkets lykke.

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche den 23.
september 2021**

Ved en gennemgang af udviklingen i de sidste dage sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at kampen mellem to indbyrdes uforenelige menneskesyn optrappes. Dette kan ses i den moralsk fordærvede ligegyldighed [et juridisk begreb i USA] af USA, Storbritannien og deres NATO-allierede, som reaktion på den humanitære krise i Afghanistan – som de forårsagede – i modsætning til de bestræbelser, som Afghanistans naboer er i gang med, ved hjælp af fælles projekter koordineret af Shanghai Samarbejds-organisationen (Shanghai Cooperation Organization – SCO), BRIKS (Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina og Sydafrika) og Bælte- og Vejinitiativet (BVI) for at fremme økonomisk udvikling i det krigshærgede land. Det kan ses med hensyn til den modbydelige udvisning af haitiske flygtninge, som sendes tilbage til et land, der mangler midler til at tage hånd om dem på grund af en nylig række af naturkatastrofer. Det kan ses ved at sammenligne talerne fra Biden og Xi Jinping på FN's generalforsamling. Og det kan ses ved optrapningen af

regimeskifte-operationer, der dirigeres af den britiske efterretningstjeneste mod Rusland og Kina.

En moralsk anløben indstilling af ligegyldighed er ikke i overensstemmelse med USA's grundlæggende principper. Hun sagde: "Vi er faret vild". I stedet for at pålægge en politik der er nykolonial, med en malthusiansk hensigt, "må vi råbe op" og vende tilbage til de principper, som USA's grundlæggere vedtog, der forpligter regeringen til at bekymre sig om "folkets lykke".

Se webcastet her

Et uddrag fra Helga Zepp-LaRouches Schiller Institut-webcast den 11. om LaRouche-videokonferencen:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Goddag, jeg er Harley Schlanger. Velkommen til vores ugentlige dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlæggeren og formanden for Schiller Instituttet.

Vi befinder os blot nogle få dage fra en stor konference, arrangeret af LaRouche Legacy Foundation, der, på 50-årsdagen, vil se på konsekvenserne af begivenhederne omkring den 15. august, 1971, der etablerede Lyndon LaRouche som førende økonom – både hvad angår hans forudsigelse af disse, såvel som hans advarsler bagefter. Helga, dette burde blive en særdeles vigtig begivenhed, og jeg håber, at mange af vores seere ikke blot vil se det, men opmuntre andre til at

deltage.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Ja. Jeg tror at denne begivenhed vil understrege det faktum, at Lyndon LaRouche, i det mindste i den transatlantiske sektor, uden tvivl er den førende økonom, som forudså følgevirkningerne af Nixons afskaffelse af Bretton Woods-systemet, ved at erstatte faste valutakurser med flydende valutakurser. Dette påbegyndte retningen mod alle de onder, som vi ser i dag – en pandemi, en disintegration af finanssystemet, et alment kollaps af den kulturelle side af samfundet. Det er muligvis en overraskelse for mange mennesker at se disse situationer som ét komplekst domæne, der hænger sammen, men Lyndon LaRouche forudså hvad dette dramatiske brud betød, som opgav at fokusere på den virkelige økonomi, på fysiske økonomier underlagt de egentlige universelle principper i universet, og erstattede det med systemanalyse, kybernetik, hele informationsteorien, fordi han indså, hvad den grundlæggende fejl i Norbert Wieneres og John von Neumanns teorier var. Og der vil være mange eksperter, som vil tale om dette på lørdag.

Så jeg synes at I, vores seere, virkelig burde se det. For hvis I ønsker at forstå, hvorfor verdens økonomer har været ude af stand til at forudse krisen i 2008, hvorfor de er fuldstændig hjælpeløse, når det kommer til at finde blot en analyse, for ikke at snakke om en løsning, til den nuværende krise, så er denne begivenhed på lørdag et absolut "must see" for jer.

Dette vil være et jordskælv af en begivenhed, og det er ikke at love for meget.

SCHLANGER: (griner) Jo, altså titlen er: "Nå, så er I endelig villige til at lære økonomi?" Og jeg tror, at det er vigtigt at nævne, at det er sponsoreret af LaRouche Legacy Foundation, som er i gang med at samle Lyndon LaRouches værker. Og når man begynder at kigge igennem disse titler, ser man hvor forbløffende hans livsværk virkelig var.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Ja, vi udgiver min afdøde mands samlede værker. Vi har allerede udgivet én enorm smuk udgave, det første bind. Det andet er på vej. Vi vil digitalisere hele værket, således at det vil være tilgængeligt for alle dem, som ønsker at studere fysisk økonomi seriøst, men også de andre områder af min mands ufatteligt rige livsværk.

Så dette er en meget vigtig begivenhed af mange, mange grunde...

SCHLANGER: Det bringer os tilbage til vigtigheden af lørdagens konference – denne kommende lørdag, den 14. august, klokken 15-20 [kan også ses senere].

Vi oplever i øjeblikket slutfasen af finanssystemet efter 1971, og dette er noget, som Lyn havde advaret om, og endvidere, ikke blot advaret om, men præsenteret alternativer til. Hvordan ville du organisere folk til at se dette og deltage, og bruge det som et springbræt, ikke blot til at forstå økonomi, men til at skabe en genoplivelse af den fysiske økonomis bedste tradition?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Spørgsmålet, som folk burde stille sig selv, er, hvorfor er verden i en så skrækkelig tilstand? Og jeg tror, at Lyndon LaRouches arbejde er den uundværlige nøgle, ikke blot for at forstå dette, men også for at overvinde det. Fordi, hvorfor var Lyndon LaRouche, som praktisk talt den eneste økonom på det tidspunkt, i stand til at identificere, hvad dette brud var, hvad betydningen var af hvad Nixon gjorde? Det var ikke blot en lille økonomisk forandring. Det var et skelsættende brud mellem noget, som var et ufuldkomment system – Bretton Woods-systemet – som aldrig var det som Franklin D. Roosevelt havde til hensigt, fordi Truman og Churchill udvandede det fuldstændigt, og betonedede aldrig nøglekomponenten, som var at overvinde underudvikling i udviklingslandene; det var aldrig en del af det egentlige Bretton Woods-system. Men det stabiliserede dog, i omkring to årtier, økonomierne i USA og Europa, fordi det var opmærksomt på nogle grundlæggende fysisk-økonomiske realiteter.

Og Nixon smed dette ud af vinduet ved at introducere en ny form for monetarisme, hvilket var idéen om, at fra nu af ville man blot bruge algoritmer til at beskrive markederne. Hvilket Lyn havde påpeget, var fejlen ved Norbert Wiener og John von Neumann, nemlig den, at de havde anvendt et system, som intet havde med virkeligheden at gøre. Det er en model, og denne model bliver brugt i dag til omtrent alting: Det bruges til – hvis man betragter spekulation, i en tidsskala på nanosekunder, i tempoer af nanosekunder, billioner rejser rundt om planeten i form af spekulation. Disse er baseret på den samme algoritmiske metode i meget hurtige computere, som styrer denne form for spekulation, fuldstændig uafhængigt af fornuft, eller realøkonomiske kriterier.

Det samme er tilfældet for vejret: Det viser sig, at den første person, som udviklede en sådan idé om vejrmønstre, som kunne forudse, eller prognosticere, var Norbert Wiener, og også John von Neumann tror jeg. Så det er grunden til, at IPCC's model er værdiløs. Den har intet med de komplekse årsager for klimaet at gøre, og det er kun en model. Det var det samme møg som Romklubben i 1972! Da de udgav programmet Grænser for Vækst, var det den samme falske model, hvor de udelod det teknologiske fremskridts indflydelse på økonomiens produktivitet. Det var det, som LaRouche havde fastslået som værende nøglen: Menneskelig kreativitet, opfindelser, opdagelser af grundlæggende principper, og måden hvorpå disse opdagelser, når de anvendes via teknologi i produktionsprocessen, hvordan de påvirker produktiviteten. Det er noget, som man ikke kan måle med disse modeller, og det er grunden til at alt dette ikke fungerer.

Men man kan kigge på mange andre områder, og man vil se at den samme idiotiske metode anvendes. For eksempel, i forudsigelsen af forbrydelser har de nu modeller, som forudser på hvilket gadehjørne, hvilken person vil begå et mord fem år ud i fremtiden, og derfor bliver man nødt til at bygge fængsler til at kunne rumme dette – jeg overdriver en lille smule, men ikke

særlig meget.

Jeg mener, det her er vanvittigt: Det har intet med virkeligheden at gøre, og jeg mener, at det er en grundlæggende diskussion. Hvis ikke dette genovervejes, og rettes op på gennem videnskab, gennem opdagelser, gennem universelle fysiske principper, er der ingen løsning, fordi der er et helt etablissement, som følger dette, ligesom rotterne følger Rottefængerens fra Hameln, og det vil føre til en afgrund, og folk vil styrte ned i afgrunden i forfølgelsen efter en forkert idé.

Heldigvis er det ikke alle som gør dette: Rusland, for eksempel, gør ikke dette; Kina har ikke den samme vanvittige tilgang. Så, når folk taler om en konkurrence blandt systemer, er man nød til at betragte årsagen til at Vesten slår fejl indenfor så mange områder. Og det er det, som lørdagens diskussion handler om, men også en forhåbningsfuld idé, fordi Lyndon LaRouche har leveret løsninger, som verden har brug for i dag, mere end nogensinde før.

SCHLANGER: Jeg tror, at det er en perfekt måde at afslutte på, for at sørge for at folk stiller ind på lørdag, den 14. august, klokken 15. Som du siger, der er ingen tvivl om, at vi befinder os i et systemisk sammenbrud. Spørgsmålet er, om vi har modet til rent faktisk at lære økonomi og lære fra den største økonom i det sidste århundrede, Lyndon LaRouche.

Se webcastet her

En verden uden geopolitik

**kræver et svar: Efter
Afghanistan fiaskoen, har vi
lært vores lektie?**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche den 7. juli 202**

**A WORLD WITHOUT GEOPOLITICS BECKONS: AFTER THE AFGHAN
DEBACLE, HAVE WE LEARNED OUR LESSON YET**

In reviewing strategic developments of the last week, Schiller Institute Chairwoman Helga Zepp LaRouche highlighted the prospects for peace and collaboration possible when geopolitical confrontation is rejected. The Merkel-Macron-Xi dialogue, for example, opens the door for a change in European Union policy, as the EU bureaucrats face growing tensions over their commitment to the unilateralism implied in imposing a "Super State." The end of the Afghan war does not mean more conflict, but the emergence of an alternative based on a desire by its neighbors to overcome underdevelopment, as a competent strategy to combat terrorism.

In her report on the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Chinese Communist Party, she challenged viewers to not fall back on the axioms drummed into their heads by corrupt media and imperial oligarchs, but to look instead at the real history of China. She described the Conference of World Political Parties addressed by President Xi, which included representatives from more than 150 parties, as an "expression of friendship", which demonstrates that overcoming underdevelopment is a mission which can be embraced by all nations. It also makes a mockery of the view pushed by

geopoliticians that China "is isolated". (hcs)

Se webcastet her!

Putin-Biden-topmødet: Et potentielt skridt i den rigtige retning- Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 29. maj 2021

På trods af at forholdet mellem USA og Rusland rammer et nyt lavpunkt, da angloamerikanske oligarker har til hensigt at gennemføre et regimeskift i både Moskva og Beijing, mener Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at et topmøde, hvor Putin og Biden taler direkte sammen, tilbyder en mulighed for at komme væk fra et fremstød mod krig.

Dette topmøde kommer på et tidspunkt, hvor der er opstået en ny kamplyst mod Den store Nulstilling (Great Reset) og den grønne New Deal, som sammen opreklameres for at redde et bankerot finanssystem. To eksempler, som hun citerede, var et videnskabeligt forum i Italien, hvor førende klimaforskere forkastede de modeller, der bruges af dem som tror på menneskeskabte klimaforandringer, samt den schweiziske regerings afvisning, i Wilhelm Tells suveræne tradition, af krav, der blev stillet af EU.

Men faren for krig forbliver, især med udsigten til at Det grønne Parti i Tyskland vil være med i den næste regering efter valget i september, og at dets førende kandidat, Annalena Baerbock, muligvis bliver kansler med fuld støtte for hendes kandidatur fra de transatlantiske krigshøge. Helga Zepp-LaRouche fremhævede, som en del af denne krigsfare, at Det grønne Partis leder, Habeck, opfordrede til at bevæbne Ukraine, på trods af tilstedeværelsen af åbne nazister i forsvars- og sikkerhedssektoren, samt optrapningen mod Lukashenko-regeringen i Hviderusland.

Se webcastet her

Tid til at være alvorlig – atomkrig kan ske! Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, den 28. april 2021

I sin ugentlige dialog uddybede Helga Zepp-LaRouche de advarsler, som den russiske præsident Putin kom med i hans nationale tale den 21. april. Putin advarede om faren ved at krydse "røde streger", hvilket ville tvinge Rusland til at handle for at forsvare dets sikkerhed og nationale suverænitet. Blandt de trusler han identificerede var vestlig involvering i et planlagt kupforsøg i Hviderusland og et attentat på præsident Lukashenko. I stedet for at tage Putin på ordet og indlede en dialog for at løse

uoverensstemmelserne, optrapper vestens krigshøge spændingerne og opfordrer regeringerne til at "hæve prisen" for Rusland for sådan påstået dårlig opførsel, mens de opfinder nye begrundelser for at straffe Rusland, såsom anklagen om, at Rusland stod bag en eksplosion ved et ammunitionsdepot i Tjekkiet i 2014!

Som sædvanlig er britiske propagandaoperationer i spidsen, herunder Chatham House og *The Economist*.

Hun skar igennem artiklerne, der støtter Annalena Baerbock, den nye kanslerkandidat for det Grønne parti i Tyskland, og påpegede, at de Grønnes program ikke kun er anti-industri og for afvikling af moderne energiproduktion, men også aggressivt anti-Rusland/anti-Kina, i tråd med Davos-kredsens kampagne for den store nulstilling (Great Reset) og den grønne New Deal. Dette hænger sammen med kampagnen for radikal befolkningsreduktion, hvilket altid har været det vigtigste engagement for dem der står bag den grønne bevægelse.

Hun opfordrede vores seere til at tilmelde sig Schiller Instituttets kommende konference den 8. maj, for at hjælpe os med at vække befolkningen til den virkelige fare, der konfronterer os, som kommer fra en bande fanatikere, der har forpligtet sig til at reducere verdens befolkning gennem krig, hungersnød og sygdom.

Hvordan en kollapsende global økonomi giver næring til

kampagnen for krig.

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 7. april 2021

I en gennemgang af den globale strategiske situation i dag kommenterede Helga Zepp LaRouche, at omfanget af løgne fra regeringer, officielle institutioner og medier er nået til det punkt, hvor det erklærede mål for britiske propagandister om at være i stand til at "overgå Goebbels" er blevet nået. Provokationerne mod Rusland og Kina, som har til hensigt at tvinge regimeskifter, er bakket op af skamløs løgn. IMF-rapporten om økonomien, der udråber USA som den "økonomiske motor" for et verdensomspændende boom, ignorerer deres egne tal, der viser voksende forarmelse i både de tidligere avancerede- og udviklingslande.

Hun påpegede, at løgnene bag kampagnen for krig og det systemiske økonomiske sammenbrud er et forsøg på at skjule det faktum, at et alternativt system, baseret på et nyt paradigme, dukker frem og nu kan blive en global virkelighed. Indiens afvisning af "netto nul"-klimapolitikken er en del af dette – en klar afvisning af den globale Grønne New Deal – ligesom indrømmelsen i en artikel i tidsskriftet *Atlantic* om, at bagvaskelsen angående, at Kina pålægger en "gældsælde" på fattigere nationer med sit Bælte- og Vejinitiativ er en løgn. Hvad angår faren fra COVID-pandemien, det råber på et moderne sundhedssystem i enhver nation, som Schiller Instituttet har insisteret på fra starten.

Se webcastet her: [Link](#)

Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale ved panel 1: 'Vil menneskehedens historie ende i tragedie eller fortsætte med et nyt paradigme?'

