

Trump og Putin: det nye paradigme i gang – giver forrædere hysteriske raserianfald

D. 16. juli (EIRNS) Det historiske topmøde i dag mellem præsidenterne Donald Trump og Vladimir Putin har markeret et dramatisk faseskifte i historien. Mødet er resultatet af en lang, svær kamp, anført ikke mindst af Lyndon LaRouche over de sidste 50 år for at skabe en gruppering af betydelige nationer og kulturer i historien som den nødvendige og tilstrækkelige styrke, der kræves for én gang for alle at gøre en ende på det britiske imperiums tyranni. Særligt gjorde LaRouche opmærksom på, at et samarbejde mellem 'fire-magterne', Rusland, Kina, Indien og det USA, som potentielt set kunne være en repræsentant for det bedste af europæisk kultur, kan erstatte det bankerotte vestlige finanssystem, centreret i London og Wall Street, med et nyt paradigme, som ikke er baseret på monetær magt og kolonialistiske krige, men som er baseret på et kreditsystem, der har til formål at bringe fred og velfærd gennem gensidig udvikling for alle nationer.

Før præsident Trump mødtes med præsident Putin til et privat, et-til-et møde, fortalte han pressen, at de ville komme til at diskutere mange ting, og han nævnte særligt, at både Rusland og USA er i et samarbejde med "vores fælles ven, præsident Xi".

De to præsidenter mødtes med pressen efter en privat diskussion på to og en halv time og frokost med deres assistenter. De konfronterede begge hvor 'tåbeligt' og 'farligt' det var, at man havde tilladt, at forholdet mellem to ledende atomvåbenmagter forsat forringedes. Putin nævnte, at "de nuværende spændinger, den anspændte atmosfære, i virkeligheden er uden grund. Den kolde Krig hører fortiden til. Den periode, hvor en heftig ideologisk konfrontation mellem de to lande truede, tilhører en fjern fortid, er et levn derfra". Han foreslog, at man skulle danne tre forskellige paneler med eksperter, som skal arbejde på løsninger til de fundamentale problemstillinger: et cyberpanel, for at få sandheden frem om den cyberkrigsførelse, som 'Get Trump'-arbejdsgruppen, ledt af Robert Mueller, bruger til at forsøge at få præsident Trump afsat og provokere en krig med Rusland; et panel af forretningsledere, idet han bemærkede, at over 500 ledende amerikanske forretningsledere deltog på konferencen 'Det Internationale Økonomiske Forum i Sankt Petersborg' i maj; og et politisk og militært panel som skal kigge efter måder, hvorpå der kan samarbejdes, når det gælder alvorlige sager, som konfronterer menneskeheden rundt omkring i verden. Trump meddelte, at han er fast besluttet på at "fortsætte det amerikanske

diplomatis dristige tradition. Helt fra republikkens tidlige dage har amerikanske ledere forstået at diplomati og engagement er at foretrække frem for konflikt og fjendtlighed." Han sagde, at forholdet mellem de to nationer "aldrig har været værre end det er nu. Det ændrede sig imidlertid for omtrent fire timer siden". Han sagde: "Jeg vil hellere tage en politisk risiko i jagten på fred, end at risikere fred i jagten på politik".

De amerikanske og britiske medier var i deres normale, hysteriske og bedrageriske lune, men både præsident Trump og præsident Putin modsatte sig kraftfuldt deres løgne. Da han blev spurgt om, om Rusland har "kompromitterende materiale om præsident Trump og hans familie", grinte Putin og forklarede, at han ikke engang vidste at præsident Trump havde været i landet, dengang løgnene fra Steele-rapporten kom ud, og han konkluderede at "det er svært at forestille sig en omgang fuldkommen nonsens på større skala end dette."

Da AP krævede, at præsident Trump skulle fordømme præsident Putin for at gribe ind i det amerikanske valg, svarede Trump igen ved at spørge, hvorfor FBI aldrig tog den antageligvis hackede DNC-server. "Hvorfor blev FBI bedt om at lade den demokratiske nationalkomite [DNC] være i fred? Jeg har undret mig over dette. Jeg har spurgt ind til dette i månedsvis, og jeg har udtalt mig om det på tweeter. Hvor er serveren?"

Angående Syrien sagde præsident Putin, at "udfordringen om at skabe fred og forsoning i dette land kan blive det første pragteksempel på et vellykket samarbejde."

De britiske lakajer i USA er bange. De ved, at de er blevet fanget i at planlægge et kup mod USA's valgte præsident på vegne af en udenlandsk magt, USA's historiske fjende, det britiske imperium. Obamas dræber, CIA-chef John Brennan, er måske den bedste repræsentant for hysteriet blandt disse forrædere, idet han tweetede: "Donald Trumps optræden til pressekonferencen i Helsinki lever op til og går udover betegnelsen for højforræderi og overtrædelse af straffeloven. Det var intet mindre end forræderisk. Ikke alene var Trumps kommentarer imbecile, men han er fuldstændig i lommen på Putin."

Forræderen protesterer for meget.

LaRouche-organisationen er nu i en situation, hvor vi kan samle de betydelige magter i 'Den nye Silkevejs ånd, for at tilvejebringe denne historiske sejr og bygge på denne optimisme til at realisere LaRouches fulde program, på et internationalt plan, via 'de fire love', som lovene der virkelig er i overensstemmelse med universets anti-entropiske love.

Den fulde betydning af dagens ustrukturerede topmøde ses måske ikke umiddelbart

D. 15. juli – Et interview med præsident Trumps nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver John Bolton, udsendt på fjernsynet i dag (med andre nylige kommentarer fra embedsmænd fra begge sider) gør det klart, at hele topmødet i Helsinki vil udelukkende være baseret på hvad de to præsidenter diskuterer og bliver enige om i begyndelsen af det første, private møde mellem de to præsidenter, hvor de vil være alene og ikke ledsagede af assistenter eller embedsmænd samt uden tidsbegrænsning. Det var præsident Trump, som havde foreslået disse usædvanlige rammer for mødet, og russerne indvilligede. I denne henseende minder Helsinki-topmødet om det historiske topmøde i Wuhan, Kina mellem den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og den indiske premierminister Narendra Modi, hvilket førte de kinesisk-indiske relationer tilbage i en retning af øget venskab og samarbejde. Dengang mødtes lederne Xi og Modi også alene, uden rådgivere. Men det format som Trump valgte til mandagens topmøde går langt ud over topmødet i Wuhan, idet de henholdsvis amerikanske og russiske nationale sikkerhedsrådgivere, udenrigsministre, ambassadører og sandsynligvis andre endnu uidentificerede embedsmænd, vil være til stede i Helsinki, og hvis de bliver bedt om det, vil de være klar til straks at tage affære og formalisere ethvert element som de to præsidenter måtte enes om imellem hinanden.

Den usædvanlige intimitet ved et sådant møde under fire øjne er nødvendig for at undgå forstyrrende udefrakommende faktorer og endnu mere for at cementere et dybt og personligt venskab mellem præsidenterne Trump og Putin, ligesom vi så det med venskabet mellem præsident Trump og Kinas præsident Xi Jinping. Lyndon LaRouche har altid lært os, at historie, ligesom videnskab og alle menneskelige aktiviteter, er personlig; han har lært os dette, både med rene ord og gennem sin egen personlighed, som gennemtrænger alle hans mange bedrifter. Det faktum at de vigtigste affærer på dette topmøde vil blive håndteret under fire øjne, uden andre vidner, kan betyde, at nogle af de vigtigste resultater kan forblive ukendte i nogen tid. Dog er den kendsgerning, at dette overhovedet finder sted, på trods af den fuldstændige opposition fra den britiske fraktion, yderst vigtig, og det er en hyldest til vores indsats under LaRouches ledelse.

I løbet af mandagen vil vores ansvar som LaRouches disciple stige enormt. Nu er den britiske imperialistiske fraktion ude, hvor den ikke kan bunde. Man ser i stigende grad efter os for lederskab. Vi skal forsyne et principielt lederskab,

i den ånd som Will Wertz' indlæg på sidste torsdags 'Fireside Chat'-møde repræsenterede.

Trump trumfer Theresa May, bukker ikke for dronningen

14. juli (EIRNS) – Præsident Donald Trump efterlod sig et hærgnet politisk landskab, da han efter sit "arbejdsbesøg" hos den britiske premierminister Theresa May fløj bort fra England og til sin skotske golfbane. I betragtning af det faktum at briterne har brugt deres efterretningstjeneste til at vælte Trumps præsidentskab, har May selvfølgelig i høj grad fortjent det. Den britiske presse giver udtryk for, hvor udflippet oligarkiet er.

The Guardian siger det hele: "Den præsidentielle orkan har fejlet igennem det sydlige England, brudt protokoller, forstyrret institutioner og efterladt politikere med en fornemmelse af piskesmæld. Da forstyrrerens MV-22 Osprey-helikoptere fløj væk, kunne man ikke fortænke Theresa May i at slippe et lettelsens suk, så velkendt for enhver hårdt testet vært. "Dette var langt fra Bill Clinton, der spadserede gennem Hyde Park under hans præsidentielle svanesang eller Barack Obama, der droppede ind på en folkeskole i Newport ... "Storbritannien må muligvis ydmygt acceptere, at det for Trump blot var en mellemlanding mellem afklapsningen af den tyske kansler Angela Merkel på NATO-topmødet i Bruxelles og fornyelsen af hans varme forhold til Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin i Helsinki ...". the Guardian satte også Mays anti-russiske bemærkninger op imod Trumps vedrørende hans topmøde den 16. juli med præsident Vladimir Putin: "Jeg tror, at jeg kan få et meget godt forhold til præsident Putin, hvis vi tilbringer tid sammen. Jeg tager muligvis fejl. Andre folk har sagt, at det ikke fungerede. Men jeg er anderledes end andre mennesker. Jeg tror, at heksejagten skader os slemt, jeg vil kalde det den iscenesatte heksejagt." {Trump refererer her til Russiagate, red.}

Trump-familiens te-aftale med dronningen kom også under kritik. The Express anklagede Trump for at spærre vejen for dronningen, da de gik hen foran 'Coldstream'-livgarden efter deres udveksling af hilsner på 'Windsor Castle'. Dronningen syntes at blive blokeret af præsidenten, da de først mødtes ved 'Windsor Castle'. Før dronningen kom op på siden af ham, så Trump sig om, som for at se, hvor den gamle hejre befandt sig, og ventede derefter på, at hun indhentede ham, før parret fortsatte på deres tur. Det anses for uhøfligt at vende ryggen til Hendes Majestæt, når man møder hende. Det er imidlertid uklart, om præsident Trump fik besked på at gå videre, før dronningen indhentede ham.

Hverken præsident Trump eller førstedamen Melania bukkede eller nejede da de første gang hilste på dronningen, men valgte i stedet et håndtryk. Den kongelige korrespondent Richard Fitzwilliams fortalte the Express, "Det var en upassende opførsel." Åh du godeste..