Her er Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale fra weekendens konference

Del 1

Goddag! Jeg hilser jer overalt i verden, uanset hvor I befinder jer lige nu. Det er en fornøjelse for mig at tale til jer. Da vi valgte titlen på konferencen, "Verden ved en skillevej: To måneder inde i USA's nye administration", forventede vi uro. Alligevel er det uhyggeligt, hvor forudvidende disse ord var. At en siddende præsident for USA kalder Ruslands præsident en morder, som præsident Biden gjorde i et ABC-TV-program, bryder helt sikkert et tabu. Det var et trickspørgsmål af George Stephanopoulos, men det fungerede. Det viser selvfølgelig, hvad såkaldt journalistik er blevet til i disse tider.

Heldigvis viste præsident Putin sig at have god humor ved at invitere Biden til at holde en direkte internetdebat, måske i går fredag, eller på mandag, eftersom Putin ville tage til Taigaen i weekenden. Ellers ønskede han ham et godt helbred. Ikke desto mindre, hvis præsidenten for det mest magtfulde

land, der har 5.800 nukleare sprænghoveder, siger sådan noget om Ruslands præsident, der har 6.375 nukleare sprænghoveder (tal fra januar 2020), viser det den fare, vi befinder os i.

Hvis man betragter den lavine af nylige erklæringer og militære doktriner, der mere og mere definerer Rusland og Kina som strategiske rivaler og konfliktfyldte fjender, ser det ud til, at vi er i akt IV eller V i en global tragedie, der hurtigt nærmer sig det, Schiller kaldte et "punctum saliens", det springende punkt. Det punkt i dramaet, hvor alle tidligere udviklinger kommer sammen i et øjeblikks beslutning. Det afhænger af karakteren og visionen hos de førende aktører på scenen, hvis handlinger betinger, om vi kan finde en løsning på et højere niveau – om vi kan få adgang til et nyt paradigme på et højere plan for tænkning og undslippe det tragiske resultat. Eller hvis de i handling omsætter logikken i deres fejlbehæftede aksiomer, og dramaet ender som en tragedie. Denne gang er det imidlertid ikke på en scene, det er vores historie, vores liv.

Lyndon LaRouche, i en smuk artikel [https://larouchepub.com/lar/2007/3444mask_pelosi_tragedy.html] offentliggjort i EIR, 9. november 2007, kaldet "Tragediens kraft", sagde en forbløffende ting, der vedrører grunden til, at vi besluttede, at denne gang skulle det første panel være tilegnet behovet for en klassisk renæssance. Fordi det er gennem de største klassiske kunstneriske værker, at man kan få adgang til det niveau af tænkning, der kræves for at håndtere denne krise. Derfor placerede vi ikke kulturpanelet i slutningen af konferencen, som vi normalt gør. LaRouche påpegede, at man siden Vladimir Vernadsky og Albert Einstein kender til universets opdeling i strengt definerede fase-rum: det ikke-biotiske, biosfæren, noösfæren [erkendelsesmæssigt liv]. Men at der er et fjerde generelt fase-rum, der kombinerer niveauet af klassisk tragedie, naturvidenskab, klassisk kunstnerisk komposition og statsmandskunst, som kendt af Aischylos, Platon, Shakespeare, Lessing og Schiller, i et

enkelt tema. Dette fjerde fase-rum er den egentlige substans i verdenshistorien, sagde Lyndon LaRouche.

Hvis menneskeheden ønsker at finde en løsning på nutidens mange eksistentielle kriser, er politiske ledere på alle samfundsniveauer nødt til at få adgang til den form for tænkning, som findes i dette fjerde fase-rum. Den russiske reaktion på Bidens bemærkninger viser, at de er klar over, at vi befinder os i et sådant punctum saliens, springende punkt. Konstantin Kosachev, vicepræsident for Det russiske Føderationsråd, kaldte det en forkastning: "Disse ubehøvede bemærkninger dræber alle forventninger om, at en ny administration vil føre en ny politik over for Rusland", sagde han. Og i ægte vrede udtalte han: "Disse bemærkninger kommer fra en præsident for et land, der smider en bombe et eller andet sted i verden hvert 12. minut. Flere end 500.000 mennesker er døde i forbindelse med amerikanske aktioner siden 2001. Kunne du kommentere på det, hr. Biden? "

Det er forfærdeligt, hvordan disse kriser er taget til i løbet af de sidste mange år, så godt som uden offentlighedens kendskab. Ingen offentlig diskurs; ingen debat blandt intellektuelle, endsige i parlamenterne. Trin for trin mod afgrunden. Inden for militære doktriner var der et stort skift mod konfrontation med Rusland og Kina, i forbindelse med offentliggørelsen af den Amerikanske nationale Strategi i december 2017, der for første gang definerede Rusland og Kina som geopolitiske rivaler. Dette fortsatte med den Nationale Forsvarsstrategi i januar 2018, efterfulgt af Evalueringen af de atomare Stillinger (Nuclear Posture Review) og oprettelsen af den amerikansk rumkommando og det amerikanske militærs rumstyrke, hvis mål er amerikansk dominans i rummet for at forhindre Kina i at definere de nye regler i rummet.

I marts 2021 offentliggjorde Det Hvide Hus den Foreløbige nationale sikkerhedsstrategiske Vejledning. Dokumentet på 24 sider

[<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/NSC-1v2>

.pdf] angiver hensigten om at rette verdens demokratier ind mod de "ondartede påvirkninger fra Rusland og Kina", genoprette en regelbunden orden i verden; i det væsentlige globalisere NATO med det klare fokus på at danne alliancer i Indo-Stillehavsområdet mod Rusland og Kina, og hurtigt vende tilbage til internationalt lederskab i den globale dagsorden for klimændringer, at formindske globale CO2-udledninger, og sikre at USA og ikke Kina laver reglerne. Alt dette formodes at være for "at udkonkurrere et mere selvsikkert og autoritært Kina" og sejre i den strategiske konkurrence med Kina eller enhver anden nation.

Del 2:

Klimaspørgsmålet vil blive til en national sikkerhedsprioritet. Vi vil inkorporere vurderinger af klimarisiko i vores krigsspil, -modeller og -simuleringer; og vi vil styrke missioners modstandsdygtighed og indsætte løsninger, som optimerer evner og reducerer vores eget CO2-aftryk.

Er det ikke spøjst, at kampen mod klimaforandringerne er en national sikkerhedsprioritet? Alt imens disse "officielle" dokumenter i det mindste forbliver i domænet af professionelt militærprog, findes dette foregivende ikke længere i skrifter, såsom dem fra London Telegraph, der genudgav et skrift fra d. 28. januar, "The Longer Telegram", fra det Atlantiske Råd [<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/atlantic-council-strategy-paper-series/the-longer-telegram/>]. Det er skrevet af et anonymt, tidligere medlem af regeringen med "dybdegående viden om Kina" og er angiveligt et af de vigtigste dokumenter nogensinde udgivet af rådet. Titlen er en bevidst reference til det "lange telegram" af George Kennan fra 1946, som opfordrede til inddæmningen af Sovjetunionen.

Dette dokument opfordrer skamløst til et kup indefra mod Præsident Xi Jinping af utilfredse, ledende medlemmer af det Kinesiske Kommunistparti, som dog er villige til at opgive idéen om at forfølge den kinesiske model for udvikling og at underkaste sig USA's dominans over verden. Hvem er de vigtigste bidragsydere til denne tænketank? Flere af de største amerikanske våbenproducenter, som Raytheon, General Dynamic, Boeing, Lockheed-Martin, Northrop-Grumman, samt NATO.

Af samme natur er den britiske efterretningsoperation omkring Alexey Navalny, som dybest set har samme hensigt – at katalysere et regimeskrifte mod Præsident Putin. Før vi havner i den 3. verdenskrig – for det er dér denne krigsopbygning vil ende – lad os reflektere over hvad der rent faktisk foregår her. Havde vi ikke hørt, blot for kort tid siden, efter Sovjetunionens fald, at vi har nået "enden på historien", som var en af de mest idiotiske ting, der nogensinde er blevet sagt? At Vestens demokratier fra det tidspunkt ville overtage verden, og at alle andre ville blive enige med de vestlige værdier, neoliberalistisk økonomi, kønspolitik, dekonstruktion i kunsten, osv. Et hurtigt overblik vil være nyttigt på dette tidspunkt, fordi der er ting at lære, hvis en tragedie skal undgås. Der er faktisk en rivalisering blandt to, konkurrerende systemer; to fuldstændig forskellige anskuelser af verden, menneskets rolle i denne og en tilknyttet vision af menneskehedens fremtid.

I 1978, da Deng Xiaoping påbegyndte politikken for reform og åbning, som efterfulgte Kulturrevolutionens dybe dal, var Kina et af de fattige lande på Jorden. Ved at anvende de bedste aspekter af traditionen for fysisk økonomi, som denne blev opfundet af Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz og videreudviklet af Hamilton, List, Carey og Witte, satte han Kina på en kurs med kontinuerlig innovation. Dette har nu, 40 år senere, kastet 850 millioner kinesere ud af dyb fattigdom, hvilket, for én som ikke er forudindtaget, er en af de største, historiske, kulturelle præstationer i verdenshistorien. De opnåede målet

om at afskaffe fattigdom inden 2020, mens det modsatte var tilfældet i USA og Europa: fattigdom tog til.

1991 udvidede vi forslaget om den Produktive Trekant (Paris-Berlin-Wien), som var svaret fra Lyndon LaRouche, min afdøde mand, på Berlinmurens fald i 1989, til den Eurasiske Landbro. Systemet af udviklingskorridorer, der bygger på den gamle Silkevej, forbinder Europas befolkninger og industrielle centre med dem i Asien, som en måde hvorpå Eurasiens indelukkede landområder kan industrialiseres. Den idé var åbenlys for en der kom fra den filosofiske tradition af Nicolaus Kusanus, Vernadsky og Krafft Ehrlicke. Nemlig at livet udvikledes gennem fotosyntese, ud fra havene. At organismer ville udvikle sig gennem en højere metabolisme (energigennemstrømningstæthed), og at en art endelig ville blive udviklet, hvis kreative evner ville etablere en hel ny kategori af eksistens i universet – mennesket.

Evolutionens naturlige gang for denne nye art var at bosætte sig ved havene og floderne og, gennem infrastrukturel udvikling, at bevæge sig længere indlands. Åbningen og udviklingen af vores kontinenters land-omsluttede områder gennem disse udviklingskorridorer var egentlig en åbenlys idé, da Jerntæppet disintegrerede. Efter at den infrastrukturelle udvikling af alle kontinenter på Jorden var fuldendt, ville den næste fase af denne udvikling være at opbygge infrastruktur i det nære rum, kolonier på Månen og på Mars, som trædesten for menneskeheden på vejen til at blive en galaktisk art.

Som jeg allerede advarede om i mange af mine taler i 1990'erne: hvis man ville begå den fejl at overlejlre en ukontrolleret fri markedsøkonomi på en sammenstyrtet kommunistisk økonomi, kunne man måske fortsætte med kasinoøkonomien i et stykke tid, men det ville snart føre til et endnu større kollaps af hele systemet. Hvis den Produktive Trekant og den Eurasiske Landbro var blevet gennemført – der var stor opbakning for dette på det tidspunkt – ville det have

været den perfekte fredsplan for det 21. århundrede. Men den blev afvist af Vesten af geopolitiske grunde. I stedet var planen fra USA's og Storbritanniens, og især Frankrigs, side at forvandle den tidligere supermagt, Sovjetunionen, til et land i den Tredje Verden, der blot producerede råmaterialer.

Jeffrey Sachs' chokterapi i Jeltsin-perioden skabte faktisk en befolkningsreduktion på 1 million mennesker om året, så det var rent folkemord. I USA blev doktrinen fra PNAC (Projektet for et Nyt Amerikansk Århundrede) etableret i 1992 – Dick Cheney's idé om at USA ville fortsætte med at være den eneste supermagt og aldrig tillade nogen rival på det strategiske plan. I juni 1992 blev den tilsvarende politik foreslået ved FN's Miljø- og Udviklingskonference i Rio, Brasilien, hvilket var begyndelsen på en omfattende malthusiansk offensiv, der var en genbekræftelse af Romklubbens politik og deres idé om "Grænser for Vækst", udgivet i 1972. Den blev på det tidspunkt gendrevet af en mægtig bog af Lyndon LaRouche: "Der er Ingen Grænser for Vækst". Topmødet i Rio var også en genbekræftelse af Henry Kissingers NSSM-200-doktrin [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pcaab500.pdf] fra 1974, som er et enormt skandaløst dokument, der kræver en befolkningsreduktion og idéen om at bruge fødevarer som et middel til befolkningskontrol.

Argumenterne for malthusiansk dominans over en unipolær verden blev ofte forandret: De gik fra begrænsede ressourcer, til ozonhullets forøgelse, til syrerregn, til døende skove, til kernekraft = fascisme, og nu, i den seneste tid, klimaforandringer. Men det egentlige mål var altid en oligarkisk, imperialistisk verdensorden, styret af en mindre elite, samt befolkningskontrol.

Det samme år, 1992, kun 14 år efter Dengs reformpolitik blev påbegyndt, havde Kina allerede opnået en vis udvikling, men det var for det meste i kystregionerne. Jeg deltog i en konference i 1996 i Beijing, som vi havde foreslået til den kinesiske regering to år tidligere, med titlen: "Udviklingen

af regionerne langs den Eurasiske Landbro". Den definerede det langsigtede, strategiske perspektiv for Kina indtil 2010. Denne politik blev dog afbrudt af den asiatiske krise i 1997.

I 2001 blev Kina inviteret til at deltage i Verdenshandelsorganisationen (WTO) med forventningen om, at integrationen i verdens markeder ville betyde, at Kina ville indføre de vestlige værdier, vestligt demokrati og så videre. At de ville acceptere Washington-Konsensusen, den "regelbaserede" verdensorden, Wall Streets og City of Londons kasinoøkonomi. Men i stedet for at anerkende "historiens ende", fornyede Kina sin 5000 år gamle tradition af kinesisk historie og kultur, og i 2013 bekendtgjorde Xi Jinping i Kazakstan politikken for den Nye Silkevej, hvilket, i løbet af syv et halvt år, er blevet til historiens største infrastrukturprogram.

150 lande samarbejder, og som komikeren Bill Maher sagde i en kort video [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2DH4v6FnbvM>]: "Ikke at anerkende dette betyder, at I er nogle fjollehoveder". Kina var nemlig i stand til at bygge 40.000 km højhastigheds-toglinjer, 500 helt nye byer til millioner af mennesker, den mest avancerede fusionsforskning, missionen til anden side af Månen og nu til Mars. Og som Xi Jinping udtrykte det for nylig: Kina er i dag tættere på målet om at forny den kinesiske nation end på noget andet tidspunkt i historien, og at blive en af verdens førende magter indenfor videnskab og teknologi.

Putin begyndte først at blive dæmoniseret, som han udstilles af det atlantiske etablissement, efter at han begyndte at vende udviklingen fra Jeltsin-perioden og genetablere Ruslands status som en verdensmagt, og ikke blot en regionalmagt, som Obama respektløst havde insisteret på, da Putin genindtog sit præsidentembede. Så, hvor vil alt dette ende? Hvis Biden-administrationen, "Globale Britannien", NATO og EU insisterer på at inddæmme Rusland og Kina, hvis strategiske partnerskab bliver styrket i lyset af denne aggressive politik fra den

vestlige alliance, vil det uundgåeligt føre til en 3. Verdenskrig, som ingen ville kunne overleve?

Under sin rejse til Seattle i 2005 påpegede Xi Jinping, at der ikke findes sådan noget som "Thukydids-fælden" i verden. Men skulle de mægtigste lande igen og igen lave strategiske fejlkalkulationer, kunne de måske skabe en sådan fælde for dem selv. Den kinesiske ambassadør til USA, Cui Tiankai, refererede adskillige gange til artiklen af historikeren Prof. Graham Allison, som stillede spørgsmålet, om USA og Kina var i færd med at ende i præcis en sådan konflikt, på den måde som den græske historiker Thukydids havde beskrevet det, og gå i krig.

Thukydids, der levede fra 460 til 404 f.Kr., belyste hvordan det skønne Grækenland brød sammen, pga. konkurrencen mellem Sparta og Athen, som førte til den Peloponnesiske Krig. Efter Perser-krigene fra 500 til 479 f.Kr., og igen fra 470 til 448 f.Kr., hvor Athen havde vist sig som sejrherre over perserne, blev det til en slags supermagt. Dette skabte vrede i det oligarkisk-kontrollerede Sparta, som havde været den dominerende magt indtil da, og som forsøgte at beholde magten ved at tage del i forskellige alliancer. Efter Athens endelige sejr over perserne og den såkaldte Kallias-fred, kunne det faktisk have opløst det Attiske Forbund, men gennem sofisternes indflydelse i Athen forvandlede det til et attisk imperium og transformerede de tidligere frivillige allierede til at betale hyldest og blive vasaller.

Mest berømt og informativt for vores nuværende situation i dag, er historien om hvordan Athen tvang beboerne på øen Milos til den nye aftale. Thukydids beskriver dette i den 5. bog [af hans Historien om den Peloponnesiske Krig] i dialogen mellem den atheniensiske udsending og Milos' repræsentanter. Atheniensen bemærker, at Athen, med sejren over perserne, skulle have erhvervet sig rettigheden til at regere – og de mægtige gør hvad de har lyst til, og de svage må adlyde. Repræsentanten fra Milos argumenterer, at hvis Athen allerede

ikke respekterer loven, burde det overveje, at andre kunne tage dets hårdhed som et eksempel, hvis det en dag selv blev besejret.

Atheniensen svarer, at milosianerne burde underkaste sig Athens overherredømme, eftersom det ville give den største fordel til begge sider. Forbløffet spørger repræsentanten for Milos, hvordan slaveri ville være ligeså fordelagtigt som dominans? Hvortil Atheniensen svarer, at det ville være at foretrække i stedet for at blive dræbt. For dem selv ville det være gunstigt, at de ikke ville være nødsaget til at dræber dem.

Del 3:

Angående spørgsmålet om de ikke kunne forblive neutrale, svarer atheneren nej, da deres fjendskab ville skade mindre end deres venskab, hvilket kunne læses som et tegn på svaghed fra deres side. Under alle omstændigheder ville princippet om de magtfulde gælde i hele verden.

Milosianeren argumenterer, at de ikke kunne opgive deres uafhængighed, som de havde haft i 700 år, men ville ønske at forblive neutrale.

Kort derefter begyndte Athen fjendtlighederne, og befolkningen i Milos måtte ubetinget overgive sig, og athenerne dræbte alle mændene og solgte kvinderne og børnene til slaveri. Yderligere beskriver Thukydide, hvordan athenernes umådeholdenhed tilskynder dem til stadig mere offensiv opførsel, og endelig til den sicilianske ekspedition fra 415-413 f.Kr., hvor de lider et knusende nederlag, hvorfra de aldrig kommer sig.

Så måske skulle man tænke over denne historie, når hr. Blinken kræver, at Tyskland skal opgive Nord Strøm 2.

I atomvåbnenes æra, bør man tænke to gange, hvis man skaber en

Thukydids-fælde, hvor der ikke behøver at være nogen. Den vigtigste konflikt kommer fra disse to systemers totale modsætningsfyldte udviklingsbaner. På den ene side Kina, og i princippet de lande der samarbejder med dem i Bælte- og Vejinitiativet, lægger størst mulig vægt på innovation, på deres befolknings levestandard, og på at fremme deres befolknings kreativitet, som kilde til innovation.

På den anden side er kursen for den malthusianske fraktion at gå tilbage i historien til en lavere energigennemstrømning, lavere forbrug og derfor færre mennesker. Centralbankerne kører en koordineret kampagne for at opnå "regimeskift", efter det berygtede møde i Jackson Hole, Wyoming, i august 2019; den store nulstilling [the Great Reset], for at fjerne CO2 fra verdensøkonomien; og "flytte milliarder", som et dokument fra EU og den tyske regering udtrykte det, for at dirigere alle investeringer ind i grønne teknologier. Hvilket vil betyde en dramatisk reduktion i levestandarden for befolkningerne i USA og Europa, og voksende fattigdom på verdensplan. Og i lyset af den allerede hærgende pandemi og verdensomspændende hungersnød, en massiv befolkningsreduktion i den såkaldte udviklingssektor. Med andre ord: folkedrab.

Aischylos beskriver denne konflikt i sin trilogi *Prometheus i lænker*, hvor konflikten er imellem den olympiske gud Zeus, der er inkarnationen af det oligarkiske system, og Prometheus, som han straffer, fordi han bragte ild til mennesket, og derfor fremskridt og produktivitet for menneskeheden. Hvad vi beskæftiger os med, og det som ligger til grund for disse to direkte modsatrettede udviklingsforløb, er hver deres forskellige menneskesyn. Det prometheusianske menneskesyn ser hvert menneske som en enorm berigelse for menneskeheden som helhed, fordi hvert individ har potentialet til at gøre grundlæggende opdagelser inden for naturvidenskab, i skabelsen af stor klassisk kunst. En kreativ person, der opdager et universelt fysisk princip, kan skabe en helt ny økonomisk platform, der kan omdefinere hele måden hvorpå menneskeheden

producerer, på et kvalitativt højere produktivitetsniveau, såsom dampmaskinen, antibiotika, atomkraft, lasere, og lignende opdagelser.

Det malthusianske menneskesyn ser hver person som en parasit, en byrde for Moder Jord, en CO2-udledende byrde, der bidrager til global opvarmning; og derfor, jo færre sådanne pestilenser der er, jo bedre.

Naturligvis er hele den malthusianske påstand et videnskabeligt bedrageri, da computerprogrammet, som bogen *Grænser for Væksts (The Limits to Growth)* såkaldte undersøgelse var baseret på, var et fusket program, hvor det ønskede resultat først blev bestemt, og derefter blev programmet designet i overensstemmelse hermed. Forfatterne, Meadows og Forrester, indrømmede senere, at de havde udeladt den rolle, som videnskabelig og teknologisk fremskridt har i at definere, hvad en ressource er.

Den malthusianske påstand er en direkte løgn fra oligarkiet, forstærket af den politiske korrekthed, der spredes af de etablerede medier, som kontrolleres af Wall Street og City of London; og for nylig de sociale medier under IT-giganterne fra Silicon Valley, fonde og tænketanke, der afspejler den finansielle sektors interesser.

Det kunstigt fremkaldte paradigmeskift, ikke indledt, men propageret gennem medierne med millioner af dollars på mange sprog, igangsat af Romklubben på vegne af det internationale oligarki, har været meget effektivt. Millioner af menneskers sind er blevet gjort grønne med mangel på videnskabelig stringens, som har gjort dem modtagelige for alle slags løgne, herunder dem om Rusland og Kina. LaRouche skriver i "The Force of Tragedy" (Tragediens Kraft):

"Her, i denne undertrykkelse af de videnskabelige og relaterede kreative erkendelsesmæssige evner i befolkningens menneskelige sind, ligger essensen af tragediens principielle

kraft..." Det er "tragedies usynlige, men alligevel effektive kraft", som LaRouche taler om, "der bøjer viljen hos mænd og kvinder for at undgå den frygtede misfornøjelse hos den magtfulde, sataniske skikkelse, den fiktive Zeus", som må italesættes og ændres.

Lyndon LaRouche påpegede, at nutidens tragedie er baseret på befolkningens totale mangel på en videnskabelig og streng forståelse, men også, at begrebet tragedie må være genstand for en strategisk efterretningsmæssig vurdering, som skal studeres af enhver seriøs iagttager af nutidens amerikanske situation.

Så lad os begynde med en nøgtern vurdering af situationen.

Det er meget tydeligt, at det neoliberale økonomiske og kulturelle systems politik er fuldstændig mislykket. Hvis man betragter pandemien, hvorfor er det så, at alle de asiatiske kulturer har håndteret det meget bedre? Med færre dødsfald og hurtigere tilbagevenden til det normale økonomiske liv. Det er fordi de er baseret på et værdisystem, der sætter det almene vel forrest, i modsætning til den nyliberale idé om individualistisk frihed, hvor alt er tilladt.

Del 4:

Se på hungersnøden i verden – den absolut utrolige humanitære krise i Yemen, i Syrien, i mange afrikanske og latinamerikanske lande. Sult af bibelske dimensioner, der er resultatet af den vestlige nyliberale politik. Hvorfor kom Vesten ikke i gang med det såkaldte vaccinediplomati, som de beskylder Rusland og Kina for? Hvorfor udviklede de ikke udviklingslandene? Da Pave Johannes Paul II blev spurgt i 1990, om Sovjetunionens sammenbrud ville bevise, at det vestlige system er moralsk overlegen, svarede han: Absolut ikke, fordi de er præget af "syndens strukturer". Se på Den tredje Verden, sagde han, og så forstår man grunden til, at

jeg siger dette.

Vestens fiasko er resultatet af en dyb kulturel krise, som kun kan sammenlignes med forfaldet i slutningen af Det romerske Imperium, Romerriget. Se på vores populærkultur; underholdningen, der spænder fra satanisk til pervers; de åndsdræbende ting som folk anser for underholdning. Vi har set en nedbrydning, næsten et hukommelsestab af den kulturelle erindring om vores store traditioner. Langt størstedelen af de unge har ingen idé om klassisk kultur. De synes, at Rolling Stones er klassisk. Samtiden ved ikke engang, hvad de har glemt.

For at afhjælpe dette, lad os se på universel historie på den måde Friedrich Schiller beskrev den i sin berømte tale i Jena i 1789. Han sagde: Det tog kun et par tusinde år for mennesket at udvikle sig fra en asocial huleboer til den høje klassiske kunst; til Dante, Shakespeare, Bach, Beethoven eller Schiller. Dette har at gøre med den absolutte forskel mellem mennesker og alle andre livsformer.

Beviset for dette er evnen til viljemæssigt at forøge den relative potentielle befolkningstæthed, som i løbet af få tusinde år – måske i alt 10.000 eller 20.000 år – gjorde det muligt for menneskeheden at øge dens befolkningstæthed fra nogle få millioner til næsten 8 milliarder mennesker i dag. Som Lyndon LaRouche mange gange har understreget, har ingen højere abe, intet husdyr nogensinde været i stand til at efterligne menneskets kreative åndsevner. De kan muligvis efterligne aspekter af menneskelig adfærd, men de har aldrig opdaget et fysisk princip.

Og det er den absolut grundlæggende forskel mellem biosfæren og noösfæren [erkendelsesmæssigt liv]. Det kan man forstå, hvis man studerer alle skaberne bag den menneskelige kultur, efterhånden som de udviklede sig, oprindelsen til den kinesiske, indiske, mesopotamiske, egyptiske og græske kultur; hvordan den konfutsianske filosofi lagde grundlaget for de

følgende 2500 år af kinesisk historie.

Se på visdommen i de vediske skrifter fra Indien; biblioteket i Alexandria, Egypten; det klassiske Grækenland; Gupta-perioden i Indien. Samarbejdet mellem Haroun al-Rashid og Karl den Store, hvilket førte til Den karolingiske Renæssance, som gjorde det muligt for Europa at genopdage dets fortids skatte. Song-dynastiet; Friedrich Hohenstaufens samarbejde med den arabiske verden; Den andalusiske Renæssance; Den italienske Renæssance; fremkomsten af den suveræne nationalstat, som skyldtes Nikolaus fra Kues (Cusanus) og Ludvig XI i Frankrig. Udviklingen af den klassiske musik fra Bach og Beethoven til Brahms; de store poeter Shakespeare, Shelley, Keats, Lessing, Schiller og Edgar Allan Poe. Alle disse kulturer bidrog til det menneskelige fremskridt, og det er helheden og kontinuiteten i de store kunstværker, videnskab, poesi, musik, arkitektur, kunstmaleri og statsmandskunst, som er det fjerde fase-rum i vores univers.

Det er gennem universel historie, der adskiller os som en menneskelig art, og som mange store sind har bidraget til, at menneskeheden bliver udødelig.

Der har i historien ofte været en debat om dyr har sjæle, og enhver ejer af et kæledyr vil insistere på, at disse dyr har en sjæl. Men jeg er enig med Ibn Sina (Avicenna), at ja, dyr har en sjæl, men de har en kollektiv sjæl, fordi man ikke kan erindre den enkelte hund, der var fornøjelsen for nogen, der levede i det 4. århundrede, men man husker meget godt Sokrates' sjæl. Hvis hvert menneske rekapitulerer den universelle historie, deltager han eller hun i det fjerde fase-rum.

Hvis vi har en dialog mellem disse forskellige kulturer, som vi har brug for blandt repræsentanterne for alle disse, har vi en meget konkret måde at løse den nuværende krise på.

Der er mange konkrete skridt, som vi er nødt til at tage for

at komme ud af denne krise:

På det militære område har vi brug for noget der kan sammenlignes med Det strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ – idéen om at gøre atomvåben teknologisk forældede. Og vi har brug for en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur.

For at afslutte kasinoøkonomien har vi brug for en global Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og et nyt Bretton Woods-system – et nyt kreditsystem.

Vi har brug for et nyt paradigme i forholdet mellem nationer, der respekterer national suverænitet, ikke-indblanding, eksistensen af et andet socialt system. Så vil tingene ændre sig fuldstændigt.

Vi har brug for et helt nyt, moderne sundhedssystem i hvert enkelt land for at bekæmpe pandemierne – den nuværende og de kommende – og sygdomme.

Vi er nødt til at fordoble landbrugsproduktionen for at udrydde hungersnød.

Vi er nødt til at udrydde fattigdom for evigt gennem økonomisk udvikling for hele menneskeheden.

Men ingen af disse tiltag vil fungere, hvis vi ikke har et nyt paradigme af klassisk kultur, der vedrører essensen af menneskehedens identitet.

I modsætning til de liberale, der siger, at alt er tilladt, og at alle gør ting efter deres egen smag, siger vi, at mennesket, gennem æstetisk uddannelse, er ubegrænset perfektibelt, moralsk, intellektuelt og følelsesmæssigt. Og med denne metode til æstetisk uddannelse har ethvert menneske potentialet til at blive en smuk sjæl og et geni. Kun hvis vi, menneskeheden som helhed, tager dette spring, vil menneskeheden være i sikkerhed.

Tak skal I have.

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche
konfronterer de falske
aksiomer fra krigspartiet og
de nyliberale.**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med
Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 11.
marts 2021**

I sin ugentlige dialog uddybede Helga Zepp-LaRouche hvordan åben dialog, snarere end profileret reaktion, er nøglen til at håndtere de kriser, som menneskeheden står overfor. De tre hovedtemaer hun behandlede var:

Den voksende modstand imod den store nulstilling (Great Reset) og den grønne New Deal;

Hvordan de fejl, der er begået i de vestlige lande i håndteringen af COVID-pandemien – inklusive benægtelse – har ført til en dybere krise, mens den "tredje bølge" nu rammer Vesteuropa;

Hvordan de unilateralistiske krigshøges anti-kinesiske propagandakampagne sætter Vesten på en farlig krigssti, baseret på falsk propaganda fra det militære industrielle

kompleks.

Hun opfordrede seerne til at deltage i Schiller Instituttets kommende todages videokonference, der åbnes med et panel om at vende tilbagegangen i den klassiske kultur i Vesten, hvilket har bidraget til, at manges godtroenhed over for løgnene fra krigshøgene og de nyliberale.

Se videoen her.

Engelsk afskrift:

Helga Zepp LaRouche Takes on the False Axioms of The War Party and Neo-liberals

The LaRouche Organization Weekly Dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Thursday, March 11, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger. Welcome to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche the founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. Today is March 11, 2021.