Trump satser på nye løsninger som ændrer spillets regler; handelskrig leder ikke til løsninger

D.9. juli 2018 (EIRNS) – Præsident Trump insisterer mere end nogensinde på et personligt topmøde med den russiske præsident Putin, samtidig med at den britiske regering, som den største modstander mod topmødet og som centrum for geopolitiske krigsplaner, står for et ønskeligt kollaps. Et russisk-amerikansk samarbejde er afgørende for at få gjort en ende på 25 års vedvarende regimeskifte-krige og terrorisme for derved at muliggøre udbredelsen af økonomisk udvikling i Sydasiens og Nordafrikas. Ikke mindst, vil et 'fire-magtssamarbejde' mellem USA, Rusland, Indien og Kina danne grundlaget for en ny strategisk fredsarkitektur, i hvilken geopolitik er ikke-eksisterende. Lyndon LaRouche påviste for over to årtier siden, at Nato ikke har noget eksistensgrundlag og at dette 'fire-magtssamarbejde' er det nye grundlag for sikkerhed og fred.

Præsident Trump har både som præsidentkandidat og præsident søgt at ændre det geopolitiske spil for at opnå en fredsordning på den koreanske halvø, i Syrien, Afghanistan og andetsteds. For at opnå dette har han måttet slå de britiske og amerikanske efterretningstjenesters 'Russiagate'-kampagne og deres kampagne for at afsætte ham som præsident tilbage. Til dette formål har han fået afgørende opbakning fra {EIR} og {LAROUCHEPAC} gennem de afslørende eksposéer om Robert Muellers "legal assassination" plot.

I sidste ende er det dog økonomisk udvikling som er det nye navn for fred. Handelskrig leder ikke til den slags løsninger som Trump ønsker for USA. Hvad leder så til de løsninger? For eksempel løsninger på de hidtil usete masser af migrationsstrømninger? Svaret er samarbejde mellem de store magter omkring konstruktionen af de vigtigste, store infrastrukturprojekter for at skabe rammerne for nye niveauer af global produktivitet og økonomisk vækst. Sådanne projekter er sat i gang og bliver gennemført af Kinas Bælte og Vej-Initiativet, også kaldet Den nye Silkevej og af Schiller Instituttet.

Schiller Instituttets konference d. 30. juni-1. juli: 'Der er et presserende

behov for et nyt paradigme for internationale relationer' fremlagde kvalificerede forslag som bidrag til skabelsen af en sådan struktur. Til konferencen blev der udvist reelt lederskab og planer for udviklingen af Sydvestasien og Afrika gennem et samarbejde mellem de transatlantiske magter og Kina, som er blevet anerkendt som Afrikas fortrukne samarbejdspartner. Ligesom en stræben på et nyt paradigme i Europa kræver at vi afviser London og i særdeleshed City of London, betyder det i Trumps USA, at vi skal opløse Wall Streets megabanker, før de krakker igen; etablere en national institution til at udstede enorme mængder af kreditter til infrastruktur for dette 'stormagts-økonomiske samarbejde; ikke forvente at private virksomheder skal udføre, hvad kun store nationer kan udføre med hensyn til videnskab og rumfart. Det er måske ikke den nemmeste vej, men det er hvad der leder til de løsninger, som vi skal kæmpe for.

[Det Nye Paradigme: Et nyt koncept for udenrigspolitik](#)

[LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 30. marts, 2018](#)

Vært Matthew Ogden: God eftermiddag. Det er den 30. marts, 2018; Langfredag.

Hvis man ser på begivenhederne i verden i løbet af de seneste to uger, kunne man sige, at, på den ene hånd, er vi meget tæt på krig; at truslen om krig er alvorligt forøget. Men på den anden side kan man også sige, at muligheden for en reel, permanent, holdbar fred er meget tæt på. I realiteten er begge disse udsagn sande. Jeg mener, at denne kendsgerning viser os sandheden omkring, hvor, vi står i historiens forløb. Vi er usikkert anbragt på en knivspids og balancerer mellem to, modsatrettede paradigmer, som ikke kan sameksistere. Der er paradigmet for geopolitik og krig, og som desperat forsøger atter at gøre sig gældende på den transatlantiske scene netop nu; men så har vi også det modsatte paradigme for win-win-samarbejde og fred gennem økonomisk udvikling. Det er det Nye Paradigme, der vokser frem og fejer hen over planeten. Det er præcis dette Nye Paradigmes succes, der har sat den geopolitiske gruppering her i det transatlantiske område i alarmtilstand. Det viser os også, at det er absolut nødvendigt, at folk af god vilje, inkl. LaRouche-bevægelsen her i USA og internationalt, intervenserer for fred, og for det Nye Paradigme.

Her følger resten af webcastet i engelsk udskrift:

On the one hand, you have this incredible provocation from Mad Theresa May, or as she's being called "Theresa Mayhem"; a very appropriate nickname. She's trying to rally an international war coalition. She's going from a very weak government that was on the verge of collapse three weeks ago, to now; she's probably casting herself in the image of Margaret Thatcher, or even her image of Winston Churchill. However, while an unprecedented number of countries have fallen into lockstep behind the UK in expelling these Russian agents, the more interesting thing is how many countries did not do so. Including nearly a dozen European countries, which include Austria, which sees itself as a bridge between Europe and Russia; Belgium, the seat of the EU government interesting; Bulgaria; Cypress; Greece; Luxembourg; Malta; Portugal; Slovakia; Slovenia. Then on top of that, you have Japan – a major US-UK ally; but also under the recent years under Abe's government, an ever-increasingly close relationship with Russia. Then, even New Zealand, which is the most fascinating of them all. New Zealand is a member of the so-called Five Eyes, which is the intelligence sharing group comprised of the United States, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. There was an article in the {Guardian} saying this was a huge surprise that New Zealand, which they characterize as Lilliputian, would go against the diktat that came from Theresa May in London.

So, you can see that this is a very precarious and dangerous situation, and that continues to play out. But on the other hand, take a look at the extremely promising developments towards actual peace and towards averting nuclear war which are now occurring on the Korean peninsula. While the geo-politicians would have you believe that second only to Russia, China is the biggest global threat that we have to face right now; or perhaps even more so. The reality is that China has played a key role in bringing Kim Jong-un to the negotiating table. This is closer to a real peaceful settlement of this crisis than we've seen in many years. The crucial factor in this has been the close personal relationship that was forged between President Xi Jinping of China and President Donald Trump here in the United

States. So, in an absolutely surprising development which caught the entire intelligence community here in the United States – for one – by surprise, Chairman Kim Jong-un made a personal trip to China; travelling by special train to Beijing on March 25th. He stayed in the official government guest house, and had a series of meetings stretching over the course of three and a half days from March 25th to March 28th, meeting with Chinese President Xi Jinping in Beijing's Great Hall of the People. They engaged in very serious talks. According to reports, this is the first time in his seven years as President of North Korea that Kim travelled outside of the country. Now, what President Xi Jinping said, as was reported in Chinese media about this meeting during the summit that he had with Kim Jong-un, he said, "The basics of the traditional friendship between China and North Korea were founded and nurtured by the elder generations of leaders of both countries. This is our invaluable heritage." Then, Kim Jong-un, who is slated to meet face-to-face with President Trump of the United States within the coming weeks in the next month or so, said that he is ready to conduct this high-level dialogue with the United States. He said, "The issue of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula can be resolved, if South Korea and the United States respond to our efforts with goodwill. It will create an atmosphere of peace and stability, while taking progressive and synchronous measures for the realization of peace. It is our consistent stand to be committed to denuclearization on the peninsula, in accordance of the will of late President Kim Il-Sung and late General Secretary Kim Jong-Il.

According to reports, Kim also told Xi Jinping that North Korea is ready to make some pretty reforms to its domestic economic policy. He's ready to further open up to a market economy, along the lines of what China has done over the past couple of decades, going back to Deng Xiao-ping; what is called "socialism with Chinese characteristics". Also, the reports are that China, coming out of this meeting, agreed to invest in and expand North Korea's two major ocean ports; one on the west coast of North Korea in Nan Pao, and one on the east coast in Wonsan. What President Trump had to say following this summit between Kim Jong-un and President Xi Jinping, he posted on twitter. He said, "Received a message last night from Xi Jinping of China that his meeting with Kim Jong-un went very well and that Kim looks forward to his meeting with me. In the meantime

and unfortunately, maximum sanctions and pressure must be maintained at all costs." But I think this shows you very clearly that this is a joint project between President Trump and President Xi Jinping personally. This is an example of the kinds of benefits that the world can gain if major nations such as the United States and China work together towards these common ends. Now, let me play you a clip from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's international webcast from yesterday, where she addressed the very positive outcome that is developing there on the Korean peninsula.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Oh, I think this is the absolute overwhelming event, happening this past week. Because the Western mainstream media are again so ridiculous. They were saying, "oh, these two dictators meeting..." and so forth, but this is very, very good, because obviously, both Xi Jinping and Kim Jong-un recalled the long friendship between the two countries, North Korea and China, and Kim Jong-un, in particular, promised to carry on policy in the tradition of his father and other relatives in the past. He basically promised that he wants to work towards the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, provided that this offer is being met in an atmosphere of peace and constructive attitude. Obviously, North Korea will need security guarantees; without that, he probably will not give up the nuclear weapons. But the fact that he first went to China, and then is going to meet with President Moon Jae-in from South Korea, at the end of April, and then, in all likelihood, with President Trump in May, that means that one of the most dangerous possible points for a World War III scenario could be peacefully resolved.

And, you know, the fact that, as contacts were telling us in South Korea, this whole thing had an economic dimension to it. China – according to these sources – is going to build ports in North Korea on the east coast and the west coast, and also obviously, the whole question of the extension of the Belt and Road Initiative, involving South Korea, North Korea, Russia, and China, – that is the framework within which one can get a really stable development.

So Trump immediately made a tweet, where he said he got a phone call from President Xi Jinping, who told him that the

meeting went very well, and that he is extremely optimistic, looking forward; that unfortunately the sanctions [against North Korea] have to be maintained until the problem is resolved, but that he is absolutely looking forward towards this coming summit. So I think this is {really} good, and it shows you that if you have back-channels and in this case, you had everybody involved, – Trump, Xi Jinping, Putin, but also Abe from Japan – so this really shows that if you have this kind of diplomacy and negotiation, there is no problem on this planet which cannot be solved by people who have a good will. And I think everybody should be very happy about this development.

OGDEN: So, exactly as I said, that is a testament that there are major crises on the planet which cannot be resolved unilaterally, but if we have this kind of great powers relationship, these kinds of crises can be confronted, and can be resolved. Crises that have hung over our heads for decades. This relationship between China and the United States through this close personal relationship between Xi Jinping and President Trump is already paying dividends, as you can see in the case of this Korean peninsula here, and the possibility of not just positive effects abroad, but very positive effects here at home is also very real if we continue to cultivate this special great powers relationship between China and the United States. Now, despite all the talk of trade war, etc., there are very interesting openings for joint Chinese-US investments and cooperation in development projects right here in the United States. This, of course, is right along the lines of exactly what LaRouche PAC has been campaigning for in terms of the United States joining this New Paradigm, joining the New Silk Road, and also exactly what Lyndon LaRouche has addressed in his Four Economic Laws for drastically upgrading the productive powers of the US labor force and lifting the United States to a much higher platform of high-technology development. This can be done with this kind of US-Chinese relationship. So, some of the very interesting US to China, China to US relationships, some news on that front over just the last few days. Some US Republican Senators – Senator Danes from Montana, Senator Grassley from Iowa, Senator Johnson from Wisconsin, Purdue from Georgia, and Senator Sass from Nebraska – all were in Beijing just a few days ago this week on March 27th, where they had a meeting with Premier Li Keqiang. The Senators called the United States-China relationship “one of the most important bilateral relationships

in the world.” So, this is very interesting, especially coming from Republicans in the US Senate who have been taking a very anti-China line up to this point. Of course we see contrary voices, such as Marco Rubio, who is accusing every Chinese student in the United States of being a secret Chinese spy. But this trip is interesting, and it comes from Senators who are mainly from the so-called Farm Belt. I think the involvement of Senator Grassley is interesting, because of Terry Branstad’s roots in Iowa. Terry Branstad, former Governor of Iowa; now the ambassador to China.