One of the interesting things that's happened in the last days, is the emergence of what you might call an opposition grouping to the Green New Deal, with the legal suit filed by 12 states against the Executive Order by Joe Biden, declaring basically an emergency order on climate change and the Green New Deal. It wasn't quite a bill, yet, but it's quite interesting, isn't it, Helga?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this is very promising, because

the Attorney General of Missouri, a man called Eric Schmitt is taking the lead on that, on behalf of these 12 states, and the arguments they're making are quite truthful, and they apply to Europe in the same way as they apply to the United States, basically saying that these policies, which really are the Great Reset and the Green Deal, they destroy the work of generations, they attack every household, every family; they destroy industry, agriculture; and they would drive up energy prices, they would destroy jobs. So they are really on the march forward to defeat that. Now, we have to see where this goes. But this legal action immediately had a very revitalizing effect on the farmers in those states and other states. And I think it would be extremely important that people in Europe who are affected by the same atrocity, but I have not seen anything like that in terms of really speaking out, that the Great Reset will only help the speculators, it will only help the hedge funds, and the very rich to become more rich, and the poor to become poorer. I would wish that this is being taken up as well.

Now, I think the Great Reset, ["The Great Leap Backward: LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal"] which is the report we published some weeks ago, which is now coming out in the form of mass pamphlets in several countries, this is biggest assault on the living standard and the character of the European nations and the United States as industrial nations, and it will completely cause chaos. I would encourage people to both look at our report, which has all the background on where this comes from, because most people, even if they oppose it, they are not quite clear about the oligarchical nature of this policy; but at the same time, take some example by the action of these 12 states in the United States and formulate similar opposition.

SCHLANGER: Just so people know, they're challenging the Executive Order 13990, which mandates green reset policies. What they've said is that this will damage manufacturing,

decrease the electricity supply, suppress agriculture, and increase poverty, meaning increased expenses to the states; they're saying hundreds of billions of dollars in damage and they claim the White House does not have the power to make policy in these areas, that it should be in the Congress. So that is quite an interesting development.

But meanwhile, we have John Kerry jetting over to Brussels to be welcomed back to the fold of the Paris Climate Agreement by von der Leyen and the European Commission.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, this is quite outrageous. What Kerry actually said is that even the Paris Agreement is not enough, that with the present policies which are already completely insane, there still would be a warming up of the Earth of 3.6°F, which is not supported by fact at all, and even the CO₂ connection is very dubious. If John Kerry was so much concerned about that, I mean, there would be one easy thing to reduce the CO₂ emissions, he could shut down the military-industry complex. Because one Eurofighter in one hour emits 11 tons of CO₂. So if you really wanted to go after the climate problem, then we could reduce these incredibly dangerous and provocative military maneuvers which are taking place all the time. But that is obviously not the real issue.

And if you then look at another aspect, namely, the absolute hysteria by the German media in particular around the 10th anniversary of the incident at Fukushima, where if you would believe what some of these radio reports and media reports were saying, this was the ultimate proof that nuclear energy is dangerous. But the reality is, that while more than 20,000 people died in Fukushima and elsewhere, *none* of them died as a result of nuclear radiation, but they all died as a result of the tsunami and the earthquake in Tohoku triggering that tsunami. So this is really incredible. In Germany we have a politician, Norbert Röttgen, who is the head of the CDU and foreign policy commission in the Bundestag, he went out of his way to say, "no renaissance of nuclear energy, and only all

renewable. And look at it, all these hedge funds and all these major player are now investing in solar and renewable, isn't that the proof that this is a good thing?"

Well, the reality is the Great Reset is an investment in the biggest bubble and the biggest swindle, because if you invest in CO₂ emission titles, you are investing in something which in reality does not exist, other than that it will completely destroy the economy.

Now, we have pointed out many times to the fact that that insanity affects only the so-called "Western" countries, because Putin, at the same time had a meeting with some of his ministers, and he basically said that Russia is going to increase its coal production and 50% of that will be exported to Asia. [<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/65085>] And, naturally, the Chinese intend to have 50% of their energy supply by 2050 still coming from coal, while going heavily into nuclear energy.

And the Chinese, on the other side, they just announced that they will soon start the first commercial high-temperature gas-cooled reactor (HTR). This is a technology which was developed in Germany by Professor Schulten from Jülich, and because it was politically unrealizable in Germany, Professor Schulten gave the entire technology to the Chinese, because he said this technology is too precious, so rather give to the Chinese than not have it developed. Now, if you want to have a really safe nuclear energy, then you go to high-temperature reactors, which, for physical reasons turn off immediately if there is the slightest irregularity.

This just shows you that behind all of this, the so-called "climate" question, the anti-nuclear question, there are quite different motives, namely, to reduce the population: And that is what is not being accepted by Russia and China. And we have discussed many times in the past, and I want to repeat it, this self-destruction of the West by deindustrializing, by

bringing back the level of industry and agriculture to the time of the preindustrial era, means the West is weakening itself. And naturally, this increases the war danger, because Russia and China have no intention of doing likewise, and therefore the so-called "threat of the rise of China" will be increasingly an issue. So these things have all kinds of strategic implications, that people who normally think about these questions are not really thinking through.

SCHLANGER: And we'll take up the broader geopolitical question on this in a moment, but I think it's interesting for people in especially the West, who don't like the Great Reset and the Green New Deal, to realize that there are allies around the world, including Russia and China; and that's part of the reason the geopoliticians of the empire are trying to provoke war between the East and the West.

We'll come to that in a moment. I think we should move to the question of the pandemic, where it's clear that the situation in Europe, in particular, but also in sections of the third world, has moved into a new phase, particularly in countries like Italy, Germany. What information do you have on this, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: For all those people who said the pandemic is just an invention and it doesn't exist, the reality is, because of the failure of the governments to deal with it in an efficient way—and I'm saying this knowing that many people will have a nervous breakdown when I say it—but, contrary to the Asians, not only China, but most of the Asians who dealt with the outbreak of the pandemic extremely efficiently and had low death rates, in most of the rest of the world the pandemic is completely out of control. Maybe the most dangerous situation is in Brazil, where a new strain has developed. You have practically the entire health system at its limit; all the ICU units are filled; and the situation is practically out of control. And the former President Lula da Silva, who was just freed of all accusations in the courts,

basically said that present President Jair Bolsonaro is an imbecile the way he criminally dealt with the situation, playing it down, by not providing the measures needed.

So, how you have a situation in which the largest country in Latin America, which borders with almost all nations of South America—not all of them, but most of them—is becoming a hotbed of an eruption of the pandemic. But if you go to Europe, it does not look much better. You have a situation in Italy, where now there are more than 100,000 who have died—and Italy only has 60 million people! So, in reality that means the death rate in Italy is even a little bit higher than that in the United States! All of Europe has 560,000 who died. Now, that's quite a big number.

So then you have a situation where many countries are now taking resolute measures, because they see that the EU Commission utterly failed. They failed a year ago, to get the masks; then they failed to get the vaccines. They ordered the vaccines much too late, while the United States, Great Britain, Israel, ordered immediately, not thinking about the costs—what did the EU do? They have a woman there, an Italian, who is in charge of doing this, who has no medical background; she's an interpreter, therefore she's completely incompetent. So she bargained to get a better price and she missed the boat. So therefore, now the vaccines in Europe are late, and that is a situation where now many countries are turning to Russia, to China. For example, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán from Hungary ordered a Hungarian plane to go to Beijing, fill it up with 550,000 doses of vaccine, and bring it back to Hungary. The same is happening in the Czech Republic, where there is a big internal brawl, where some politicians say, "we will not have our people die; we will go to Russia and get Sputnik V." And the same is happening with Denmark and Austria, where the prime ministers, respectively the Chancellor of Austria went to Israel to consult with Netanyahu about what Israel did that was right, because they have almost

the entire population vaccinated already.

Now the unity of the EU is completely disappeared, because in this situation, responsible national leaders insisted we have to protect our population, and if the EU is incapable of dealing with it, we will go to Russia, we'll go to China, and we will take their offers to get the vaccines from there.

This is a very interesting development, and it just shows you that the mistake which was made by the EU, rather than thinking about the people, they followed their ideology, by saying, this is a perfect opportunity where we can assert the power of the EU by having more centralization, so no nation should order vaccines themselves, we'll all do it centrally. But then they completely ruined it! They did not think of increasing the production of the vaccine production capability, they gave it to the private firms and bargained for a lower price. So by turning to the supranational construction of the EU, not thinking of the interest of the members, not putting the common good first but going to the free market ideology, they completely ruined it. And the populations are really getting mad. People are right now realizing that their livelihood is ruined, their jobs are ruined, the death rates are high. And this comes now on top of the fact that obviously, all the back and forth, lockdowns a little bit, then going back and forth, has not worked.

So in Germany, where you had a medium hard lockdown, which was supposed to be loosened by the end of March; this now becomes very dubious, because just today, the Robert Koch Institute stated that the third wave has arrived. Yesterday there were 14,000 new infections. This is also getting out of control, and it probably has to do with the new strains that are much more infectious.

The Prime Minister of Finland was warning that the way this is going, they are very concerned about the coming fall, the coming spring a year from now, and expressing the worry that

the pandemic will be with us for many years to come.

I think this brings up what Dr. Tedros from the World Health Organization has been saying, that in light of this—and we are not even talking about what is happening in Africa, and some parts of Asia—that all the patents must be lifted for the time being, that the pharmaceutical concerns should not be allowed to look at it from the standpoint of profit, but that there has to be a maximum production, and increase of production and an international cooperation. If people want to compensate these pharmaceutical firms, if governments want to do that, they can, but the question of protecting these patents should not be in the way of responding to this pandemic in the most powerful way possible, and that would be to make the vaccines a common good, and not think about profit in this situation.

That also underlines what the Schiller Institute has been saying from the very beginning, that only if we have a world health system, a modern health system in every single country, not one can be left behind, because as it is now becoming clear, if you don't vaccinate, and test, and do contact tracing, and all of these measures, then the danger of mutations of new variants is developing and it comes back so that even the vaccines may be ineffective in those countries which have them.

So it's really a race against time, and this idea to only take care of the rich countries and not pay attention to the poor countries, is a boomerang, and we are seeing right now that it can completely backfire. So I would really urge all of you to work with the Schiller Institute for the idea of a modern health system in every single country, work with the Committee of the Coincidence of Opposites; these are mostly doctors, nurses, and other people working with the Schiller Institute, to try to apply the kinds of methods, to address the famine, because you can't deal with the pandemic when you have an expanding world famine at the same time, which is, according to the World Food Program threatening 300 million people this

year! These two questions have to be tackled together, and you have to have a modern health system going together with overcoming poverty and underdevelopment in the developing countries, or else we will not get out of this.

SCHLANGER: Just a quick correction, you said 870 million deaths in Europe. I think it's about 560,000.

But what I think is interesting from this discussion is that if you look at what we've discussed so far, in the opposition to the Great Reset and also the cooperation that's coming from Russia and China, you have a real potential for collaboration now, between Western countries with Russia and China. And yet, we still have in the United States, coming from the British geopolitical networks, a lot of—well, provocations aimed at China in particular. And many people don't fully understand this and are going with a knee-jerk reaction against China, in a sense, the same way they were going into a knee-jerk reaction against Russia around Russiagate.

There are some meetings coming up between the Biden administration and China, but there's also a lot of harsh rhetoric, so, how do you see this thing shaping up, in terms of the U.S.-China perspective?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: For anybody who does not have geopolitical spectacles on their nose, would see that unless the two largest economies in the world, the United States and China, are working together to tackle these problems, like the pandemic, like the poverty, like the famine, the world will be a miserable place! And therefore, what some of these military doctrines which declare Russia and China the "enemy," are doing is really stupid. One can say more harsh words than that, but the minimum one can say is that they're completely stupid.

There was just now a hearing in the Senate Armed Services Committee, where Admiral Davidson, who's the commander of the

Indo-Pacific basically blasted China that they are oppressive toward the domestic policy and aggressive in the Indo-Pacific, threatening every country there, on and on like that—and it's just very dangerous and part of a propaganda which in the end result can only lead to war.

Now, many people, and this is being brought up by people we are talking to in the organizing a lot, both in the United States and in Europe, who say, "but, yeah, China is this, and that." Well, let me discuss a couple of facts: Before the Tiananmen Square in 1989, the image of Chinese in the United States was very positive. More than 80% had a positive idea about the Chinese people; then this Tiananmen Square massacre happened and the Chinese government in the meantime said that maybe the way they dealt with it was too harsh, but on the other side, one should also see very clearly that this was a first color revolution! And many of these protesters, these students, they turn out to be in think tanks in the United States. So this is like what is being done in Hong Kong, or what was done with the Orange Revolution in Ukraine or later the Maidan in Ukraine. I mean, this was a color revolution.

China protected the unity of its state. But people should just take a look at what is happening: First of all, there is absolutely no proof that China spread the virus deliberately. That has been a propaganda which was cooked up by the same geopolitical faction which really wants to contain the rise of China. China was able to deal with the virus extremely efficiently. They went into a very hard quarantine in Wuhan for two months. They built all these hospitals, they did testing, contact tracing, quarantine, and they got it completely under control. And now, when it flares up, it's relatively easy, because they use modern electronics to trace people and isolate the people who are infected and it does not spread.

That was the reason why China in 2020, was practically the only country which had a significant economic growth, +2%.

They want to have, and they will have 6% growth this year. While all the other nations, the United States, the European nations, all had collapses of 8%, 10% or something like that. And China is now set to become the engine of the economic recovery worldwide, *if* nations basically recognize the chance which lies in that.

People should just re-think: China in the Cultural Revolution and most of the 20th century before that, was dirt poor. Mostly very backward agriculture, people had a very low living standard. Many people died in the Cultural Revolution. And then, when Deng Xiaoping started to open up, the reform and opening-up policies, implementing the policies of Friedrich List, the German economist, and really also the American System of economy, by concentrating on the increase of the productivity of the population as the source of wealth, they made the most spectacular improvement by using what Lyndon LaRouche, my late husband, would call the "machine-tool principle": By recognizing that innovation, the discovery of universal physical principles, as scientific and technological progress, when you apply that in the production it increases productivity and with that, you increase the wealth, the living standard, the longevity of people. And that is how China has uplifted 850 million out of poverty, created a growing, happy middle class of people who have a clear, positive idea about the future.

And China is continuously betting on the most advanced technologies: We talked about space mission to the far side of the Moon, the Mars mission, and now China has concluded together with Russia an agreement to jointly develop the Moon, Moon villages; and China will have, next year, their own space station in 2022. They already said, they were excluded from the Artemis mission, but their Chinese space station will be a model for international cooperation; it will be open for any country that wants to cooperate.

So, what do you want to criticize about that, when the people

are getting better? Their living standard is improving. Most people are happy with what the government is doing. The young people are motivated to study, to learn, the government is putting a lot of emphasis on the aesthetical education, because, as Xi Jinping said, the aesthetical education is extremely important because it produces beautiful minds. They just declared the Teachers Day, or they changed the Teachers Day of education, from Sept. 14 to Sept. 28, because that's the birthday of Confucius.

So, if you look at the reality of what China is doing, they are doing a lot of things absolutely right, and the people who are accusing China of all these horrible things, of "internal oppression, external aggression"—well, I want to say that this is, for the most part, a projection of their own evil thoughts of the accusers. And that is all you can say about it, because, ask any developing country—ask the people in Africa, in Latin America, in the Caribbean, in most Asian countries what they think about the win-win cooperation with China? They say it's good for China, but it's also good for us! The West is nowhere, Europeans are not building railways, Americans are not building industrial parks, so, it is simply like that.

I really wanted to say that, because I know it's very controversial, but I can assure you, I'm not saying that for any reason but that this is my complete conviction, which, I have formed my opinion over almost half a century—actually 50 years, because I was in China the first time in 1971, and I have visited many times in between. And I have seen with my own eyes the transformation of this country. And, one also has to say, at the same time, the United States and Europe are not progressing. In Europe, you don't see positive changes; in the United States, the infrastructure is collapsing.

So people should stop having these ideological spectacle, and look at the world for what it is, and they will be much more productive.