Also, we had news of the mayor of Miami-Dade County in Florida, Mayor Carlos Jimenez, who just returned from a visit to China, where he led a delegation of 50 elected officials and business leaders from Florida. He met with the mayor of Shanghai, who stated to Mayor Jimenez, “The bilateral relationship between China and the United States is the most important. It will affect the well-being of the people from both countries and the world’s peace and prosperity as well.” So, interestingly, exactly the same wordings that came out of that communiqué from the five US Senators, that the China-US bilateral relationship is one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world. The mayor of Shanghai also made the point very correctly that this is a win-win; the well-being of the people of both countries – the United States and China – can benefit out of this kind of bilateral relationship; but also, the world’s peace and prosperity as well. So, this is exactly along the lines that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been making and has continued to make this week, as we will see.

Also – this is very interesting – the Governor of Alaska, Governor Bill Walker, has announced that he will lead a trade delegation to China in May; which interestingly, he first proposed during his January 2018 State of the State address. This has been subsequently worked out, so this is another state along the lines of what Governor Jim Justice in West Virginia has been discussing. Jim Justice, in his State of the State, obviously discussed the importance of these \$80 billion Chinese investments into the state of West Virginia. Now, you have Governor Bill Walker from Alaska. This does come in the wake of Governor Walker personally hosting President Xi Jinping last April in Anchorage when President Xi was flying back from Florida, where he had his meeting with President Trump at Mar-a-Lago on his way back to China; where he took a brief

opportunity to visit Governor Walker in Anchorage, Alaska. Then on November 8, 2017, Governor Walker was the only governor to accompany President Trump on his delegation for the so-called "state visit plus" to Beijing, where one of the deals that was signed out of the \$300 billion of deals and memoranda of understanding, one of the deals that was signed was a \$43 billion China investment and purchase deal for an 800-mile Alaska gas pipeline. Also, there were important commitments made for liquefied natural gas sales. But this pipeline project which is now being very much emphasized by Governor Walker, is being characterized by the CEO of the Alaska Gas Line Development Corporation – one of the parties in this memorandum of understanding – is being characterized as having the potential of "turbo-charging" the Alaskan economy.

So, these are states that have been on the margins and are some of the poorer states. West Virginia for sure, Alaska very isolated, who are now developing these relationships with China and are becoming gateways for the Silk Road spirit to enter into the United States. This is exactly what we've been discussing in terms of the crucial importance of the role that China can play; these mutual investments and joint projects that China is willing to assist in building here in the United States. And just the idea of the United States joining this wave of mega-projects which is sweeping the globe and upgrading our infrastructure from the point that it's now reached, which is a very sorry state of disrepair and deterioration that has come from decades and decades of disinvestment.

President Trump was in Ohio just yesterday, where he was speaking to a room full of union members and building trades workers. The point of his trip was to address his so-called infrastructure plan. We know that there are many deficits when it comes to the actual content of what Trump has proposed, but Trump in this speech made it clear that he is still very clear in terms of what the urgency of the problem here in the United States is when it comes to infrastructure. And also the image of the United States as a nation of builders, and reclaiming the legacy that we had over centuries that we were the premier building nation in the world. Our infrastructure was second to none, and other nations were coming to the United States to try to emulate what we had accomplished. So, I'd like to just play a couple of excerpts from President Trump's address in Ohio yesterday, and you'll see that this infrastructure debate is

still very much on the front burner. It desperately needs the kind of input that the LaRouche movement is uniquely positioned to make.

PRESIDENT TRUMP

: We will breathe new life into your very run-down highways, railways, and waterways. We'll transform our roads and bridges from a source of endless frustration into a source of absolutely incredible pride. And we're going to do it all under budget and ahead of schedule. You ever hear those words in the public world? Under budget and ahead of schedule. We have other things. Nearly 40% of our bridges were built before – think of this – before the first Moon landing. You go to some countries, they're building bridges all over the place; all over you have bridges going up. One particular country, I won't use it because they're friendly to me, they weren't friendly to us as a nation, but now they're friendly; they're building 29 bridges. We don't build bridges like that very much anymore. A little bit, every once in a while. But our roads are clogged, we have average drivers spend 42 hours every year stuck in traffic, costing us at least \$160 billion annually. Our mass transit systems are a mess; they're dilapidated and they're decayed. Nationwide, we average 300 power outages per year; compared to just five per year in the 1980s. A total mess. In recent years, Americans have watched as Washington spent trillions and trillions of dollars building up foreign countries while allowing our own country's infrastructure to fall into a state of total disrepair. We spent – and I was against it from the beginning – they try and say “Well, maybe not â!” I was against it from the beginning. And by the way, we're knocking the hell out of ISIS; we'll be coming out of Syria like very soon. Let the other people take care of it now. Very soon, very soon we're coming out. We're going to have 100% of the Caliphate as they call it, sometimes referred to as land; we're taking it all back, quickly, quickly. But we're going to be coming out of there real soon; we're going to get back to our country where we belong, where we want to be. But think of it. We spent, as of three months ago, \$7 trillion – not billion, not million – \$7 trillion with a “t”; nobody every heard of the word trillion until ten years ago. We spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East. We build a school, they

blow it up; we build it again, they blow it up. We build it again, it hasn't been blown up yet, but it will be. But if we want a school in Ohio to fix the windows, you can't get the money. If you want a school in Pennsylvania or Iowa to get Federal money, you can't get the money. We spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East. And you know what we have for it? Nothing. Stupid! Stupid! But we spent \$7 trillion, but we barely have money for the infrastructure. For most of our history, American infrastructure was the envy of the world – true. Go back 30, 40, 50 years. They would look at us like – now, we are like in many places a Third World country. It's an embarrassment! And we're the ones that had the imagination and the drive to get it done, but we've got that again. Other nations marveled as we connected our shores with transcontinental railroads and brought power to our cities that lit up the sky like no other place on Earth, and build mile after mile of interstate capabilities and interstate highways to carry American products all across the country and around the globe. Nobody did it like us! We dug out the Panama Canal; think of that! Thousands of lives were lost to the mosquito, to the mosquito – malaria. We dug out the Panama Canal. We transformed our skylines with towering works of concrete and steel, and laid the foundation for the modern economy. To rebuild this nation, we must reclaim that proud heritage – have to reclaim it. And we're on our way. We must recapture the excitement of creation, the spirit of innovation, and the spark of invention. We're starting! You saw the rocket the other day, you see what's going on with cars. You see what's going on with so much. NASA, space agency, all of sudden it's back, you notice? It was dormant for many, many years. Now it's back, and they're doing a great job. America is a nation like you, of builders. It's a nation of pioneers, a nation that accepts no limits, no hardship, and never ever gives up. We don't give up! We don't give up. Anything we can dream, you can build. You will create the new highways, the new dams and skyscrapers that will become lasting monuments to American strength and continued greatness. You will forge new American steel into the spine of our country. You will cement the foundation of a glorious American future, and you will do it all with those beautiful American hands. Powerful hands, powerful heart, and powerful American pride, right? Powerful American pride.

But you're the ones who are truly making America great

again. We're going to work together. We're going to work with the state of Ohio, we're going to work with everybody. And we're going to bring our country to a level of success and prominence and pride like it has never ever seen before. Thank you, and God bless America. Thank you. Thank you very much.

OGDEN: So you can see, the commitment truly is there. This is obviously what got President Trump elected in the first place. He's back in Ohio, back in the industrial heartland. That commitment to the reindustrialization of the United States, the reclaiming of the legacy of the great manufacturing power and returning to that image of the United States as the envy of the world in terms of builders. He cited the transcontinental railroad connecting the sea to the sea, ocean to ocean, stretching across the United States. The Moon landing, so many other things that the United States accomplished. Now, in his words, there are parts of the United States that literally have come to resemble a Third World country. So, the commitment is there.

The program is exactly what LaRouche PAC has issued. This is the Four Laws economic program, and that's why it's so indispensable that this pamphlet is circulated across the country, and that this is studied by people in the United States everywhere. This should be the material which is being used by these trade delegations that are travelling to China. Alaska, Miami-Dade County, West Virginia; all of these states, all of these local government officials, all of these governors, all of these Senators and Congressmen. If they really want to figure out what is the policy that the United States should be discussing, this is the source material. This is what they should be studying. You are the ones who play the critical role in getting it into their hands and communicating the ideas that are contained in this pamphlet.

The way that this is going to happen, and this is exactly what Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have been addressing from the standpoint of the New Silk Road becoming the World Land-Bridge and the United States becoming part of this New Paradigm of development and mega-projects. One very interesting development, which is really just a continuation of what has been discussed by numerous officials coming out of China, and really was originated by Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the LaRouche movement when she went to the Belt and Road Initiative forum last Spring, along the lines of China actually converting their US Treasury bonds that they

hold into equity in a national infrastructure bank here in the United States and putting that money in terms of credit into allowing the United States to capitalize such an infrastructure fund; and to build these great projects that you heard President Trump discussing.

So, let me just say, this week, as publicized by CGTN, which is the China Daily global television network, an organization called the Center for China and Globalization has reiterated the idea that the only pathway towards stability in terms of US-China trade relations, and evening out this so-called trade deficit, the only pathway should be based on joint economic initiatives and joint investments. Instead of tit-for-tat tariff retaliation this way and that way, the Center for China and Globalization – according to CGTN – said that China should continue ten measures that it should take to foster US-China trade ties. They recommend, in addition to adjustments that should be made in areas such as lifting excessive limits on high technology exports to China, and various other aspects. The two most important steps that they propose here are the following: 1. “Consider the establishment of an investment fund to help the United States upgrade its infrastructure, capitalizing on China’s advanced technology and expertise in the field.” 2. “Enlist the participation of American companies in Belt and Road projects as third party partners.” So again, the establishment of an investment fund where China can invest in the upgrading of US infrastructure, and also contribute its significant expertise that it has developed in terms of the projects that China has built over the last 10-15 years. Then, two, enlist American companies in Belt and Road projects as third party partners. So, in other words, the United States and US companies actually join China as third party partners in some of these development projects in other countries. Why could the United States not be participating as joint investors and joint partners in some of these fantastic rail projects that China has been building in Africa, for example? Or some of the water projects, or some of the power projects? And this kind of win-win relationship between the United States and China could then benefit both China and the United States, but also benefit the world. So, in this way, China can continue to adhere to their professed goal of long-term stable economic and trade relations between the two nations, but also third party partners can also benefit.

So, that's what was proposed by this organization – the Center for China and Globalization. And emphatically, this is not a new idea. In fact, this idea comes directly from what the LaRouche movement has been discussing in terms of America's future on the New Silk Road. So, this is a very significant opportunity, and despite the fact that everything you're hearing right now is trade war, tariffs, tit-for-tat, and so forth, President Trump even in that speech in Ohio that you just heard, praised what China has been able to accomplish in terms of these marvels of infrastructure. Bridge building, so forth and so on, over the recent years. It's exactly that spirit, the spirit of the New Silk Road that the United States must emulate right now. We see some very interesting potentials around that sort of development. Again, as I said, these are the dividends of the close personal relationship that President Trump and President Xi Jinping have forged. And it's our job to continue to develop things along that path.

So, let me conclude here by playing another clip from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's webcast from yesterday, where she addresses this proposal for the United States joining the Belt and Road Initiative as a third party partner in development projects abroad, and also this idea of Chinese investment through an infrastructure bank or similar investment fund in infrastructure projects here in the United States. So, here's this clip from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Well, there is actually a very interesting response from China, where the Prime Minister Li Keqiang made a proposal: He said, rather than reducing the trade deficit by imposing tariffs, which would end up in a trade war, and nobody would be the winner in the end, he said, the other way to resolve the trade deficit would be to increase the volume of trade, and that way you could have also joint ventures between the United States and China and third countries. And that is obviously the approach which we have been proposing for a very long time.

There was also an extremely productive approach being discussed on CGTN, the China Global Television Network, where they said that the United States and China should start a dialogue about infrastructure, and that Chinese investors could

invest in the development of infrastructure in the United States, through a fund. Now, this is a proposal which we have been pushing from way back, saying that China has these very large US Treasury reserves, which if they just sit there, don't do anything good. But if they would be invested in the infrastructure inside the United States, through an infrastructure bank or some other mechanism, it could help to solve the financing problem which President Trump clearly has; given the fact that presently what is available in terms of funding, is very far from the \$1 trillion he had mentioned during the election campaign. And the American Society of Civil Engineers had said what is needed is not \$1 trillion but actually \$4.5 trillion; and some experts have even said, in order to get modern infrastructure in the United States, you need \$8 trillion in investment.

So, I think there is a situation where you could get rid of the trade imbalance by really using the Chinese expertise in high-speed train systems and other infrastructure. And what we have shaping up from the Schiller Institute was this idea to do exactly in the United States what China has been doing and will complete by 2025, or even 2020, to connect all its major cities through fast train systems. Now, obviously the infrastructure in the United States is in terrible shape and needs urgent repair, most of it is almost 100 years old or even older. So this would be an approach to really resolve this on a higher level.

I think many people should discuss this, and there are already many forces in the United States who have opened channels with their Chinese counterparts. The governor of West Virginia, the mayor of Houston, Texas, the governor of Alaska. Naturally people in Iowa are very tuned in, because the former Iowa Gov. Terry Branstad is U.S. Ambassador in Beijing. So there are actually other alternatives than going into a trade war, which nobody would really benefit from.

[T]he world has reached a point where we {have} to overcome geopolitics. Because if, at this point, the United States, or the West in general, would go into the Thucydides Trap, take the rise of China as a reason to go into war and confrontation, this could very easily be the end of all of humanity, so we have to find a different way. And China has said many times, they do not want to surpass the United States and replace with a unipolar world order, but they want to be in a new alliance of sovereign countries, and have the idea of the one

humanity first.

And I think this is a new concept of foreign policy, and people should study it and relate to it, rather than going for the rather uninformed opinions of such people as Marco Rubio, who is on a rampage against anything Chinese. But it really is not going to work, because the rest of the world is very happy with what China is doing, and I think it would be for the absolute benefit of humanity if the United States and China could find a way to cooperate in their mutual interest.

OGDEN: So there, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche said, it would be of the absolute benefit of the people of the United States and of China and the benefit of all humanity, if these two countries can find a pathway towards cooperation in their mutual interest. In fact, that's the reality with all countries. This is the point of the idea of a great powers relationship. Russia, China, India, the United States; and that really is the foundation of exactly what this idea of a new win-win paradigm of relations between nations is. There are problems to be overcome; there are disagreements that will invariably occur; there are conflicts that different nations must resolve. But all of these can be resolved by elevating the dialogue to a higher level, and to look at what the common challenges are and what are the avenues of the common benefit that all nations can work together towards this idea of a common destiny for mankind.

So, we're out of time right now. As I said in the beginning, if you looked at it in one way, you would say the possibility of war is very near at hand. But if you look at it in another way, you say the possibility of a New Paradigm of peace and mutual development is also very close at hand, and is right there for the taking. It is all that much more necessary that those of us who have this perspective and understand that the big picture – events on the ground are being dictated and are being driven by this fight; by this struggle between two mutually opposing paradigms. The geopolitical paradigm, that has brought us to the threshold of this kind of war situation; but also, this New Paradigm of economic development and mega-projects. And the offer, that we will assist you, not expecting something in return, not trying to impose our will on you; but just from the standpoint that this kind of cooperation is in our mutual benefit. It's up to us and it's up to the elected leadership here in the United States on all levels, to gain that perspective and to look for those avenues of mutually

beneficial cooperation and win-win relationships that can build the bridge from now into this future in which the New Paradigm is dominant.

So, as I said, we have the material which you need, which is in the contents of this Four Laws pamphlet. This is "Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws; The Physical Economic Principles for the Recovery of the United States: America's Future on the New Silk Road." This was originally printed many months ago, but it remains highly relevant and a very timely intervention that we can use to educate our fellow Americans according to this potential for the dividends of the New Paradigm of win-win cooperation and economic development. With that perspective in mind, we wish you a Happy Easter, and we thank you for tuning to larouchepac.com. Please stay tuned, and we'll see you on Monday.

[Theresa Mays anti-russiske korstog er intet andet end UK's krig mod Trump](#)

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 26. marts, 2018 – Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har hen over de seneste 35 år spillet en hovedrolle i udformningen af relationer mellem nationer til det bedre: gennem LaRouches idé til præsident Reagans Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) fra 1983, og gennem »LaRouche-doktrinen« for stormagtsrelationer, som ledsagede denne idé; og gennem deres kampagne fra 1989 for den »Eurasiske Landbro«, som sluttelig bidrog til Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, der nu udvikler mange nationer i hele verden. Hele vejen igennem var fjenderne af disse tiltag hen mod et nyt paradigme for udvikling, City of Londons finansimperium og britisk geopolitik.[\[1\]](#)

Denne tidligere, hyppigt skjulte virkelighed er pludselig, på dramatisk vis, blevet åbenlys. Den britiske premierminister Theresa May og udenrigsminister Boris »bondske« Johnson har tyranniseret USA og 14 europæiske nationer ind i en eskalerende konfrontation med Rusland, der tilsigter at ødelægge stormagtssamarbejde for fremskridt gennem projekterne i Bælte & Vej, og som meget hurtigt kan føre til verdenskrig.

I går understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at London har gjort dette som en reaktion på miskrediteringen af det af britisk efterretning styrede Russiagate-kupforsøg mod præsident Donald Trump. Hun sprængte den udokumenterede sag om

»russisk nervegift« som værende intet andet end Russiagate fortsat, genopfundet og genoplivet. Denne sags foreløbige succes, efter at Russiagate mod Trump var slået fejl, er ekstremt farlig, sagde hun. Både Kina og Rusland vil reagere på denne ændrede, transatlantiske dagsorden.

Kina har, gennem sin præsident Xi Jinping og sine partiorganer som *Global Times*, indset, at Kinas fredelige opkomst, konfronteret med et sandt stormløb af britisk geopolitisk og økonomisk krigsførelse, måske ikke vil få lov at blive let eller fredelig.

Men Kina har udløst en udviklingsdynamik og hæver produktivitet og levestandarder i mange nationer, såvel som i sin egen, og bruger et nyt koncept, som Lyndon LaRouche for 30 år siden kaldte »Verdenslandbro-udviklingen«. Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ tiltrækker nu også nationer fra selv Vesteuropa. Dets lederskab vil ikke lade sig standse af toldkrig eller investeringsembargo; i stedet anvender det dette nye paradigme for at stoppe dem.

Som Helga LaRouche udtrykte det, så er Kina omsider i færd med at feje Londons århundredelange Malthus-politik og nulsums-geopolitik til side; og Kina erstatter det med et Nyt Paradigme for gensidig fordel for nationer, for udryddelse af fattigdom, videnskabeligt fremskridt og for »et fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«. Lyndon LaRouche har i 50 år insisteret på nødvendigheden af denne udskiftning. Hans LaRouche-bevægelse har fremlagt ammunitionen til overvindelse af angrebene mod præsident Trump, som kommer fra britisk efterretning, og for de tiltag for en økonomisk politik, der kan virkeliggøre Amerikas fremtid på den »Nye Silkevej«.

[1] Se [Harley Schlangers præsentation af geopolitikken historie](#), fra serien, 'Hvad er det Nye Paradigme' (video; dansk pdf.)

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump i samtale med britiske PM Theresa May under et bilateralt møde i det ovale kontor, 27. januar, 2017. Premierminister May var det første statsoverhoved, der aflagde statsbesøg i Det Hvide Hus. (Official White House Photo)

[Strategisk Forsvarsinitiativ 35 år i](#)

dag: Omsæt Lyndon LaRouches vide ord til handling for et Strategisk Forsvar af Jorden. LPAC Internationale Webcast, 23. marts. 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: Det er i dag den 23. marts, 2018, en meget gunstig dato: Det er nemlig 35 års dagen for en meget vigtig dato, som var 23. marts, 1983, hvor præsident Ronald Reagan annoncerede vedtagelsen af det [Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ](#) (SDI; Strategic Defense Initiative). I dag er det et meget passende tidspunkt for at bedømme den stadigt mere presserende nødvendige vedtagelse af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur for planeten, og den samtidige nye økonomiske arkitektur, som må ledsage den.

Vi befinder os i et meget dramatisk øjeblik i verdenshistorien, og jeg mener, at, hvis vi træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede, så står det klart, at verdensordenen, som vi har kendt den i de seneste 70 år, er i færd med at undergå en total transformation. Og udfaldet af de strategiske kampe, der raser netop nu, både på den nationale scene her i USA, men især på den globale scene; udfaldet af disse strategiske kampe vil afgøre menneskehedens historie i mange generationer fremover.

Med de begivenheder, der har fundet sted i løbet af de seneste tre uger, siden den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin den 1. marts annoncerede, at Rusland havde udviklet en helt ny generation af strategiske våben, baseret på avancerede fysiske [principper], og som er i stand til at gennemtrænge alle kendte forsvarssystemer, har vi set, hvor dramatisk nødvendigt det er, med det presserende i en sådan ny sikkerhedsarkitektur. Ikke én, der bygger på Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD; garanteret gensidig ødelæggelse), men derimod én, der bygger på win-win-overlevelse og økonomisk fremskridt *for alle nationer* på denne planet; nødvendigheden heraf bliver i stigende grad mere presserende. Jeg vil gerne fremhæve, hvad præsident Putin selv sagde i denne tale 1. marts til den føderale forsamling:

Han sagde:

» ... lad os sætte os ved forhandlingsbordet og sammen udtænke et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig

civilisation. ... Dette er et vendepunkt for hele verden og for dem, der er villige til, og i stand til, at forandre sig; de, der handler og går fremad, vil tage føringen.»