SCHLANGER: Just a couple of points on this double standard: Blinken, the U.S. Secretary of State, talking about the “rules-based order” said that “China is challenging all the rules, values and relationships that make the world work the way we want it”: That’s the unilateralism. That’s the British geopolitical doctrine that after the fall of communism in 1990, the world has to come under a U.S.-dominated “rules-based order.” And anyone who goes against that gets crushed.

Now, similarly, you mentioned Adm. Philip Davidson. He accused China of “engaging in efforts to coerce, corrupt and collapse governments.” This coming from a U.S. military official, when what have we been doing *repeatedly* in the Middle East, in Ukraine, in targetting Belarus and other countries? So this double standard we see all the time. And this is something people don’t think about when they get into a knee-jerk reaction against China.

The Schiller Institute is going to be sponsoring a conference on March 20-21, a two-day online conference, taking up this question of the direction of the Biden administration, after two months in office. And I encourage people to go to the Schiller Institute website, <https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/20210320-conference>, to register for that.

Helga, do you have anything else to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I think this coming conference will be extremely fascinating. The first panel, we decided to reverse the usual order, and every time we’ve had a conference in the past, we always said, when we had the cultural panel, usually at the end, that this was really the most important, and why don’t we put this at the beginning? This time we will do that: We will discuss the absolute crisis of education, so all the teachers and parents, professors are invited to participate. We will discuss the true dialogue of civilization, how nations can work together, and how the torch of progress was really passed from one civilization and one culture to the next, and

this gives us many, many clues. We will talk about Dante, 700th anniversary of the birth of Dante. Naturally, it's still the Year of Beethoven, so we will have a lot of music, beautiful poetry. So that will be the first panel, you should absolutely subscribe to and watch.

Then we will have an extremely important discussion on the strategic situation. We have already important speakers from the major countries, the United States, Russia, China, European countries, Africa.

And then we will have a panel on Sunday, March 21, devoted especially to Southwest Asia, because this is a region of the world which has an incredible danger—Yemen, 20 million people are in danger of dying from hunger! Syria, a country which is starving to death. You have a situation in Afghanistan, very dangerous. Iraq, dangerous, but potentially good. So, we will have a whole panel with speakers from these countries on the dangers, but also how to fix it, by expanding the New Silk Road from Iran to Egypt, to Turkey, into Europe, rebuilding Syria, rebuilding the war-torn countries. Basically, undoing the damage which was done through the endless wars, because the suffering of the people this region has to end. There will also be some discussion about the East European developments and the Indo-Pacific.

This will be a very important strategic discussion, and then we will end with the work of the Committee of the Coincidence of Opposites. And that hopefully will give you all a perspective for how to get out of this crisis. So you should really participate in this conference, and spread the knowledge that it will be taking place as far as you can.

SCHLANGER: So you can register for it at <https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/20210320--conference>. It's March 20-21, a week from this coming Saturday and Sunday. Helga, thanks for joining us, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

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

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

c

I sin ugentlige dialog advarede Helga Zepp-LaRouche om, at de totalt unødvendige dødsfald og lidelser i Texas og andre amerikanske delstater på grund af en polarkoldfront giver et tegn på hvad der vil ske, hvis den "store nulstilling" og dens grønne New Deal ikke stoppes. Disse dødsfald er ikke resultatet af en "naturkatastrofe", men en advarsel om hvad for en fremtid vi står overfor, hvis nedlæggelsen af kul- og atomkraftbaseret elektricitetsproduktion ikke tilbagerulles. Den nye EIR-rapport, "The Great Leap Backwards" ("Det store spring bagud"), giver både en analyse af de tydelige farer ved

at vedtage en grøn dagsorden, og et alternativ baseret på hendes afdøde mands, Lyndon LaRouches, videnskabelige idéer.

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

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

Afskrift på engelsk:

Deaths from Power Outages in Texas Give a Foretaste of Things To Come with the Green New Deal

The LaRouche Organization Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Wednesday, February 17, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger with our weekly

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

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

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

Since we have this new report out, "The Great Leap Backward—LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal," and the Great Reset, there we have warnings in it, that this will lead to blackouts and the blackouts could be even more dramatic. We have the case of the EU, where studies were made by the scientific advisory service to the German Parliament, already nine years ago, that you could have a collapse of the entire European energy grid, and that would have much more devastating consequences than even this. But this is bad enough. I think 4 million people in Texas, in the U.S., and 5 million people in the north of Mexico are without electricity.

Now, that means people can die in the cold, they can die of the effects of it in various ways, and I think it's quite important that the former governor of Texas, Rick Perry, who was also the Energy Secretary in the Trump administration, blasted this in a very powerful way, saying that if you cut out coal, if you cut out nuclear energy, then you are completely dependent on an ideologically based energy policy, and people are dying! And that is what would happen if you have an energy policy defined by such people as AOC [Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez] and the like.

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

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

But Helga we have another problem that this comes up against, which is the absolute dysfunction of the political parties in the United States, with a feud going on in the Republican

Party which broke out this week; with the Democrats somewhat chaotic and stuck with nothing but the Green New Deal. How does this look to you?

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

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

SCHLANGER: One of the things that The LaRouche Organization is doing is conducting a series of dialogues, such as the one from last Saturday on U.S. Russia policy. [https://laroucheorganization.nationbuilder.com/forum_worsening_u_s_russian_relations_reverse_them_with_new_paradigm_or_face_nuclear_war] It is clear that the war machine that was never removed under President Trump is now back on all gears, targetting Russia and China. Where do you see this headed?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It is extremely dangerous. We had the Atlantic Council Paper, "The Longer Telegram," so-called, basically referring to the "long telegram" paper by George Kennan from 1946, now referring to the need to have regime change against

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

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

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

Russian grouping.

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

I mean, if you put yourself in the shoes of Russia and China, what is the natural consequence of these policies coming from the U.S., from the EU, from Great Britain? Already in October 2020, at the annual Valdai conference, Putin raised the possibility—this is not the first time it was raised, but he raised it publicly at this Valdai conference—the possibility of a Russian-Chinese military alliance. And this was brought up again on Feb. 4, this year, in a meeting between Wang Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, and Sergey Lavrov, discussing this option. Now, Putin in some context, also said it's not necessary, but obviously, it would be a major change in the strategic situation. What it would do is, it would protect China, if China would sort of come under the nuclear umbrella of the Russian nuclear forces, which are sizable, they're extremely modernized; Putin had introduced these new weapons systems, the hypersonic missiles, the nuclear-powered submarines—all weapons systems which sort of make the previous plans for a global missile defense system by the U.S. and by NATO obsolete; obviously, all these countries are working high-speed in their own hypersonic missiles, so it's a dangerous arms race.

But, it would mean, if China would come under the nuclear umbrella of Russia, it would completely change the situation for good; it would basically make a limited nuclear attack on China impossible, unless you want to have World War III all

the way. It would basically allow China a greater flexibility in dealing with the problems in the South China Sea, in respect to Taiwan. It would definitely have an incredible signal effect on all the countries participating in the Belt and Road Initiative. It would basically give them assurance that there can be a peaceful win-win cooperation.

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

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

of every single country on the planet, if we want to overcome the danger of nuclear war.

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

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

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, I think it's being seriously looked at. I think the Chinese government has started an investigation, exactly of what the effect would be, as you say, on the military sector, on the production of fighter jets, and if this escalation increases, one could actually see that happening. That would be a sort of nuclear bomb, but it would be one of these signs of a prewar situation if it happens.

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

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: The situation in Yemen is a complete tragedy, and also I can only say the world community which allows this to happen—I mean, the Yemen population is the worst humanitarian catastrophe in years; it's escalating; everybody knows it, nobody does anything decisive about it. Right now you have 2 million Yemeni children under the age of 5 who are in acute malnutrition; 400,000 of those are in acute severe malnutrition, which is acute danger of starvation. Now how easy would it be to tell the Saudis, "you open the ports, you allow the entrance of food aid," and if the EU and the United

States and some other countries would really put their foot down, it could be remedied, practically in a week! The fact that this is not happening, I really think that the EU policies on the question of refugees, what they have done with Frontex [EU's border guard] backing and participating in the pushback operations against refugees, all of these policies are completely inhuman, and I think any nation in Europe that wants to have a decent policy should leave the EU! The EU and NATO, right now, are really alliances which are completely against the interests of the member states, and there is no need to have a bureaucracy in Brussels.

Look what they did in terms of getting vaccines: Ursula von der Leyen is a complete failure; this woman was a problem when she German Defense Minister. Now her record as the so-called President of EU Commission is a disaster. Why does she not resign? She should resign! And I think the European nations should leave the EU and form an alliance as republics of "fatherlands" as de Gaulle was calling for it, and you can have a multinational cooperation for the development of Africa, for the reconstruction of Southwest Asia, and you don't need a supranational bureaucracy.

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

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

ZEPP-LAROCHE: We have to see. Right now, you have the Lega being in the government, and they have one minister post; I

think one big test case will be what happens to the Messina Bridge and also the Taranto steel plant, which Draghi basically wants to shut down, and the EU wants to shut down: This steel plant is the production facility which could actually produce the amount of steel needed for the Messina Bridge [to Sicily], which obviously would completely change the dynamic in terms of the Mezzogiorno, bringing real development to Southern Italy and Sicily. And the Lega basically wants to convince Draghi to go ahead with this bridge. Let's see how this plays out: Draghi made his first speech in the Senate which was unfortunately, everything one could expect. He made the absurd statement saying that the more there is European integration, the more Italian, the Italians become. He also called for Schumpeter-like "creative destruction," saying that some industries are not worth saving. So this is exactly what one could expect from somebody who has been in the ECB for many years, and demanding all kinds of "reforms" which created the problems in which Italy right now finds itself. So this does not look good.

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Obviously. Look, for the Mars missions—I'm still most impressed by this U.A.E. operation, because this was a Mars mission which was only started, I think six years ago; so, in an incredible speed, they caught up, at least with Japanese help, but nevertheless, and they have now an spacecraft in Mars orbit. This shows you that any developing

nation—after all the Gulf States only discovered oil less than 30 years ago—and turned from total desert states into, in some cases, states which are really doing quite remarkable things, in terms of for example, the Emirates have an island which they irrigated and turned into beautiful gardens and forests. And when my husband and I were in Abu Dhabi in 2002, he made a speech there on the future of oil; this was organized by the Zayed Center. And he basically said, look, forget oil as a fossil fuel, it's too precious and should be used for chemical production, for pharmaceutical production, and use the revenue to invest in the production of water, that will green the deserts.

[https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2002/eirv29n23-20020614/eirv29n23-20020614_006-the_middle_east_as_a_strategic_c-lar.pdf]

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

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

else you will not live, and you will not exist.

And the kind of international cooperation among astronauts which we have seen on the International Space Station (ISS), that is the model for the future cooperation among nations, like the United States, Russia, China, India, Europe—the best policy of Europe is their work on ESA, the European Space Agency, where its head, Mr. Jan Wörner, is enthusiastically speaking about the village on the Moon all the time; and ESA has just put out a request for young people to be trained as astronauts. That program should be enlarged. Europe should have a much, much larger space program, and if a small country like the Emirates can have a Mars mission, why cannot Germany have a Mars mission on its own? You know, Germany right now is in place 27, in terms of the number of people being vaccinated; the Emirates are in place 6 or 7.

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

SCHLANGER: Well, Helga, it's always good to end with a healthy dose of optimism, as you just did. For our viewers, let me remind you: You can get the new report "A Great Leap

Backward-LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal” on why we have to defeat the Great Reset and the Green New Deal, go to <https://schillerinstitute.com> and get an invoice for it.

And Helga, I guess that’s what we have now, so we’ll see you next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: And join the Schiller Institute!

“Vi har så meget at opdage” om vores univers Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 10. februar 2021

I sin ugentlige dialog i dag stillede Helga Zepp-LaRouche de spændende horisonter, der blev åbnet af tre næsten samtidige rumflyvninger med ankomst til Mars, i modsætning til det igangværende polariserende cirkus i det amerikanske senats retssag mod tidligere præsident Trump. Mars-missionerne, sagde hun, "viser, hvor menneskeheden skal hen... Vi har så meget at opdage." Hun pegede på de russiske og kinesiske forskeres vellykkede udvikling af COVID-vacciner og deres vilje til at dele dem, som et andet eksempel på den form for samarbejde, der kræves i en krisetid som denne.

Se i stedet på den utrolige situation i USA rettet imod Donald Trump og hans tilhængere. De seneste afslørninger der viser,

at ledere af oprøret fra de "Stolte drenge" (Proud Boys) og "Ed-vogtere" (Oath Keepers) var forbundet til FBI, gør det klart, at angrebet på kongresbygningen den 6. januar ikke blev tilskyndet af Trump, men faktisk var en "fælde". Og mens skueprocessen fortsætter, er der en optrapning for regimeskifter mod Putin og Xi, der anføres på vegne af dem, der presser på for den store nulstilling (Great Reset). Hun opfordrede seerne til at studere den kommende EIR-specialrapport om den store nulstilling/grønne New Deal (www.larouche.org/eir) og til at deltage i rundbordsdiskussionen om optrapningen af konflikten mod Rusland denne lørdag kl. 19 dansk tid (www.schillerinstitute.com), som nødvendige skridt til at blive de oplyste borgere, der kræves for at skabe et nyt paradigme for samarbejde blandt suveræne stater.

Se Helgas webcast her: [Webcast](#)

Afskrift på Engelsk:

We Have So Much to Discover' About Our Universe

The LaRouche Organization Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Wednesday, February 10, 2021 <https://laroucheorganization.nationbuilder.com/20210210-zepp-larouche-webcast>

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger. Welcome to our weekly dialogue with Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's February 10, 2021.

And we're seeing some extraordinary developments in the United States, of chaos, of the circus-type environment around the impeachment. Helga, what's your best reading of what's going

on around this situation?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: It is a circus, but let me say something optimistic in the beginning: because you have three Mars missions—one is already in orbit from the U.A.E., another one today from China, and then still another one from the United States on Feb. 18. So that shows you where mankind should be going. But before we come to that, let's look at what needs to be overcome, and one of those situations is exactly what you are referring to, the unbelievable situation in the United States. Looking at it from a distance, so to speak, I think it's a very, very dangerous development because you have a clear effort to declare former President Trump a non-person; you have a trampling on the Constitution. Yesterday, 56 Senators voted for impeachment, which means they don't respect the Constitution, because the Constitution says you can only impeach a sitting President or official, but not a former one. And it is clearly designed to completely confuse the population, brainwash the population.

It will increase the polarization, and the whole thing is phony, because there is now plenty of evidence that the storming of the Capitol was planned long before Jan. 6, probably immediately after the election took place, there were preparations. The FBI now has evidence that there were 200 people, whom they arrested on Jan. 6, who were involved in the preplanning: Some of these people were FBI informants, or had high-level security clearance from the FBI, such as some of the people from the Proud Boys, and also the so-called Oath Keeper head Caldwell. So, this is a sting operation if you ever have seen one, and it is clearly designed to make sure that Trump can never run for office again, so the whole thing is fraudulent.

But you have to see it in the context of other things which are going on in the United States as well: And that is, censorship. What we had seen already beginning against then-President Trump when he gave press conferences, the major TV

stations intervened and said, “no, we don’t agree with the content of what he is saying,” overriding and overruling the President of the United States. Now you have a whole pattern of blogs and websites are being banned by the social media. You cannot mention certain words any more. If you say “vote fraud” you are being banned; if you say certain other things which don’t fit the official narrative, so it completely suppresses any kind of open discussion and the First Amendment. And then, you have this very worrisome effort to criminalize the Trump base: Naturally one is against violence of any kind, but when the former CIA station chief for Afghanistan and Pakistan, and Director of the CIA Counter Terrorism Center—a person called Robert Grenier—says one has to use the same methods one used against insurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq against those domestic terrorists, because they swim in a larger environment of support in the population.

This is really incredible: This should upset any person who loves democracy, for that matter, or freedom. And I think it is creating an atmosphere of real—I think McCarthyism is a mild word for saying it—and it’s a very dangerous development. So I can only call on all people to keep free debate, keep open truth-seeking of matters, and—I think it’s a very dangerous development, that’s all I can say.