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/56957>

Men, snarere end klart og nøgternt at vurdere denne ændrede, strategiske virkelighed, med denne game-changing tale af Ruslands præsident, og besvare dette tilbud for at forhandle, med hans ord, »et nyt og relevant system for international sikkerhed og bæredygtig udvikling for menneskelig civilisation«, for endelig at bringe denne nihilistiske dødsspiral med stadigt mere dødbringende masseudslettelsesvåben til en afslutning; snarere end at gøre dette, har briterne og deres såkaldte »partnere« i Europa forsøgt at oppiske en generel støtte til en krigskonfrontation mod Rusland ved anvendelse af det, Labour-partiets leder, Jeremy Corbyn, meget korrekt karakteriserede som det, han kaldte »fejlbehæftet efterretning« og »uvederhæftige dossiers« af den type, som blev brugt til at retfærdiggøre invasionen af Irak. Og som Jeremy Corbyn advarede om, så bør vi ikke »affinde os med en ny Kold Krig ... og en intolerance over for dissens som under McCarthy-perioden«.

Som [Helga Zepp-LaRouche i går understregede i sin internationale webcast](#), så har briterne og Theresa May, i deres forsøg på at gennemtvinge en sådan krigsprovokation, overspillet deres hånd. Deres metoder og deres mål står nu afsløret for hele verden at se. På trods af Theresa Mays bestræbelser på at presse præsident Trump over i et hjørne, hvor han ikke ville vove at forsøge at tage skridt, der ville gøre det muligt for ham at honorere sin forpligtelse til at forbedre relationerne med Rusland; snarere end at lade sig blive bakket ind i et hjørne, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde, så udmanøvrerede præsident Trump imidlertid hele operationen ved at tage telefonen og ringe til præsident Putin og lykønske ham med genvalget og hans næste periode som Ruslands præsident, og fortsatte med en meget sober diskussion mellem de to statsoverhoveder om nogle af de meget vigtige, fælles bestræbelser og fælles udfordringer, som disse to nationer, USA og Rusland, sammen konfronteres med; og som, hvis vi fik lov at gøre det, vi kunne arbejde sammen om at løse, såsom krisen i Syrien; såsom muligheden for et totalt gennembrud for fred på Koreahalvøen; såsom den igangværende situation i Ukraine; og meget signifikant, såsom at forhindre et nyt våbenkapløb.

Umiddelbart efter denne telefonsamtale, blev pressen, som I kan tænke jer, hysterisk, og Det Hvide Hus' pressesekretær Sarah Sanders holdt en pressekonference i briefing-værelset i Det Hvide Hus, hvor hun ikke mindre end et halvt dusin gange understregede den absolutte betydning af at opretholde en

dialog mellem USA og Rusland på lederskabsniveau, omkring fælles interesser og fælles udfordringer.

Jeg vil afspille nogle eksempler på nogle af disse gentagne udtalelser fra Sarah Sanders på denne pressebriefing i Det Hvide Hus.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

SARAH SANDERS: We want to continue to have a dialogue with Russia, and continue to talk about some of the shared interests we have, whether it's North Korea, Iran, and particularly as the President noted today, slowing the tensions when it comes to an arms race, something that is clearly important to both leaders....

We want to continue to have dialogue so that we can work on some of the issues that concern both countries, and we're going to continue to do that, while also continuing to be tough on a number of things....

The President once again has maintained that it's important for us to have a dialogue with Russia so that we can focus on some areas of shared interests...

These are conversations that sometimes take place, and certainly the President finds there to be an importance in having that dialogue with Russia so that we can talk about some of the big problems that face the world....

We disagree with the fact that we shouldn't have conversations with Russia. There are important topics that we should be able to discuss, and that is why the President's going to continue to have that dialogue.

Again the focus was to talk about areas of shared interests.

We know that we need to continue a dialogue. It's important for a lot of the safety and security of people across the globe. We would like to be able to work with them on things like North Korea, on Iran, and also both countries shared interest in lowering the tensions when it comes to an arms race, recognizing that that's not the best thing for either country, and so we want

to be able to have those conversations and that was the point of today's call.... [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's a very clear message, obviously. Now, on the same day, President Trump himself reiterated exactly the same points in a couple of tweets that he posted, and I would like to just read you those tweets. He said:

"I called President Putin of Russia to congratulate him on his election victory (in past, Obama called him also). The Fake News Media is crazed because they wanted me to excoriate him. They are wrong! Getting along with Russia (and others) is a good thing, not a bad thing."

"They can help solve problems with North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, ISIS, Iran, and even the coming Arms Race. Bush tried to get along, but didn't have the 'smarts.' Obama and Clinton tried, but didn't have the energy or chemistry (remember RESET). PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH!" he concludes.

Now of course that final phrase is a quotation directly from President Ronald Reagan. And this direct reference is a very timely one, and perhaps is not merely a coincidental one: As I said, today, March 23rd, is the 35th anniversary of one of the groundbreaking moments in modern history, and it's one which completely reshaped the global, strategic geometry at that time, and which remains immediately relevant all the way up to the present day.

That moment, March 23rd, 1983 was representative of a complete shock, a shock wave which was felt around the world. This was the surprise announcement by President Ronald Reagan at the conclusion of a live, national television broadcast which was an address to the nation, nominally on national security. But what President Reagan did at the conclusion of that broadcast, to the surprise of almost all of his leading advisors in the White House even, was to announce what came to be known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, what President Reagan called a "vision of the future, which offers hope."

In the speech, what President Reagan did was that he committed the United States to a crash program, a crash scientific program for the development of advanced technologies which would be based on new physical principles to (quote/unquote) "free the world from the threat of nuclear war." And so, in so doing, President Reagan completely overthrew the ideology of retaliatory nuclear deterrence through the threat of

instantaneous, total nuclear response in the event of the detection of a nuclear attack against the territory of the United States. This was what was so-called Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).

President Reagan completely rejected the very premise of Mutually Assured Destruction and in so doing, Reagan shocked the world, and truly did change the course of world history. So, right now, why don't we wind the clock back 35 years, and listen to what the world heard on that night, March 23rd, 1983:

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century...

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and defend against aggression – to preserve freedom and peace. Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States, or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable – quite the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different

world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age...

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisors, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides...

Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisors, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today. What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current

technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort...

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose – one all people share – is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war. My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you. [end video]

OGDEN: That was 35 years ago today.

Now, just as a side note, incidentally, President Trump is not ignorant of this history. In 1999, far before he ever was a candidate for President, in an interview with none other than Wolf Blitzer on CNN, President Trump actually addressed what he thought of as the necessity for the Strategic Defense Initiative, but also the necessity for sitting down and having talks to work out the tensions between the United States and Russia. Here's just a quick quote from President Trump. He said:

"As far as nuclear is concerned, this country, us, we need a shield..."

Wolf Blitzer said, "A Strategic Defense Initiative?"

And Trump affirmed that, saying, "Because Russia is unstable. We need a missile defense shield. People used to

criticize Reagan, but now it's very developable. We need a shield... We need a change. The ABM Treaty was 1972. Who knew what technology would develop? We have to sit down with the Russians and many others."

So, that was just a side note. That was Nov. 28, 1999. But as I think you can see, now-President Trump remains committed to that inclination to sit down with the Russians and many others – North Korea, for example; and to resolve these nuclear threats. If you just go back again to that date in 1983, this was 35 years ago. In President Reagan's own words, he said that what he announced that night would, indeed, change the course of world history; and it did. And, it took most of the world completely by surprise. But, it didn't come out of nowhere, and this history is very important for viewers to understand.

Let me just read you a portion of what Lyndon LaRouche had to say at that time. This is a statement that he issued the morning following that historic speech, so this is from March 24, 1983. What Mr. LaRouche had to say was the following:

"Only high-level officials of government, or a private citizen as intimately knowledgeable of details of the international political and strategic situation as I am privileged to be, can even begin to foresee the Earth-shaking impact the President's television address last night will have throughout the world... [T]he words the President spoke last night can never be put back into the bottle. Most of the world will soon know, and will never forget that policy announcement. With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

"Today I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope for humanity's future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of greatness never to be forgotten."

So that was Lyndon LaRouche, March 24, 1983. Now, as LaRouche alluded to in that statement, he was no bystander or casual observer of the events of that night President Reagan announced the SDI. In fact, the grand idea behind what Reagan announced that night, came directly from none other than Lyndon LaRouche himself. I would like to play for you a brief excerpt

of Mr. LaRouche, in his own words, speaking about the background to what had shocked the world that night – March 23, 1983. This is taken from a video that LaRouche PAC published about ten years ago, back in 2008, on the 25th anniversary of the SDI speech. The video was titled “A Brief History of Lyndon LaRouche’s SDI.” So, let’s listen to what Mr. LaRouche had to say in that video.

LYNDON LAROUCHE

: I had been organizing the SDI operation, including initially from 1977, long before it was called an SDI. I was the one who said, “We’re going to make a project of this thing.” So, I adopted this and stated this as my program in 1979, when I was running as a Presidential candidate. Then, I had this conversation with Reagan, and then as a follow-up after he was President, we had a follow-up with various people in the Reagan circle; including his National Security Council. I was working with the head of the National Security Council on this operation, and with people from the CIA and this and that. I was sworn to this and sworn to that, so I was doing the whole thing. The SDI was my work, which they liked. And there was a faction, including the President, who liked it. He liked it because he was against, he always hated Henry Kissinger; and he hated Henry Kissinger particularly because of the so-called “revenge weapons.” The idea that you build super weapons, and if somebody throws a bomb at you, you obliterate the planet. That is not considered a good defense, and he was against that. When he saw from experts that what I was saying was accepted experts – military and others – and this was French intelligence, the leadership of the Gaullist faction in France; this was the leadership of the German military; this was the leadership of the Italian military, and all over the world. So, I was the creator of the SDI. Reagan liked it, he adopted it. I was creating the thing in direct cooperation during the entire period, with the cooperation of the National Security Council and the heads of the CIA. People recognized that I was right; I had the scientific capability and knowledge to do it, and we were doing it.

OGDEN: So, that’s the story in Lyndon LaRouche’s own words. That is merely the tip of a very fascinating iceberg. We

encourage you to watch that full video that I cited that that excerpt was taken from. But also, to visit the page on the LaRouche PAC website which gives you the full background of this story. As you can see there, the link is larouchepac.com/sdi. That gives you this full, historic background. But as you heard Mr. LaRouche say there in that video clip, this effort on his part to craft the idea of what then became adopted by the President of the United States in the form of the SDI, this effort went all the way back to the mid-1970s. Here's an image of a campaign pamphlet which was commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, titled "Sputnik of the '70s: The Science behind the Soviets' Beam Weapon." In this pamphlet, Lyndon LaRouche called for an international crash program to develop a space-based missile defense system based on new physical principles. A Manhattan project-style mission which would provide the economic driver to fuel global development. The pamphlet proposed "... Long-range economic and scientific collaboration with the Soviet Union, among other nations, which would eliminate the danger of world obliteration," and it emphasized "... Tremendous revolutionary industrial implications available to this nation and the world if the political will of the United States forces a recommitment to technological progress in the form of an International Development Bank and its national concomitant Third National Bank."

So, as you can see, Lyndon LaRouche's idea of this missile defense system, was always framed around the idea of not unilateral defense systems, but rather, a joint missile defense and joint scientific and economic collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union. To do so, would be to unleash the revolutionary industrial and economic implications of such technological breakthroughs as the basis for a new international, economic order; something which he had been involved in all the way back to at least 1971 when he first issued the proposal for a new International Development Bank – the so-called IDB. So you can see in LaRouche's idea, the kernel of what became the SDI, always had with it a new international security architecture, overthrowing this entire reign of terror of Mutually Assured Destruction and revenge weapons. But concomitantly, a new international economic order, which would be driven by the revolutionary, unprecedented economic boom that would come out of the progress associated with such technological breakthroughs around these new physical principles in the

collaboration of US and Soviet scientists to develop this joint missile defense to make International Ballistic Missile and nuclear war impotent and obsolete.