SCHLANGER: What I find interesting is that parallel to what’s being done against Trump and the Trump supporters, is the escalation for regime change in Russia against Putin, which sort of goes back to the whole issue of Russiagate as targetting both the United States *and* Russia. What’s the latest you have on this anti-Putin move?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, this Navalny story is really a concoction. First of all we should remember that Navalny was not very well-known in Russia until recently, until this so-called “poisoning” through the Russian government was supposedly happening.

As a matter of fact, if you look at his older statements, he is a rightwing person, he called some people "cockroaches" and using a language which we know from Germany from 80 years ago, so he's not exactly a hero or a nice person. But he is being used to absolutely go for street demonstrations to finance those; there is this video which was published by RT, where one of his top campaign managers, Vladimir Ashurkov, is seen in 2012, where he talks to a member of the British embassy who in reality was an MI6 agent, where Ashurkov asks this British so-called diplomat for \$10-\$20 million a year, because that would enable them to organize mass demonstrations in Russia.

So this is the reality of this operation, and Maria Zakharova just said in a press conference, that it is very clear that there are powerful circles behind Navalny from the West, and some of them demonstrated in these street demonstrations, members from the embassies and consulates, from Germany, from Poland and from Sweden, which is going against any statutes and standards of the diplomatic service. So Russia expelled these individuals; then, in a reciprocal move, these countries expelled Russian diplomats. But then the thing was crowned by an unbelievably provocative event, which just took place in Brussels, in the Polish mission to the EU, with EU participation, but also U.K., U.S., and Canada, and they basically discussed with Ashurkov and also another person, Leonid Volkov, who is another person from the Navalny team. And they discussed how all these countries should respond together to the jailing of Navalny.

This is a real intelligence operation, and it is aimed to create an environment where you have internal opposition emerging against Putin, and it has the same character as we discussed last week, with the paper of the Atlantic Council targetting Xi Jinping for regime change. [<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/atlantic-council-strategy-paper-series/the-longer-telegram/>]

Now, needless to say, that if from one nuclear power, and the

EU, they are running regime change operations against the other two major nuclear powers, this is really very, very dangerous. And I think, it's completely disgusting. Then also the so-called "foreign minister" of the EU Josep Borrell went to Moscow; he had discussions with Lavrov, supposedly they were very relaxed and friendly. But when Borrell went back to Brussels he gave a press conference and said that he mainly discussed Navalny and the question of human rights, so that then Lavrov said there are two stories: One is what Borrell said at the press conference in Moscow, and another was what he said when he was back in Brussels, so who is running EU foreign policy?

Lavrov also said, and this is extremely worrisome, that Germany would have opened secret files to Navalny when he was in Germany making this so-called movie about luxury mansion of Putin. In other words, the German secret services gave Navalny files which is extremely provocative. And it turns out now that this so-called luxury palace has been empty for many years; Putin has never been in it, and it is being restored to become a hotel. But it was manipulated with Photoshop methods, to look like a private mansion. So these are these methods, which are really prewar creating an enemy-image of a country, and I think it's completely disgusting.

Even more disgusting is that the German foreign minister Heiko Maas spent €21 million, obviously, of taxpayers' money, to finance the opposition in Belarus.

Now, I don't know—this is all really counterproductive, and it should be denounced. It's a kind of warmongering, and any clear-thinking citizen should really distance himself or herself from these kinds of operations.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned the Atlantic Council paper targetting Xi Jinping. There's also the commander of StratCom, the Strategic Command for the nuclear defense of the United States, talking about the likelihood of nuclear war, and the

Chinese are continuing to very strongly discuss that. At the same time, they're holding open the possibility of a better relationship. What's your reading on that?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: There was a very interesting article in *People's Daily*, where the author makes the point that if the United States is worried about a nuclear war, then the easiest thing not to have it, is not to make a strike against Russia or China, because it is China's policy under all circumstances, to have a no-first-nuclear-strike policy. And as you say, they again and again say now is the time to have a new definition of the relationship between the United States and China. So it is very clear that the warmongering comes not from Russia and people should not fall into this trap, because once you are in the dynamic where you keep shouting negative things, you know, you get a reaction. And the *Global Times* chief editor Hu Xijin, answered and said, "Well, obviously, China must increase its nuclear arsenal, and build at least 1,000 ICBMs to be credible," but that is the kind of reaction you get. And I think the world is really confronted with so many real problems, that this kind of geopolitical warmongering is really more superfluous than anything else on this planet.

SCHLANGER: One of the problems we've been focussed on is the push for the Green New Deal, a global green economy, a green financial bubble, and this just continues to unfold with Biden's initial executive orders. But there is a real reaction against it from certain countries. How is this developing over the last week?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: It is a bubble, as we discussed many times. The financial system is hopelessly bankrupt. The central banks have pumped money, trillions and trillions into the system since 2008, when you already had a systemic crisis, and it is very clear this cannot be maintained forever. So in one sense, this idea to pump another \$30 trillion into the system for green investments, which will ruin the economy! If you go to

these low energy flux-density levels, you cannot maintain a modern industrial power, and it really is a last-ditch effort to bail out the banks, to bail out the speculators. And it is more than cynical: One aspect is, and this is unbelievable, that the EU, otherwise famous for their pushback operation in the context of Frontex, which shows you what the mindset is of these bureaucrats; but what they have now done is they have made agreements with 31 African countries to mass produce solar and wind energy and turn it into hydrogen; ship the hydrogen then from Africa to Europe because if you go all green technology and energy in Europe, you cannot build as many wind parks (one shouldn't call them "parks")—offshore and onshore wind hubs and solar panels in Europe, because it would cover the entire territory with these things. So what they are planning to do, is to import 80% of their energy from these operations in Africa.

Now, obviously the African nations are poor and they are desperate for all kinds of deals, but it ruins the environment in Africa, it means no industrial development, which is what they really would need, and just shows you the absolutely cynical character of this Green policy, which one can only call an "eco-dictatorship" and in reality, "eco-fascism": Because it does reduce the population capacity of the Earth, and therefore, one can call it an eco-fascist policy, for sure.

SCHLANGER: One thing we're seeing in Europe, particularly in Germany, is rising prices for electricity, and also a new wave of industrial layoffs, and this is also pretty troubling.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yes, the economy is collapsing. You have massive layoffs in all major industries, Thyssen, MAN, and various others, but also many small and medium industries are going bankrupt. And the energy prices increase, I think there was in January alone, in Germany, an energy price increase of 7.5% at once, and when all of these schemes are implemented, it will get worse and worse. And the idea behind it is what

the Greens have discussed since a long time: To change the behavior of the population by increasing the prices such that most people cannot afford electric appliances, or warm heating, or going by train somewhere. So it is really an absolute imposition of massive austerity policy, de facto, in respect to the living standard of the population. We should really fight against it.

We will be bringing out tomorrow, *Executive Intelligence Review* will publish a Special Report on the Green New Deal, on the Great Reset, and I can only encourage our viewers to get this report, because this is designed to explain to people what will be the effect of such a policy and what can be done against it.

SCHLANGER: The other thing we should take up is this question of what went wrong in Europe, in particular, with the vaccines, what EU Commission President Ursula von der Leyen did to make it impossible for people to get vaccinated in many European countries. But at the same time, the Russian vaccine, which everyone was scoffing at and making fun of, now is becoming almost a prize for the Russians. What can you say about this?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It is very clear that the EU—that's now being discussed everywhere—I mean, the EU does not care about its member states and their population. So they were falling behind very massively in ordering vaccines, and now there is a recognition that if European are going to get themselves vaccinated, they'd better buy vaccines from Russia and China. Even Alexander Dobrin from the [Bavarian Christian Social Union] CSU said that this is what should be done. And Merkel talked with Putin and also with Xi Jinping, so this is underway.

But if you look at China, they have now said that they will donate vaccines to 53 developing countries, and in addition to that, they have agreements for sale of vaccines to another 22

countries. They have developed altogether six vaccines, and I think all the slanders against China are really contradicted by what is happening in terms of deeds. So, I think there is a clear tendency to recognize that all these accusations against China are completely ill-founded.

SCHLANGER: I find it interesting: We started with the question of the Mars missions, and I know we'll talk about in just a moment, but at the same time, we're seeing the potential that exists in Russia and China for scientific breakthroughs that are of benefit to the whole world. And of course, in the United States as well, the vaccine program is moving ahead, although there are problems.

But let's go back now to the question of Mars. This is really extraordinary—this is a big week. I don't know if there's an air traffic control system on Mars, but there's a lot of incoming spacecraft!

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: This is really exciting, because yesterday, the orbiter Hope from the United Arab Emirates, the U.A.E., arrived in orbit of Mars, and they will make images of weather patterns on Mars for future expeditions. This is very exciting, because if you look at some of the pictures from the laboratories in the United Arab Emirates, you see all these men and women—the men dressed in their typical Arabic garb—and it's just such a completely different image about the future of the Arab world. The last time the Arab world was in the forefront of science was in the Abbasid dynasty, around the time of Haroun al-Rashid, al-Mansur, al-Mamun, and at that time Baghdad was the most advanced science city in the world. The Caliphs gave gold to anybody who would bring a discovery, from Egypt, from Spain, from Italy, and weigh them in gold. And this time, the head of the U.A.E. Space Agency said that they chose one of the most difficult missions, namely to go to Mars, because they thought the challenge would be such that it would provoke the greatest leap forward, the leapfrogging in science and technology. And you know what the average age is

of these engineers? Twenty-seven years! And one-third of them are women. So if there is *any* way to catch up with the future, and modern world, it is exactly that.

And they quote especially a poet, whose name is Al Mutanabbi, but he was born in 915, and they quote him saying, "If you ventured in pursuit of glory, don't be satisfied with less than the stars." So I think this is very beautiful.

And as I said, today is the Tianwen-1, it has reached the orbit of Mars. It will be there for a while, and then they will plan very carefully the landing on Mars; I think it will happen in three months. But then, they have a lander and a rover, so this will be a very carefully preplanned operation.

And then, on Feb. 18th, you will have the Perseverance mission from NASA, also a lander and a rover.

So I think this idea that the future of mankind is the colonization of space, and that the best thing which could happen is that all countries work together. The way to overcome geopolitical conflict on Earth is to start to really reach for the stars, to colonize the Moon and Mars, and prepare for future interstellar travel of mankind as one.

I mean, if you look at mankind from space, you see that our little, blue planet is very small, it's very fragile, and the universe is incredibly big. We have not discovered the first secrets yet—there's so much to discover, in 2 trillion galaxies, which we know for sure to exist. So it's really time to overcome what I call the infancy of mankind, where people squabble over territory. If we go for space science, we can completely transform everything which is called a "resource," and conflicts now which seem to be so big, will completely vanish once we reach the next phase, the next era of human civilization. So I think this is good reason for optimism.

SCHLANGER: Yes, of course, and in keeping with your late husband's life work, to have that kind of cooperation, what

your friend Krafft Ehrlicke called the Extraterrestrial Imperative. And we should note that we're coming up on the second anniversary of Lyndon LaRouche's passing. And on that date, Feb. 12, there will be on the website, 24 hours of videos for people to become more familiar with Lyndon LaRouche.

And Helga just to conclude, in terms of addressing the geopolitical crisis, the Schiller Institute is sponsoring a roundtable this weekend to discuss the situation in Russia. Do you want to say something about that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, this will be a roundtable of experts; we already have very renowned speakers, Sen. Mike Gravel, I think agreed; then, Professor Edward Lozansky from the American University in Moscow, we also have possibly; Mr. Alex Krainer, the author of *Grand Deception*, the book on Bill Browder; possibly another expert from Russia; maybe Ray McGovern. So it will be a very important round of people to discuss both what's behind the operation and why the truth has to be gotten out to neutralize it. So you should all tune in on Saturday at 1 p.m. Eastern Time. So, see you then.

SCHLANGER: Yes, 1 p.m. this time. And I think people would find it not just fascinating but crucial, to address the crises we've been discussing. Helga, thanks for joining us, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week!

Overvind Davos' "store

**omstilling" med LaRouches nye
paradigme.**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche,
den 27. januar 2021**

Se Helgas Ugentlige webcast, her:

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

Mens Helga Zepp-LaRouche var forsigtigt optimistisk med hensyn til Biden-Putin-aftalen om at ratificere en femårig NY START-atomnedrustningsaftale, sagde hun, at Bidens belæring af Putin

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

Engelsk afskrift:

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

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

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: It's a mixed bag, because on the one side, you have all the CEOs of the large firms and banks, BlackRock, Standard Chartered, you have basically the people who—they don't talk about the Great Reset any more because that has been discredited a lot, so they're calling it the "Great Transition." For example, Bill Winters who's the CEO of Standard Chartered bank, said this is the great \$50 trillion opportunity for the next ten years; others like Philip Hildebrand, the Vice President of BlackRock and so forth, they're all saying they need a lot private finance, private

investment. Basically this is a scheme to transform the world economy, get rid of fossil fuels, naturally no emphasis on nuclear energy, and it would mean to bring the energy flux-density of the world down to a level where, for sure, the present level of more than 7 billion people cannot be maintained. As a matter of fact, Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, the former head of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, he had said many times that he thought the ideal population for the world is 1 billion, and if these policies of these people would be implemented, you would destroy the world's industrial capacities. Because if you eliminate fossil fuels—first of all there are clean coal plants now; secondly if you eliminate coal plants, especially for the developing sector, there is no way how you can prevent mass death! And obviously, this is the hidden, or not so hidden, implication of all of these schemes.

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

So I think the fact that China is just existing, and is offering a different model of development, including having now started to deliver vaccines for the COVID pandemic to 150 countries, is setting a different tone. And if these oligarchs of the big banks and corporations want to push through their scheme it just means they will dismantle the industries of the United States and Europe and other countries

that go along with that; but I don't think that they can win. So it is a sign of the times that Chancellor Merkel, who spoke after Xi Jinping basically supported Xi Jinping in his idea of having multilateralism. She said she does not want to be put in a position where she has to choose where one bloc is centered around the United States and another one is centered around China, and that she thinks future relations must be based on multilateralism.

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

However, I just got a report before we started this program, about the speech of President Putin, and while I didn't have time to read it at length, I think some of the elements which he said are extremely important: Because he said that the danger is that the world risks a conflict of all against all if global development concerns are not taken care. And he also said that he really hopes that it will not come to a hot global conflict, because this could mean the end to our civilization. [http://en.kremlin.ru/events/-president/news/64938]

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

I think this Davos virtual summit is just a measurement of where the different forces in the world stand. I think the

decisions are being made by the central banks and the forces of Wall Street, City of London, Silicon Valley, and that is the new oligarchical power, which is the real problem.

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

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

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

largest nuclear powers stop talking, then this is the most dangerous. So while I'm not saying that this is resolving anything, I think it is an important first step. And it is important, because the world is really in a very dangerous situation, so I think that that's what one can say about it.

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, there is obviously an effort to beef up the production of vaccines. I think there are efforts being made. But now, there's a huge scandal in Europe, because—this is unfortunately true, that the EU was very slow in ordering vaccines; they clearly had the idea of saving money rather than ordering as many different products from different firms and then see which one comes first, and there is no danger to order too many, because if you have too much you can give it all the other countries in need. So this was clearly not done by [European Commission President Ursula] Von Der Leyen; she's now targetted even in {Bildzeitung}—this tabloid—that she did not order, and that the result is in Germany, it's going very slowly; in other countries in Europe, it's going very slowly, and this is a reflection of the same austerity mentality which is really—I hope it shortens the career of Von Der Leyen, because she is just the wrong person to be in any leading position in Europe.

The real problem, however, is what the head of the African Union and President of South Africa Cyril Ramaphosa said, who pointed to the fact that so far the rich countries have mostly cared for themselves, and he said there will be no solution to the pandemic as long as one country is not having the

necessary vaccines. And Tedros from the World Health Organization said that the behavior of the rich countries so far, which got themselves 95% of all the vaccine orders, and leaving the so-called third world with only 5%, that this is a "catastrophic moral failure." One can only hope that this is being remedied as quickly as possible, because it now turns out that the idea that Africa was having relatively little problems with COVID-19, turns out not to be true, and as we suspected, it was only due to non-reporting, little testing; and now it comes out through a study from a university in Zambia, that especially the age group between 19 and 59 years of age have the highest mortality rate, {and} children! Now, as we also know there are new strains in Britain, in South Africa, and in Brazil, which are much more lethal and also spread more quickly; and there are now medical experts warning that what could happen is that one of these new mutations, new variants, could develop to become vaccine-resistant. If that would happen, then we would be in a very dramatic situation.