The history is as fascinating as it is extensive. Here is not the time or the place to go through every single aspect of this history; but the full background, again as I said is available on that webpage – larouchepac.com/sdi. But if you fast forward from that pamphlet “Sputnik of the '70s” all the way to the lead-up into the 1980 Presidential campaign in which Lyndon LaRouche himself was a candidate for President of the United States. Let’s take a look at a picture here of Lyndon LaRouche meeting face-to-face with then-candidate Ronald Reagan at a candidates’ forum that took place in Concord, New Hampshire. During this face-to-face meeting and in several other opportunities to interface with the Reagan campaign team, Lyndon LaRouche presented this idea, in principle and in detail. Following Reagan’s victory and his election, Lyndon LaRouche and representatives of his organization, were brought in for meetings with first the Reagan Presidential transition team, and then with leading members of the National Security Council and Reagan’s intelligence community. They discussed LaRouche’s idea for this new strategic doctrine, and the related scientific and energy policies that would go along with it. So, Lyndon LaRouche commissioned numerous reports and campaign pamphlets promoting this idea. As you can see here, this is from {Fusion}; this is a special report titled “Directed Energy Beams; A Weapon for Peace.” Here’s the next one; this is an edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine from November 30, 1982. Again, before the March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI. This was titled “Beam Weapons: The Science to Prevent Nuclear War.” Here’s another one; this is a pamphlet. “How Beam Weapon Technologies Can Reverse the Depression.” So, all along, this was always an economic idea from Lyndon LaRouche’s standpoint. As you can see, being an American at this point, in the years preceding the 1980 Presidential election and then coming out of Reagan’s victory, 1980, '81, '82, the idea of this Beam Defense system which would be based on new physical principles, was associated – including in the popular mind – it was associated with Lyndon LaRouche. And it had been associated with Lyndon LaRouche for at least half a decade prior to Reagan’s historic, groundbreaking speech.

The morning after Reagan’s March 23rd address, the media was

scrambling to try to find experts to interview to explain what it was that Reagan had presented the night before. Naturally, they had to turn to representatives of the LaRouche organization. Here's a photograph of Paul Gallagher, who was at that time Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, appearing on CBS' Evening News program on March 24, 1983 – the day following Reagan's address – to explain the science behind Reagan's policy that had been announced the evening before.

Immediately following Reagan's address to the nation, Lyndon LaRouche launched a mass educational campaign to educate the American people as to what their President had just presented. He published and commissioned the publication of numerous mass circulation reports to inform the American people and also policymakers on the details of how such a program would work. This image here is an array of different publications that were issued by the LaRouche movement, supporting Reagan's announcement of the Strategic Defense Initiative and detailing the scientific, the economic, and the military-strategic implications of the policy. There you can see one pamphlet – "Support the President's Strategic Defense Initiative; Kill Missiles, Not People."

As should be very clear, Lyndon LaRouche was in a leading position of authority following this groundbreaking announcement, and the influence that his ideas had come to wield put him in a position of real power inside the political structure of the Presidency of the United States. He used that influence to launch and to escalate on his campaign to completely reorganize the entire international economic and strategic architecture of the planet. Let's take a look at a document that Lyndon LaRouche released exactly one year following Reagan's March 23, 1983 announcement of the SDI program. This was called "The LaRouche Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and the USSR." This was published March 30, 1984. Let me read you some excerpts from what Lyndon LaRouche published under this title "The LaRouche Doctrine." He begins by saying: "The political foundation for durable peace must be: a) The unconditional sovereignty of each and all nation-states, and b) Cooperation among sovereign nation-states to the effect of promoting unlimited opportunities to participate in the benefits of technological progress, to the mutual benefit of each and all. "The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the monetary,

economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and those relatively subordinated nations often classed as 'developing nations.' Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there can be no durable peace on this planet.

"Insofar as the United States and Soviet Union acknowledge the progress of the productive powers of labor throughout the planet to be in the vital strategic interests of each and both, the two powers are bound to that degree and in that way by a common interest. This is the kernel of the political and economic policies of practice indispensable to the fostering of durable peace between those two powers.

.. [T]he general advancement of the productive powers of labor in all sovereign states, most emphatically so-called developing nations, requires global emphasis on: a) increasing globally the percentiles of the labor force employed in scientific research and related functions of research and development ... b) increasing the absolute and relative scales of capital-goods production and also the rate of turnover in capital-goods production; and c) combining these two factors to accelerate technological progress in capital-goods outputs.

"Therefore, high rates of export of such capital-goods output to meet the needs of developing nations are indispensable for the general development of so-called developing nations: Our common goal, and our common interest, is promoting both the general welfare and promoting preconditions of durable peace between our two powers....

"By supplying increased amounts of high-technology capital goods to developing nations, the exporting economies foster increased rates of turnover in their own most advanced capital-goods sectors of production....

"The importer of such advanced capital goods increases the productive powers of labor in the economy of the importing nation. This enables the importing nation to produce its goods at a lower average social cost, and enables it to provide better-quality and cheaper goods as goods of payment to the nations exporting capital goods.

"Not only are the causes of simple humanity and general peace served by such policies of practice; the arrangement is equally beneficial to exporting and importing nations....

.. [T]he general rate of advancement of the productive

powers of labor is most efficiently promoted by no other policy of practice.”

Then a little later in the report, he reviews the situation of strategic tensions between the USSR and the United States. He says:

“Since the rupture of the wartime alliance between the two powers, U.S. military policy toward the Soviet Union has passed through two phases. The first, from the close of the war until a point beyond the death of Joseph Stalin, was preparation for the contingency of what was sometimes named ‘preventive nuclear war.’ The second, emerging over the period from the death of Stalin into the early period of the administration of President John F. Kennedy, was based on the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response ...

“From approximately 1963 until approximately 1977, it might have appeared, as it appeared to many, that the doctrines of Nuclear Deterrence and Flexible Response had succeeded in preserving a state of restive peace, something called ‘détente,’ between the two powers. This appearance was deceptive; during the period 1977-83, there was an accelerating deterioration in the military relationships between the two powers....

“Beginning shortly after the inauguration of President Jimmy Carter, the deterioration of the military situation accelerated....

“In response to this direction of developments, the U.S. public figure Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. proposed that both powers develop, deploy, and agree to develop and deploy ‘strategic’ defensive, anti-ballistic-missile defense based on ‘new physical principles.’ This proposal was issued publicly by LaRouche beginning February 1982; he proposed to U.S.A., Western European, and Soviet representatives that the development and deployment of such strategic defensive systems be adopted policy, as a means for escaping from the ‘logic’ of Nuclear Deterrence....

“... The true solution must be found in the domain of politics and economics, and the further shaping of military relations between the powers must produce military policies by each coherent with the direction of development of the needed political and economic solutions....

“On the part of the United States of America, the government is committed to avoiding all colonial, imperial, or kindred endeavors in foreign policy, and to establish, instead, a growing community of principle among fully sovereign nation-states of

this planet. This shall become a community of principle coherent with the policies of the articles of this draft memorandum. If any force should endeavor to destroy that community of principle, or any member of that community of sovereign nations, the United States will be prepared to defend that community and its members by means of warfare, should other means prove insufficient. With respect to the Soviet Union, the government of the United States offers the Soviet Union cooperation with itself in service of these principles, and desires that the Soviet Union might enter fully into participation within that community of principle...

"Under these conditions, provided that all nations share in development of the frontiers of scientific research, in laboratories, and in educational institutions, all nations will be made capable of assimilating efficiently the technological by-product benefits of the military expenditures on systems derived from application of 'new physical principles.'

"To lend force to this policy, the powers agree to establish new institutions of cooperation between themselves and other nations in development of these new areas of scientific breakthrough for application to exploration of space.

"To this purpose, the powers agree to establish at the earliest possible time institutions for cooperation in scientific exploration of space, and to also co-sponsor treaty-agreements protecting national and multinational programs for colonization of the Moon and Mars.

"At some early time, the powers shall enter into deliberations, selecting dates for initial manned colonization of the Moon and Mars, and the establishment of international space stations on the Moon and in the orbits of Moon and Mars, stations to be maintained by and in the common interest and use of space parties of all nations.

"The powers jointly agree upon the adoption of two tasks as the common interest of mankind, as well as the specific interest of each of the two powers: 1) The establishment of full economic equity respecting the conditions of individual life in all nations of this planet during a period of not more than 50 years; 2) Man's exploration and colonization of nearby space as the continuing common objective and interest of mankind during and beyond the completion of the first task. The adoption of these two working-goals as the common task and respective interest in common of the two powers and other cooperating nations, constitutes the central point of reference for erosion of the

potential political and economic causes of warfare between the powers.”

That was known as the “LaRouche Doctrine,” published March 30, 1984. As you can see, what Lyndon LaRouche outlined in that document was the basis for exactly what we’re calling now a new international economic and strategic architecture. In fact, the one requires the other. You cannot have a new strategic architecture without resolving what Lyndon LaRouche characterized as the root causes behind the conflict between these nations; the persisting inequalities between nations. And you cannot have the kind of cooperation needed for the common, mutual economic development and the application of these groundbreaking new physical principles and the technologies that are derived from those, without the establishment of a new international economic order. Elsewhere in that document, Mr. LaRouche described exactly how such an economic order must take place; with fixed exchange rates between currencies, massive credits – both domestically within countries for the upgrading of the technological and infrastructure platforms within those nations – but also, international credit treaty agreements in the form of what he originally described in 1971 as the International Development Bank, or the IDB.

As you can see, and I think any astute reader of that document now, almost 35 years later, that document laid the basis for what we now see as the so-called “win-win” new economic paradigm. This idea of the common benefit of all; mutual cooperation for joint development; the upgrading of the so-called “developing” nations, which were still suffering under the effects of colonialism and post-colonial policy. So, when President Xi Jinping of China speaks about “win-win” economic development and a new community of nations with a shared destiny, I think that the echoes couldn’t be more clear of what Lyndon LaRouche himself was describing at that time in the middle of the 1980s, almost 35 years ago today. When Xi Jinping offers the United States to join this new “win-win” system, the Belt and Road Initiative, which is already resolving these persisting inequalities that the world has been suffering, such as in Africa or Central and South America. Or, when President Putin offers to “sit down at the negotiating table and devise together a new and relevant system of international security and sustainable development for human civilization,” we should reflect on what was laid in that document. That LaRouche Doctrine now almost 35

years ago today, in the wake of that history-changing announcement by President Ronald Reagan, at which he called a spade a spade. The world could no longer survive under the dictatorship of Mutually Assured Destruction; that reign of terror that President Kennedy characterized as the Sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads over every man, woman, and child on this planet, threatening nuclear annihilation. What Lyndon LaRouche characterized at that moment as the "LaRouche Doctrine" is the principle behind the new economic and new security architecture which must be adopted on this planet today. Not as a recipe, not taking everything exactly as it was said, because clearly of course, the world has changed; and we must apply the principles that lay at the root of exactly what Lyndon LaRouche had in mind when he proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative and when he proposed the subsequent LaRouche Doctrine, and apply those to evolve necessarily to fit the specific conditions of today.

One thing that Lyndon LaRouche alluded to explicitly in that document, was the need for joint cooperation in the colonization and exploration of space. In fact, that is the form that the idea of a revived SDI has actually been taken. The proposal for not an SDI, but what's now called an SDE – the Strategic Defense of Earth – to literally re-tool the strategic nuclear weapons with these massive payloads that have been accumulated by the United States, Russia, also other nations – China and India and other nations. To re-tool those nuclear weapons and also the delivery systems, these high-power intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also the new technologies that Russia has just announced. To re-tool these technologies and have what were offensive weapons become defensive tools against asteroids and other threats to planet Earth which we may encounter from outer space. While this was proposed under that name, the SDE, by certain individuals inside Russia about five years ago, coinciding with the 30th anniversary of the original SDI speech. What this originally actually came out of, had its origins in the late 1980s and the early 1990s with the scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Teller was actually one of the leading scientific advisors of President Reagan in the 1980s around the SDI initiative, but following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr. Edward Teller travelled to Russia and visited some of the leading science cities that had been involved in developing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. He met with some of the

leading former Soviet scientists, the Russian scientists, and proposed exactly this. He proposed the idea of the United States and Russia saying the Cold War is over; let's now cease this policy of aiming our nuclear missiles one against the other, and let's now aim them against the common threats that mankind as a whole faces. Especially with the latest news of an asteroid which poses a credible threat – what's called a “non-zero threat” – to the Earth in the foreseeable future, which was just discussed in the media over the past week, this proposal is all the more timely and all the more relevant today.

So, what I'd like is to just play an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's international webcast that she delivered yesterday. She takes up exactly this idea, so here's an excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think that the SDI proposal, which was absolutely not what the media made out of it, calling it “Star Wars,” and things like that, the SDI proposal of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche was an absolutely farsighted vision of a New Paradigm! And if you read the relevant papers about it, especially the proposed draft for a dialogue among the superpowers, which was published one year later, which you can find in the archives or in the newer {EIR}s. This was a vision where both superpowers would develop together, new physical principles which would make nuclear weapons obsolete. And I think what Putin announced on March 1st in terms of new physical principles applied for new weapons systems, is absolutely in this tradition. And Putin also asked, now they have to sit down and we have to negotiate and put together a new security architecture, including Russia, the United States, China, and the Europeans.

This was all envisioned by my husband in this famous SDI proposal, and it was a very far-reaching to dissolve the blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to cooperate instead among sovereign republics, which is exactly what the New Silk Road dynamic today represents. And it was also the idea to use a science-driver in the economy to use the increased productivity of the real economy for a gigantic technology transfer to the developing sector, in order to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

And this is what we're seeing today, also, in the collaboration between China, Russia, and the countries that are participating in the Belt and Road Initiative.

So I think, in a certain sense, part of this danger of peace breaking out, that there is right now the very vivid tradition and actualization of that tradition of the SDI, and I think we should circulate this proposal by my husband again. I think we should enlarge it to become the SDE, the Strategic Defense of the Earth, because it was just discovered that very soon, another big asteroid is already taking course on the planet Earth. So we need to move quickly to the common aims of mankind, and all countries should cooperate and be a shared community for the one future of humanity.

This is the New Paradigm which I think is so obvious. I mean, if you look at the long arc of history, we {have} to overcome geopolitics and we have to move to a kind of cooperation where we put all our forces together to solve those questions which are a challenge to all of humanity – nuclear weapons, poverty, asteroids – there are so many areas where we could fruitfully cooperate – space exploration is one of them. And I think we are in a very fascinating moment in history, but we need more active citizens. So please contact us, work with us, and let's together make a better world.

OGDEN: So, that was Helga LaRouche's call to action, and I think that's a perfect concluding point for our webcast today, as we observe this very auspicious date – March 23rd – the 35th anniversary of President Reagan's groundbreaking speech announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative. Let's take that kind of sense of victory and the optimism that indeed, ideas can change the course of history, and consolidate this New Paradigm; this new security architecture and new economic architecture for the planet. The opportunity is greater than it ever has been before; but the need is ever more dire.

Thank you for joining me, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Perfide Albion: Det dødeligt sårede, britiske bestie slår fra sig; Forgiftningen af Skripal er desperat britisk forsøg på at genoplive deres amerikanske kup

Denne artikel vil udforske den strategiske betydning af betydningsfulde begivenheder i verden, med begyndelse i februar, 2018. Vores formål er præcist at placere Theresa Mays sindssyge bestræbelse den 12.-14. marts på at fabricere et nyt svindelnummer med »massetødelæggelsesvåben« med anvendelse af de samme folk (MI6-efterretningsgrupperingen omkring Sir Richard Dearlove) og det samme manuskript (en efterretningssvindel med hensyn til massetødelæggelsesvåben), som blev brugt til at trække USA ind i den katastrofale Irakkrig. Svindelnummeret med forgiftningen af Skripal involverer ligeledes direkte den britiske agent, Christopher Steele, den centrale person i det igangværende kup mod Donald Trump. Denne gang er den britiske operation for informationskrig direkte rettet mod at provokere Rusland samtidig med, at de fastholder den amerikanske befolkning og præsident Trump som mål for deres angreb.

Som den ophedede, krigstidslignende mediedækning og hysteriet omkring sagen gør det klart, så synes en vist lag i den britiske elite at være parat til at risikere alt på vegne af det døende imperiesystem. På trods af alt ståhejet, så synes økonomisk krigsførelse og sanktioner at være briternes foretrukne våben. Som vi vil få at se, så afslørede Putin for nylig Vestens atomare bluff.[\[1\]](#) Med Russiagate-kuppet mod Donald Trump, der er ved at ebbe ud og eksponerer den britiske agent Christopher Steele og et slæng af hans amerikanske venner til retsforfølgelse for kriminelle handlinger, var der et desperat behov for et nyt værktøj til at drive USA's præsident ind i det britiske, geopolitiske hjørne, som de har til fælles med det meste af det amerikanske establishment. Dette værktøj er et efterretnings-svindelnummer, et gennemprøvet og pålideligt britisk produkt.

Foto: Den britiske premierminister, Theresa May. (Photo: EU2017EE Estonian Presidency)

Trump til Putin – Lad os mødes snart

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 20. marts, 2018 – Præsident Trump har netop trukket tæppet væk under den skøre lady, Theresa May, og den endnu mere skøre udenrigsminister Boris Johnson. Alt imens disse afdankede forsvarere af det døende, britiske imperium beskylder Rusland for krigshandlinger, beskyldninger, der typisk ikke er baseret på nogen beviser, ringede Trump i dag og talte med den netop genvalgte præsident Vladimir Putin. Trump ikke alene lykønskede Putin for hans valgsejr, men annoncerede til den amerikanske presse, at han og Putin »sandsynligvis vil mødes i en ikke så fjern fremtid« for at diskutere forholdsregler for at forhindre et våbenkapløb og finde fredelige løsninger på kriserne i Ukraine, Syrien og Nordkorea. Kremls udskrift af samtalen lød, at de to ledere »talte for at udvikle praktisk samarbejde inden for forskellige felter, inkl. bestræbelser for at sikre strategisk stabilitet og bekæmpe international terrorisme, med særlig vægt på betydningen af koordinerede bestræbelser på at begrænse et våbenkapløb.« Kreml tilføjede: »Samtalen om økonomisk samarbejde afslørede en interesse i at styrke det. Energi blev diskuteret særskilt.«

Her til aften vil briterne bide i gulvtæppet. Ikke alene har Trump ødelagt deres kneb med at beskylde Rusland for et kemisk krigsangreb på britisk jord; men også svindelnummeret med »Russiagate« i USA, som køres direkte af MI6-agenten Christopher Steele og hans agenter internt i USA, er kollapsede. Nu står aktørerne i dette kupforsøg mod den amerikanske regering – inkl. John Brennan, James Clapper, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton og flere nyligt fyrede FBI-operatører – over for mulige anklager om kriminelle handlinger for det mest åbenlyse forræderi i moderne amerikansk historie, alt sammen på vegne af Det britiske Imperium.

For at gøre det hele værre for den ynkelige, håbefulde »M« og hendes kohorte, har »BoJo«-Labour-leder Jeremy Corbyn, der efter al sandsynlighed ville vinde et valg mod May, hvis det blev afholdt nu, krævet, at May fremlægger beviser (hvis der eksisterer nogen) for den nervegift, der blev brugt i Skripal-angrebet, over for russerne og (ligesom præsident Trump) insisteret på, at forhandlinger med russerne er absolut nødvendigt. I et BBC-interview her til morgen mindede han også landet om de katastrofale resultater af Tony Blairs tidligere forfalskede

efterretninger om Iraks masseødelæggelsesvåben.

Og, for lige at banke sømmet dybere ind, så bekræftede talsperson for Det Hvide Hus Sarah Sanders, at nervegiftangrebet i UK slet ikke blev nævnt i telefonsamtalen mellem Trump og Putin!

Det nye paradigme er ved at komme i fokus på globalt plan: ikke alene lykønskede Trump Putin med at vinde seks år mere på posten, men sagde også, at det var godt, at Kina har ophævet begrænsninger af embedsperioder – for, sagde han, Xi Jinping er en storslået leder.

I dag talte Xi Jinping for den afsluttende forsamling i den 13. Nationale Folkekongres og udtrykte tillid til, at den kinesiske foryngelse vil fortsætte og ekspandere, med Kina, der bidrager endnu mere til global regeringsførelse og global udvikling gennem den Nye Silkevej. »Lad solskinnet fra et fællesskab for en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden oplyse verden«, sluttede han.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i dag, at præsidenterne Trump, Putin og Xi viser sandt lederskab for verden, alt imens Det britiske Imperiums desperate handlinger er begyndt at give bagslag. Tidligere har britiske imperieintriger været støttet af svage, amerikanske ledere, der endda stillede sig i spidsen for håndhævelse af britisk politik, som i krigen i Indokina, Irakkrigen og krigen i Libyen, samt i de radikale politikker for det 'frie marked', som holdt de tidligere kolonisationer økonomisk tilbagestående samtidig med at ødelægge de industrialiserede nationer i Europa og Nordamerika.

Men Trump har nægtet at lade sig udnytte af den »særlige relation« og har i stedet fremført, at imperieopdelingen i Øst og Vest skal være forbi. I sin besejring af kupmagerne kan han også gennemføre sit løfte om at vende USA tilbage til det Amerikanske System for fysisk økonomi og opgive den fejlslagne, britiske »frie markedsmode« til fordel for en dirigeret kreditpolitik i Hamiltons tradition til genopbygning af Amerikas industrielle infrastruktur. Situationen er stadig ekstremt farlig, men aldrig har vi været så tæt på at afslutte selve eksistensen af Imperium, én gang for alle.

Foto: Trump og Putin hilser på hinanden på APEC-topmødets første dag. 10. nov., 2017, De Nang, Vietnam.

Præsident Trump ringer til Putin for at diskutere strategisk samarbejde og muligt møde

20. marts, 2018 – I samtale med reportere under sit møde i dag i det ovale kontor med den saudiske prins Mohammad bin Salman, annoncerede præsident Donald Trump rask, at han havde ringet til den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin tidligere på dagen for at lykønske ham med hans valgsejr og foreslå, at de to skulle mødes »i en ikke for fjern fremtid« for at diskutere, hvordan de i fællesskab kunne forhindre et våbenkapløb, blandt andre afgørende spørgsmål.