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

So either there is a change in the attitude, that people understand that you have to start to build modern health systems in every single country, or this cannot be controlled, that rethinking has not yet started in a serious fashion and that's what the Schiller Institute is campaigning for.

Because unless we take this crisis to really start to overcome the underdevelopment of the developing countries in a serious way, there is no guarantee that this will not lead to a major crisis. And I think Putin, in his speech in Davos reflected that dimension very clearly, that out of chaos you could have a global catastrophe.

The ILO just reported that the loss of jobs in 2020 was equivalent to 255 million fulltime jobs. I don't think that covers all the shadow industry jobs, but that's a significant number, and they expect another 130 million losses in 2021, and they say this does not yet take into account the likelihood of a fourth and a fifth wave. So that all makes clear that we have to change the whole situation: I cannot see a willingness right now on the side of the central banks in Europe, the United States, to go in that direction, but that will be a subject of mobilizing the population, because if these institutions are unable to reform—and you know, if you look at the situation, with the riots having now spread to Holland, where for four days you had massive riots in 10 cities; last week we had the same thing in Denmark. This was not unlike the mob which stormed the Capitol on Jan. 6 in the United States, and if you now have more job losses, more unemployment, the danger of blackouts—we have a huge danger that if this Green energy policy is implemented that you will have blackouts leading to complete chaos, I think this could really lead to major social upheavals, and the only way to avoid that would be to really go for our program, starting with the health system in every country. And we have published this program for 1.5 billion productive new jobs, which have to be created [https://larouchepub.com/-special_report/2020/larouche-plan-for-1500000000-jobs.pdf]. And despite the coronavirus condition there has to be a rethinking and there has to be a vision for the population to see the light at the end of the tunnel, that even if some of these things will be very difficult to implement under coronavirus conditions, I think it is important that there is

a willingness by the leading institutions to address that.

Xi Jinping in his speech in Davos also mentioned that he wants to strengthen the G20, because he said that that is the institution to build up global governance—well, that is important because as long as you have some countries at least in that combination that go in a different direction, it is important. And just to mention it, China has had last year 550,000 new patents, which is an increase of 17%; that is because the Chinese government put a lot of emphasis on science and technological progress innovation, and there was just a study by a German university that found that the civil law in China is compatible to Western standards, essentially because they took the entire canon of civil law in Germany as a model to write their Chinese civil law. So the university study comes to the conclusion that this an absolutely Western standard and there's no reason to complain about it.

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

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, there was the vote in the Senate where only five Republican Senators voted with the Democrats, so the

impeachment trial will start on Feb. 9th, but I think it has almost zero chance to succeed, because they would need 17 Republican Senators to go along, and there are already now many voices that there is no basis in the Constitution to even do that, because the Constitution does not allow for private persons to be impeached. So you can impeach a sitting President, but not a former President. So that is a big argument. And the whole campaign is ludicrous in the first place, because Trump did not incite violence and the mob to storm the Capitol, despite the narrative which is being put out by the media and the Democrats. He gave a speech to his supporters! And then said, "let's move down Pennsylvania Avenue," and "we have to take back the country"—I mean, these are normal things to say; many politicians have said many things like that. So it's a complete orchestration, and to somehow now criminalize 75 million Trump voters is also not going to work.

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

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

SCHLANGER: Also a reflection of the old paradigm is the

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think it's going to be built. I think it's only few kilometers left. They restarted the completion of it, and the government spokesman of Merkel, Steffen Seibert said that this is not something which concerns the government, because it's a private contract between private firms, and even the Environment Minister Svenja Schulze said these were contracts which were made many years ago, and it would put into question the reliability of Germany as a partner in any kind of trade deal if they would now stop it. So I think this is interesting, and as I said, I do see baby steps of self-assertion on the side of the German government, and I think it is a tendency in Europe as well; and one could only hope that it would continue.

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

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

is the sign of the times.

The fact that China, Russia, about 150 other nations are going in this direction, I think this is something which is a hopeful development, and I don't think the efforts by the Biden Administration to go back to the old confrontation with China, with Russia—well, the only thing it can bring is World War III, in which case, nobody would enjoy it, not Biden, and not anybody of his cabinet. They have no way of crushing this ferment without causing World War III. Now, that's a real danger and I don't want to belittle it for one second. But I think that if people really think about, there is a way to solve this problem, and that is to do exactly what the American System of economy was, in the beginning of the American republic, what the German economic miracle was in the postwar period, to go back to scientific and technological progress, to go in the direction of increase of productivity, the Four Laws which were designed by my late husband, to go for global Glass-Steagall, get rid of the casino economy; implement national bank in every single country on the planet; then go in the direction of a credit system, cooperate in long-term development projects—it would bring the whole world out of this crisis!

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

we not have an alliance of republics working for the common good of all of humanity? That's what John Quincy Adams was advocating, and I think that that is exactly what is needed now.

And I also think this must be combined with a cultural renaissance: I think we have to realize in the West that this exaggerated liberalism, where you replace moral standards with the principle of everything is allowed, the more pornographic, the more violent, the more perverse something becomes, the more interesting it becomes—that was a wrong way! And I think we have lost our way in the West, and all we have to do, is to do the same thing that China is doing, what Russia is doing; they went back to their own high traditions of their high culture. There is a big revival of 5,000 years of tradition in China. Russia is doing the same thing. And we could do the same thing as well! In Europe, we have a {beautiful} European Classical period, we have the Italian Renaissance, the Andalusian renaissance, we have the Ecole Polytechnique in France; we have the German Classical period. In America, you have the principles of the American Revolution, the American System of economy. We have so many wonderful traditions which we could revive and be an absolute important shaping factor in the future world. And I think we have to mobilize the population to rally around that, and then solutions are possible.

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

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

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week!

Bidens opfordring til "Enhed" er ikke nok: Udvikling er det nye navn for enhed!

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche den 21. januar
2021**

Se Helgas Webcast på Schiller instituttets Youtube kanal her

I en vidtrækkende og meget provokerende dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte hun med at bemærke, at hvis Joe Biden virkelig er fast besluttet på at skabe "enhed", som han sagde i sin indvielsestale, skulle han vedtage pave Paul VI's rundskrivelse, "Udvikling er det nye navn for fred ", som sin politik. Dette ville kræve, at "identitetspolitik" droppes, samt den grønne New Deal – som han ikke viser tegn på at gøre – til fordel for LaRouche-bevægelsens plan for at skabe 1,5 milliarder produktive arbejdspladser, herunder udvikling af et moderne sundhedssystem i enhver nation for at håndtere COVID-pandemien.

Hun spurgte også, om den paranoia, som Hillary Clinton og

flertalsleder i Repræsentanternes Hus, Nancy Pelosi, viste over for Rusland og Trump-vælgerne, gør dem til "QAnon"-tvillingerne [QAnon er en højreekstremistisk konspirationsbevægelse]. På en indsigtfuld måde forklarede hun, at QAnon er en operation for psykologisk krigsførelse. Hun beskrev, hvordan QAnon har fælles træk med den romantiske bevægelse, som blev skabt af oligarkiet efter Napoleonskrigene, for at ødelægge klassiske tænkemåder til fordel for dissociative følelser.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche berettede, hvorfor hun mener, at EU's splittelse over den grønne New Deal, og de katastrofale virkninger det vil have på industrien, åbner døren til at besejre den.

Hun diskuterede også konsekvenserne af opdagelsen af nye varianter af COVID 19.

Uddrag:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg overværede selvfølgelig indsættelsen og hans tale. Først og fremmest er jeg ikke imponeret over hans kunstneriske smag. Jeg fandt, at Lady Gaga var temmelig forfærdelig; Hvis man sammenligner Marian Andersons smukke fremførelse af nationalhymnen ved indsættelsen af John F. Kennedy [og Dwight Eisenhower i 1957] og så Lady Gagas, så får man en fornemmelse af, hvad der er galt med kulturen.

Lad os nu sige, at vi giver Biden kredit for, at han mener, hvad han sagde, at han ønsker forsoning. Nuvel, så har jeg et ganske godt råd til ham – han er katolik, og så burde han læse pave Paul VI's Encyclical (rundskrivelse -red,), som han skrev i 1967, under titlen 'Populorum Progressio' – eller 'om folks udvikling' – og hvori han sagde, at "det nye navn for fred er udvikling". Og på samme måde kan man sige, at det "nye navn for enighed er udvikling". Den eneste måde man kan håbe på at have enighed inden for USA ville være at sætte et økonomisk program på dagsordenen, der giver produktive jobs til alle

amerikanere, hvilket ville annullere de økonomiske uretfærdigheder, der trods alt er grunden til, at Trump blev valgt i 2016, og til at alle Trump-vælgerne stadig holder fast ved ham. Så hvis han ønsker at have forsoning, må han gøre udvikling til det nye navn for enighed, og så vil det gå i samme retning internationalt.

Nu ved jeg ikke – men hvis han mener det alvorligt, er han nødt til at slippe af med identitetspolitik. Fordi så længe man deler folk op efter deres etnicitet eller deres seksuelle eller anden overbevisning eller forskel, er dette polariserende. Dette er nøjagtigt det modsatte af, hvad Martin Luther King sagde, nemlig at alt skal være inkluderende. Lad os nu se, hvad Biden gør; virkeligheden vil vise sig meget hurtigt ved hans gerninger og ikke ved ordene.

Meget mere kunne siges, men han er ny præsident, så lad os se hvad der sker. Hvis man ser på det hold han har valgt – tja, altså, mange kommer fra den gamle Obama-administration; mange har allerede udtrykt enighed med Pompeo, eksempelvis om holdningen til anti-Kina, anti-Rusland. Tony Blinken sagde, at han er enig med Pompeo mht. Kina, så det tegner ikke så godt... Så jeg tror, at mange ting skal ændres, og som jeg sagde, den eneste måde hvorpå Biden muligvis kunne forene USA ville være at bryde fuldstændigt med den politik, han har kæmpet for i valgkampen: 'the Green New Deal', fordi 'Green New Deal' betyder, at opgaven med at skaffe et produktivt job til enhver amerikaner er helt umulig. Så med mindre han ændrer politik, hvilket naturligvis ikke er sandsynligt, tror jeg ikke, at nogen af de ord han sagde, vil betyde meget.

Så lad os se. Mit råd til Biden ville være at støtte pavens rundskrivelse, 'Populorum Progressio', det "nye navn for enighed er udvikling".

SCHLANGER: To interessante aspekter ved præsident Trumps afgang: Den ene er, at vi endelig fik offentliggørelsen af noget af dokumentationen omkring Russiagate med frigivelsen af

FBI-interviewet med Christopher Steele, hvor Steele indrømmer, at han fremlagde dossieret, fordi han var bekymret over det britiske forhold til USA, og forhåbentlig kommer der mere. Det er lidt sent. Men jeg var ret skuffet over Trumps beslutning om at give en benådning til den korrupte Steve Bannon og ikke gøre noget i forhold til Julian Assange. Har du nogen tanker om det, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jo, 'skuffende' er et mildt ord – jeg synes, at undlade at benåde Assange kan virkelig ikke forsvares; der er ingen tvivl om, at Assange sidder i fængsel i Storbritannien for at have afdækket nogle virkelige forbrydelser. Han er en 'whistleblower', der skal have beskyttelse i ethvert samfund, der respekterer dets egne love. Så det er en trussel mod Assanges liv, og nu bliver det meget sværere at redde ham, så jeg mener, at dette absolut er uforsvarligt...

Engelsk afskrift:

Webcast With Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Call for 'Unity' Is Not Enough: Development Is the New Name of Unity!
January 21 (EIRNS)–Schiller Institute Weekly Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Thursday, January 21, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger with our weekly update with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and President of the Schiller Institute. It's Jan. 21st, 2021.

Well, we're three weeks into the New Year, and already it's been a year of surprises and tumult, chaos. We had yesterday the inauguration of Joe Biden, and I find it a bit ironic that Biden's main theme was unity, when I guess he intends to enforce unity through censorship, through a new Patriot Act—what did you make of his speech, Helga?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I watched the inauguration and his

speech, naturally. First of all, I'm not impressed by his artists tastes. I thought that Lady Gaga was quite horrible; if you compare the beautiful singing of Marian Anderson of the National Anthem at the inauguration of I think it was John F. Kennedy [and Dwight Eisenhower in 1957] and Lady Gaga, then you get a sense of what is wrong with the culture. [<https://www.gettyimages.com/detail/video/marian-johnson-sings-the-national-anthem-as-john-f-news-footage/173704298>]

Now, let's say we would give Biden the credit that he means what he said, that he wants to have unity. And well, then I have very good advice for him—he's a Catholic, and then he should read the Encyclical of Pope Paul VI that he wrote in 1967, which was called *Populorum Progressio*, or *On the Development of Peoples*, and in which he said that the "the new name for peace is development." And in the same way, one can say that the "new name for unity is development." The only way one can hope to have unity inside the United States would be to put on the agenda an economic program which would give productive jobs to every American, which would undo the economic injustices which are, after all, the reason why Trump was elected in 2016, and why all the Trump voters are still sticking to Trump. So, if he wants to have unity, he should make development the new name for unity, and internationally it would go in the same direction.

Now, I don't know—if he means it seriously, he has to get rid of identity politics. Because, as long as you divide people by their ethnic or sexual or other conviction or distinction, this is polarizing. This is exactly the opposite of what Martin Luther King said, that everything has to be inclusive. Now, let's see what Biden does, if the reality will show itself very quickly by its deeds and not by the words.

A lot more could be said, but he's a new President, so let's see what will happen. If you look at the team he has selected, well, many of those are from the old Obama Administration; many have come out already agreeing with Pompeo, for example,

on the anti-China, anti-Russia stance. Tony Blinken said he agrees with Pompeo on China, so that does not forebode very good. And one cannot forget that the shadow which is hanging over the Biden Administration is exactly what was done in the five years of the Trump candidacy in 2016, the four years of Trump's Presidency when we had Russiagate, we had the Mueller report, we had impeachment 1, impeachment 2; we had the collusion of the heads of intelligence with British intelligence against Trump for this entire period. So that is the heritage, and now, basically, if everybody who voted for Trump is potentially a domestic terrorist—well, if somebody is a white male and voted for Trump, if he is labeled a domestic terrorist, that makes about, at minimum, something like 40 million Americans domestic terrorists—I don't think that that will work for unity.

So, I think a lot of things have to be changed and as I said, the only way how Biden could possibly unify the United States, would be to completely break with the policy he has campaigned on in the election campaign: the Green New Deal, because the Green New Deal means that the task to have a productive job for every American is absolutely impossible. So if he doesn't change policy, which is not likely, obviously, I don't think any of the words that he said will mean much.

So, let's see. My advice to Biden would be to go with encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, the "new name for unity is development."

[http://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum.html]

SCHLANGER: Two interesting aspects of the departure of President Trump: One is that finally we got the declassification of some of the documentation around the Russiagate, with the release of the FBI interview of Christopher Steele, in which Steele admitted that he produced the dossier because he was worried about the British relationship with the United States, and hopefully there'll be

more coming. It's a little late. But, I was quite disappointed in Trump's decision to issue a pardon to sleazy Steve Bannon and not to do something with Julian Assange. Do you have some thoughts on that, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah, "disappointing" is a mild word, I think, not to pardon Assange is really not defensible, because there's no question that Assange is sitting in jail in Great Britain for having uncovered some real crimes. He's a whistleblower which should be protected in any society which respects the laws it has given itself. So it's a threat to Assange's life, and now it will be much more difficult to save him, so I think this is absolutely indefensible.

Concerning Bannon, this unfortunately is not a surprise, because it was clear for the better part of 2020, that Trump, who had distanced himself from Bannon, which was a good thing, had moved back into the influence domain of Bannon starting in April, when he started to say this line that the COVID virus was deliberately spread by China, which is scientifically ridiculous. Nobody in the world who has any knowledge about pandemics would argue like that, and it was also wrong. It is a matter of fact that China has done an enormous job to contain the virus, and to then immediately help a lot of other countries, first with masks, then with medical supplies, now with the vaccine.

So, it is wrong, and to say something like that is also dangerous, because it is creating an enemy-image, which in line with what the military-industrial complex is saying and doing against China, is creating an enemy-image for a potential future military conflict, which is really inexcusable.

I think this is really bad. And Trump also stuck to his line that the U.S. economy is doing great because the stock markets are going up, or are up—I mean, all of these are the weak points, and I don't think that that was a very good departure

at all.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned the strategic continuity between people like Blinken, the new Secretary of State, or would be Secretary of State, with Pompeo. We saw something that was quite hideous with Hillary Clinton and Pelosi conspiring to criminalize all 75 million Trump voters, but also continuing the targetting of Russia. If this continues, this is extremely dangerous.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I mean, sometimes one wonders if either Hillary Clinton and Nancy Pelosi are the Democratic version of QAnon, or, maybe the two ladies have a severe attack of paranoia. Because the idea, what Clinton actually said, that she thinks it's possible that Trump was on the telephone with Putin during the attack on the Capitol on Jan. 6—it's a world full of conspiracies, of insinuations; it's just completely, I think, deranged.

SCHLANGER: [laughs] I like that. The twin "Q Sisters."

Now, the other thing that's happening is we're seeing a kickoff in a couple of days of the Green New Deal with the World Economic Forum, the Davos group, pushing their Green policy based on the Great Reset. There's resistance developing to that. This really is no solution, but what do you think is going to come of this meeting, in the next few days?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: It will be interesting, because, it's a virtual meeting; it will be addressed by many heads of state. Not all of them are on this Green Deal line. You have President Alberto Fernández from Argentina, President Xi from China, Prime Minister Modi from India, Merkel, Macron; so I think we will hear quite different accentuations from these different leaders. But it is very clear that the Davos crowd—this is the top 2,000-3,000 CEOs of the top financial institutions and multinational corporations, they are pushing for the Green New Deal, the Great Reset, the idea of implementing a "stakeholder

capitalism," as they say. There will be a tremendous push to brainwash the whole world into accepting the idea that everything has to be Green, all investment must go into only Green technology. But the reality is there are now the first voices realizing, or speaking out, that this will be a catastrophe. For example, of a place where you would not necessarily expect it from—namely, an economist from Deutsche Bank, Eric Heymann—he put out a quite interesting article saying that the policy of the EU, which naturally also for the Green Deal, is very dishonest, because they're not telling people that this will only go through with a massive reduction in the living standards. And that, in turn, can only be implemented through massive eco-dictatorship, in other words, a complete bending of all legality and constitutionality by implementing dictatorial measures.

Now, that is slowly dawning on some people. For example, when the EU just recently tried to implement the infamous "taxonomy," as they're naming it, which means that all the firms have to give their CO₂ footprint, ten countries refused to do that, and the EU was forced to postpone this whole affair, because they couldn't get the unity—it was mostly East European and South European countries, that obviously have already been on the losing end in terms of the EU austerity policy, so their enthusiasm for the EU policy is very limited to say the least in the first place.

So, I think that this whole Green Deal is absolutely crazy. For example, the head of Toyota in Japan, Akio Toyoda, he calculated and said that if you want to put Japan entirely on e-cars, electric cars, it would cost investments in infrastructure of over \$1 trillion. Now, we took the figures given by the Toyota study and tried to calculate a similar cost for the EU: Germany alone is already scheduled to lose 400,000 jobs in the auto sector if there is a transition to e-cars, because they have much less components for the motors, so the supply industry becomes shrunk. But it's much, much

worse: First of all, you would need an investment in infrastructure for e-cars in Europe of over €1 trillion, probably €1.2 trillion, and then naturally you have no electricity because we already had several almost blackouts for the entire European energy grid, last week! Now, if you try to put all these cars on electric fuel, the electricity is by far not sufficient. So this whole thing is economically very stupid. It would destroy the industrial countries of Europe, the United States and Asia if they would go with it. So I can imagine that there will be a lot more resistance once people start to realize what the effect is: it will drive energy prices even higher, it will cause mass unemployment; it will drive prices in general much higher.

So I think that if there is an effort to implement that in earnest, what we have seen in terms of the Brexit vote, the Trump vote, riots in the streets, Yellow Vests, all of that will increase, because you cannot destroy the livelihood of millions and millions of people without their starting to go to the street in protest, when they realize that their livelihood is in danger.

So I can only say, people should abandon this idea. There is climate change—obviously—but what it is exactly is not so clear. There are big debates in the scientific community; there are many studies which attribute the climate change to very different phenomena, such as galactic cycles. We have introduced on the Schiller Institute website a page, which is called “Science—Stop Green Fascism” [<https://schillerinstitute.com/stop-green-fascism/>]. And there we will institute an international debate, where we already have many scientific papers, by many scientists. And I invite you to go to this page—we will have many more coming in the next days and weeks, so that is a place where you can inform yourself about what is really behind this Green Deal, and get a more scientific approach.

SCHLANGER: And while we're talking about this question about

the loss of energy production that's planned with the Green New Deal, we have an attack from Pompeo in the United States against the Nord Stream 2 [pipeline] which is crucial for Germany. But we're also seeing something interesting: The choice for the new chairman for the Christian Democrats in Germany is someone who's considered to be anti-Green. How significant is this?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, it is not so clear that the German industry and politicians will capitulate to the U.S. sanctions [against firms working with Gazprom to build the Nord Stream 2 pipeline from Russia]. I mean obviously, the danger of being hit with such sanctions is a deterrent, so one of the industries involved, Bilfinger, already withdrew. Even Gazprom said it's questionable if it can be brought into completion, but there is also massive resistance, because people know that what's behind that is an effort, on the one side, to treat Germany and the other 12 European countries that participate in Nord Stream 2 as a colony, and people don't like that so much any more. And secondly, everybody knows the U.S. wants to sell their liquefied natural gas and that is also pretty obvious; it's more expensive, it's more environmentally unfriendly (to say the least), so I think there is still resistance.

Concerning Mr. Armin Laschet [new Christian Democratic Union chairman], he has already been attacked that he is "soft" on Putin, that he did not agree with the Skripal interpretation; that he didn't make enough fuss about the Navalny case—I think all of that speaks for Laschet, because all of these cases were efforts to manipulate an anti-Russian hysteria. That's all I can say on that point for now.

SCHLANGER: Going to the more crazy side of U.S. politics, we have this movement called QAnon, which was predicting a military coup, that Biden would be arrested, Hillary Clinton arrested, Trump would be brought back in—this has many people wrapped up in it, and it's turning out, from the research

we're starting to do, that this was a military psy-ops from the beginning, using the military side of artificial intelligence and so on. This is also emerging in Europe, as well. What do you make of this, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it is a psychological warfare operation against the population, to try to confuse them: As you say, we are looking into the connections to the military right now, but there is also another interesting observations which intrigued me. It's written by a designer of games, Reed Berkowitz, and he basically says that looking at the way the QAnon operation works, he said it's exactly like the games he is designing, that it leads to something which he called "apophenia," which is a notion coming from psychology which means that people have a sort of free association, where they connect things and put them together in a pattern which looks logical but these things are not connected, or at least not in the way they're being put together. For example, you have this really crazy interpretation of people who say that the entire COVID-19 is just a conspiracy to implement military or dictatorial means. This is a mental disorder, because the pandemic is quite real, which we should talk about a little bit later. But I think this idea of game theory, or designing games is actually quite accurate. [<https://medium.com/curiouserinstitute/a-game-designers-analysis-of-qanon-580972548be5>]

And when I read the article by Berkowitz, I was immediately reminded of my research into the Romantic movement. Now, this is extremely important. Because how do people judge things, like reality? How do they know that their judgment is truthful or at least trying to be truthful? Well, you have to think like a scientist, or you have to think like a Classical artist, because these are the only two groups of people who think in terms of universal principles. A universal principle is something which you can verify everywhere, no matter if you are in Africa, or in the United States, or in Europe, because

it's a universal principle because it's universal; therefore, you have a test of reality.

The last time there was a culture which was based on such universal principles, was the German Classical period, which produced such giants as Bach and Beethoven, Haydn, Schubert, Schumann, Mozart; but in poetry, Schiller; Shakespeare would another, from another period, proponent of such universal thinking; and this was extremely important, because it established a high standard of morality, a high standard of intelligence, of creativity, and it would have liberated the population to be truly free if that would have been the dominant culture. And it was on a good way in Germany, because one of the closest collaborators and friends of Schiller for example, Wilhelm von Humboldt, had designed the Humboldt education system, and when he was Education Minister he started to implement it. And it would have meant that the entire population would have been rational creative, the potential of everybody would have been brought out, so it was on a very good way.

But then, a counter-movement developed, which started maybe innocently as a Romantic, just slightly confused form of thinking in the person of Novalis. But then, soon there were some others, like August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel, Tieck, and these people were quickly taken over by Metternich, by the Restoration, and they became the political Romantics. Now, what is the difference between Classical thinking and Romantic thinking? In Classical thinking it's what I said before: you have an absolute ability to find the truth by the method of exhaustion, by establishing principles which can be found, and established and proven again and again, because they are principles which are pertaining to the real universe.

What the Romantics started to do, they started to consciously take the poetical stringent form of the Classical culture apart, by saying there should be no beginning, there should be no end, day and night, and waking and dream should all be

interwoven; you should have free association follow diffused emotions, and this became a real Schwärmerei and it turned the absolute optimism of the German Classical period into the pessimism which now, in the end—and I'm leaving out many steps in between—it ended with the horrible 12 years of the National Socialism in Germany, which was sort of the end form, or in the modern deconstruction of all modern art.

So, when you see something like that, and you see a method being applied which consciously confuses people, as it is clearly the case in the QAnon movement (or whatever), it is psychological warfare of people, because it goes against science, it makes people deliberately believe things which they are no longer able to think through, and I think it's a real dangerous thing, and we will do some more work on it, to discover what it really is.

SCHLANGER: Good, that was very important, what you just went through. We're down to just a couple minutes, so I'm going to jump ahead to the one question that you referred to earlier, which is the importance of addressing the new variants of coronavirus. This is now out of control in Germany, in the United Kingdom; the situation seems to be getting worse, the vaccines are not ready. Where is this headed?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, just today there was an EU meeting, and Merkel, who is not my favorite politician, but she said something which is extremely truthful, unfortunately, and she seems to have a little bit better grasp on COVID than most politicians have shown; and she is warning of something which many medical experts have express extreme concern about in the recent days: Namely that these new variants, which emerged in Great Britain, in South Africa, and Brazil—each of them being different—are rapid variations, and there is a danger that soon these variants will be vaccine resistant. Now, if that would happen, then we would look into a completely different kind of catastrophe, because up to now, for example, in the United States, most of the bets, at least in the previous

administration were put on quickly developing a vaccine, and if that goes out of the window, then you are really in trouble.

I think the only possible answer to that, is, we have to have a world health system: This is what we have been saying since the beginning of this pandemic, that unless you have a modern health system in every single country—in Haiti, in Mali, in Ecuador, in India—just simply every single country, you are not going to protect your country. The idea that American, or Germany, or any one of these so-called advanced countries can be protected when the pandemic is raging in the developing countries, is simply an illusion. And since the medical experts already have been warning that new viruses are already waiting to spread new variants of MERS and SARS, that this question of really changing the attitude towards the developing sector is becoming a question of the moral fitness to survive for the entire human species. That means, we have to build modern health systems in every country, and that is only possible if you have infrastructure! If you don't have clean water, electricity, means of transport and communications, you can't do it.

So we are at the crossroads where we in earnest have to go to the policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what he intended with the Bretton Woods system, which was never realized because he died too early; but he wanted to increase the living standard of the entire population of the world, and that, he said, is the precondition for peace. I think we are at that point, where we either correct that failure of the entire post-war period, or we will go into an endless series of catastrophes.

That is the program which we have been putting forward, 1.5 billion productive jobs have to be created anew, and the whole drive has to start with this idea of a world health system. And I would appeal to all of you who are listening to this, that if you agree with that, then you should join our efforts. We have a Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites, which is

trying to get an approach to all the aspects of this problem, meaning to double food production worldwide to deal with the famine of “biblical dimensions,” and at the same time train young people to be helpers for medical personnel, partnerships of the developing countries—all of this is still in the works.

But I think we really have to start with a change in the attitude: You cannot this pandemic in one country, and you cannot, for sure, solve it with the Green Deal. If you go for the Green Deal, there is no way how the necessary science and technology can be available, or the industrial capacities to implement such a world health system. So, we are at a crossroads, and you should join the Schiller Institute and work with us to give this whole thing a different direction.

SCHLANGER: For updates on this story of the coronavirus, as well as everything we were discussing today, you can get them at The LaRouche Organization website [www.laroucheorganization.com] as well as the Schiller Institute [https://schillerinstitute.com]

So Helga, thank you for joining us today, and we’ll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

Hvad der står på spil er hvilket paradigme der kommer ud af denne situation

25. oktober (EIRNS) – I sit ugentlige webcast den 22. oktober sammenfattede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af Schiller

Instituttet, hvad der står på spil ved det amerikanske præsidentvalg den 3. november og ugerne umiddelbart efter, både for USA og for verden.

"Hvad står der på spil her? Man havde en rigsretssag mod præsident Trump og i det mindste et forsøg på domsfældelse med beskyldningen om, at han havde truet med at tilbageholde hjælp til Ukraine, hvis de ikke ville dække over at han var involveret. Nu er realiteten, at nøjagtig det modsatte skete. Hvad de under rigsretssagen beskyldte Trump for at have gjort er, hvad Joe Biden rent faktisk gjorde"!

Zepp-LaRouche fortsatte: "Det der står på spil her er ikke kun et spørgsmål om, hvem der vinder valget, men spørgsmålet er: Vil USA forblive en republik og vende tilbage til de grundlæggende fædres idé om, at det er en forfatningsmæssig republik; eller vil det blive et imperium, der grundlæggende styres af det særlige forhold mellem USA og Storbritannien, som det rent faktisk unipolære britiske imperium? Betydningen af dette er gigantisk, og jeg tror, at alt afhænger af at få Biden-historien ud, som han og briterne er så desperate efter at dække over...

"Så, hvad der virkelig står på spil her, er spørgsmålet om krig og fred, for der er ingen tvivl om, at 'Biden-dagsordenen' er at bringe hele krigspartimaskinen tilbage – man behøver blot at se på rollebesætningen, og hvad de har sagt om Rusland og Kina".

Zepp-LaRouche understregede den underliggende økonomiske krise, der driver briterne og deres malthusianske grønne dagsorden, såvel som deres geopolitiske balancegang. "Hvad der står på spil, er spørgsmålet om hvilket paradigme der kommer ud af denne situation som vinder. For med finanskrisen, den tydeligt voksende pandemi, næsten overalt undtagen i Kina, en utrolig hungersnød i Afrika samt en sammenbrudt realøkonomi, er det meget klart, at disse mennesker har til hensigt at forsvare deres døde system for enhver pris: inddæmme Rusland,

inddæmme Kina og igangsætte et geopolitisk spil, der indeholder kimen til 3. Verdenskrig.

Mennesker bliver testet: krig eller fred, sult eller udvikling, afhænger af individer, der handler for det fælles bedste, bekræftede Zepp-LaRouche. Det betyder, at vi må mobilisere for at sikre Trumps rungende genvalg, og det inkluderer mobilisering for at handle på den presserende appel fra LaRouches sydafrikanske leder, Phillip Tsokolibane, til præsident Trump og til hele verdenen om at handle for at stoppe den truende sult for snesevis af millioner i Afrika, og for at bringe en endelig afslutning på det 'britiske system for folkedrab', som er Joe Bidens største sponsor.