Som præsidenten forklarede: »telefonsamtalen havde også at gøre med det faktum, at vi sandsynligvis vil mødes i en ikke for fjern fremtid, så vi kan diskutere våben, diskutere våbenkapløbet. Som I ved, så har han erklæret, at det, at være i et våbenkapløb, ikke er så godt. Det var lige efter valget – en af de første udtalelser, han kom med.

Vi vil bruge \$700 mia. i år på vores militær, og meget af det er, at vi fortsat vil være langt stærkere end nogen anden nation i verden.

Vi havde en meget god samtale, og jeg regner med, at vi sandsynligvis vil mødes i en ikke så fjern fremtid for at diskutere våbenkapløbet, der er ved at komme ud af kontrol, men vi vil aldrig tillade nogen at have noget, der blot nærmer sig det, vi har. Og ligeledes for at diskutere Ukraine og Syrien og Nordkorea og forskellige andre ting«, sluttede han.

De amerikanske medier, både i »anti-Trump« CNN og »pro-Trump« Fox News versionen, viste deres britiske stamtavle ved at gå bersærk mod Trump, for at tale med Putin.

Kremls udskrift af samtalen var i overensstemmelse med ånden i præsident Trumps rapport om de to ledes diskussioner, inkl. at omtale interessen i at øge det økonomiske samarbejde.

»Donald Trump lykønskede Vladimir Putin med hans valgsejr i præsidentvalget. Lederne talte til fordel for at udvikle praktisk samarbejde inden for forskellige områder, inkl. bestræbelser på at sikre strategisk stabilitet og bekæmpe international terrorisme, med særlig vægt på betydningen af koordinerede

bestræbelser for at forhindre et våbenkapløb«, rapporterede Kreml.

»Ordvekslingen om økonomisk samarbejde afslørede en interesse i at styrke det. Energi blev særskilt diskuteret.

Problemet med Syrien blev diskuteret, såvel som også den interne krise i Ukraine. Der var en erkendelse fra begge sider af nødvendigheden af at gøre hurtige fremskridt mod opnåelse af afgørelser.

Der blev udtrykt tilfredshed med den begrænsede reduktion af spændinger omkring Koreahalvøen. Det hensigtsmæssige i at fortsætte med konstante bestræbelser for at løse situationen ved fredelige, diplomatiske midler blev understreget.

Det aftaltes at udvikle yderligere bilaterale kontakter i lyset af ændringerne i det Amerikanske Udenrigsministeriums lederskab. Muligheden for at arrangere et møde på topniveau fik særlig opmærksomhed.

Generelt var samtalen konstruktiv og forretningsmæssig, med fokus på at overvinde de akkumulerede problemer i de russisk-amerikanske relationer«, sluttede det.

Foto: USA's præsident Donald Trump ringede i dag til præsident Vladimir Putin for at lykønske ham med valgsejren i søndags. Her ses de to ledere under G20-topmødet i Hamborg, 7. juli, 2017.

[Londons scenarie for krig, eller Kinas scenarie for fremskridt? Hvad vælger Amerika?](#)

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 19. marts, 2018 – Den britiske regerings nu dagligt eskalerende konfrontation med Rusland er drevet af de mest korrupte motiver og tilsigter frem for alt at trække USA ind i – det, der kunne blive krig, endda en »krig uden overlevende«.

I løbet af de seneste 48 timer er tre nye »narrativer« om angivelige russiske angreb mod Storbritannien blevet sendt ud af London, som konstant optrapper og forandrer den oprindelige, udokumenterede anklage om, at Rusland – og dernæst,

russere efter præsident Putins personlige ordre – forsøgte at myrde en MI6-dobbeltagent i England. Og de britiske medier har gjort en dristig »militær udfordring af Rusland« ud af en øvelse med britiske ubåde, læsset med amerikanske atommissiler, sammen med amerikanske atomubåde under polarisen.

Hvilke motiver har den britiske udenrigsminister Boris Johnson, der ser ud, og agerer, som »Col. Blimp« fra tegneserien fra Første Verdenskrig, og Theresa May, der blev premierminister ved et tilfælde, og som har den stilling, Johnson troede, ville blive hans? De er imperialister af en finansiell og geopolitisk London-orden, som, forventer de, vil blive håndhævet militært af USA.

De ser denne geopolitiske orden blive erstattet af Kinas nye paradigme for samarbejde mellem stormagter for alle nationers fremskridt og deres befolkningers produktivitet: Bælte & Vej Initiativet med nye infrastrukturprojekter og udryddelse af fattigdom. De ønsker Kina holdt tilbage, Bælte & Vej sat under City of Londons regler; men de kan ikke få det til at ske. De ønsker Kinas allierede Rusland konfronteret og endda udfordret til kamp.

De konfronteres selv med utilfredse britiske befolkninger og en determineret og bredt støttet leder i Labours Jeremy Corbyn, som bekæmper deres geopolitiske politikker og City of Londons finansielle, imperiale bankcentrums finansielle forbrydelser. De ønsker Corbyn tjæret som en »håndlanger for Kreml« af tabloidpressen, og drevet ud.

De ser fortsat stærk modstand mod Londons geopolitik fra præsident Donald Trump. Efter 18 måneders nonstop angreb på Trump, der har deres udspring i britiske efterretningstjenester, som sigter på at knække ham eller fjerne ham, går han stadig ind for samarbejde mellem stormagterne og vinder støtte i den amerikanske befolkning.

De står meget snart over for endnu et krak i London-Wall Street-kabalen, værre end i 2007-08. Det britiske Imperiums svar på denne trussel har altid været krig.

På trods af hysterisk støtte i de store medier, så har de »nye Churchills« fra London ikke det momentum, de forestiller sig, for krigskonfrontation. Ikke engang i UK – men, for dem er det, at køre USA, altid det, der tæller mest.

Det, der nu er afgørende, er, at præsident Trump og USA vælger tilbuddet fra Kina, Bælte & Vej Initiativet, og lader dets paradigme for produktiv, økonomisk fremskridt dryppe lidt på os.

Skattelettelser og afregulering af Wall Street har ikke genoplivet, og vil ikke genoplive, amerikansk vækst fra dens lange stagnation, og heller ikke udfylde USA's enorme infrastrukturunderskud. Det vil derimod de tiltag, som stifter af EIR, Lyndon LaRouche, har foreslået, med begyndelse i Glass/Steagall-loven til at bryde Wall Street op. Disse tiltag, som omfatter den første, statslige kreditinstitution, USA har haft siden Franklin Roosevelts Reconstruction Finance Corp., har til formål at slutte USA til et globalt samarbejde mellem suveræne nationer for »menneskehedens fælles mål«.

Det betyder at vælge Kinas fremskridt til, og Storbritanniens krig fra.

Foto: Vladimir Putin og Theresa May diskuterede spørgsmål af fælles interesse for Rusland og Storbritannien. Hangzhou, Kina, 4. september, 2016 (Kreml).

Det britiske Imperium er nu totalt afsløret; **Det må knuses! Helga Zepp-LaRouche** **i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 15. marts** **2018**

Der er mange spørgsmål, vi bør diskutere, og mange ting, vi bør gøre, for det image, folk har af Vesten, er virkelig noget, folk bør tænke over. Hvordan kan det være, at det kommunistiske Kina, som er et socialistisk land, baseret på socialisme med kinesiske karaktertræk, som de siger – hvorfor klarer dette land sig så meget bedre end Vesten? Det bør give stof til eftertanke. Hvad er der i vejen med den neoliberale metode, et system, der forårsager svælget mellem rig og fattig at blive større hele tiden? I alle europæiske lande, og dette reflekteredes også i valget af Trump, væmmes mange mennesker fuldstændig ved den politiske klasse, med klassen af direktører, med bankfolk, med akademikere, og føler sig ikke længere repræsenteret af disse institutioner, hvilket er meget farligt, for i Europas tilfælde giver det grund til, at der vokser nogle virkelig meget farlige, eller i det mindste problematiske, partier og organisationer frem.

Så, manglen på fornuft afføder monstre, som Goya så klart påpegede i sine

tegninger.

Folk bør begynde at blive aktive, for man kan ikke sidde passivt i et paradigmeskifte som det, vi oplever på dette tidspunkt.

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

Det britiske Imperiums rolle har aldrig været klarere

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 14. marts, 2018 – Først var det Tony Blairs »uvederhæftige dossier« om Saddam Husseins masseødelæggelsesvåben, som udløste, at den ynkelige George W. Bush forvandlede hele Mellemøsten (med Obamas hjælp) til et helvedeshul af terrorister. Dernæst kom påstande om Bashar Assads brug af kemiske våben, som narrede Trump til at gennemføre et missilangreb mod en syrisk flyvebase. Så kom britisk efterretningsagent Christopher Steeles eget »uvederhæftige dossier«, der lancerede et forsøg på regimeskifte mod USA's regering, baseret på eventyrfortællinger om Trump og Rusland. Nu erklærer Theresa May, typisk uden beviser, at der »ikke er nogen alternativ konklusion«, men at den »russiske stat« er ansvarlig for angrebet med nervegift i London-området Salisbury, »en ulovlig magtanvendelse mod Det forenede Kongerige«. Vi må alle forenes mod de onde russere, hylér May og hendes kontrollers.

Det er alt sammen selvindlysende nonsens, men der er desperation i Det britiske Imperium. I 50 år har Lyndon LaRouche dokumenteret Det britiske Imperiums historiske had mod De forenede Stater og den systemiske overtagelse af den amerikanske regerings politik gennem Wall Street og andre aktiver, i kølvandet på FDR's død og mordet på JFK. Få lyttede. »Det britiske Imperium er dødt«, lod man os ofte vide, efterfulgt af en påstand om, at det eneste imperium i dag er Det russiske Imperium, eller Det amerikanske Imperium, afhængigt af, hvilket af

Det britiske Imperiums kontrollerede miljøer, man valgte at bo i.

Men det fungerer ikke så nemt denne gang. Londonavisen *Guardian* viste i dag graden af panik i Imperiet. Lederartiklen lyder: »UK arbejdede hårdt hele dagen i Washington for at overtale Trump til at skubbe sit ønske om et forhold til Putin til side og indse, at Rusland var det eneste land, der havde midlerne og motivet til at søge at dræbe Skripal«, den russiske dobbeltagent for MI6, som sammen med sin datter i sidste uge blev ramt af et angreb med nervegift. Men, klynker de, »Trump tilbød kun en modstræbende accept af det britiske tilfælde, men tilskrev ikke direkte Rusland ansvaret ... Det ville være et slag mod de angloamerikanske relationer, hvis Trump nægtede at acceptere den britiske efterretningsvurdering, men siden sit valg har han følt sig under belejring pga. beskyldninger om, at han havde indgået et aftalt spil med Rusland for at vinde præsidentskabet, og han mener, at tidligere, britiske efterretningsofficerer har næret disse beskyldninger.«

Det gør hanså sandelig, og denne bestræbelse på at bruge løgne, brygget sammen af MI6, for at bringe hans præsidentskab til fald, er nu blevet godt og grundigt miskrediteret. De tidligere efterretningsfolk fra Obamas tid, som bragte disse britiske løgne til torvs, er blevet taget på fersk gerning i at køre et forræderisk angreb mod den amerikanske regering, og de kunne (og burde) snart havne i fængsel.

Premierminister May har heller ikke bare frit løb internt i UK. Det bliver i stigende grad sandsynligt, at leder af Labour-partiet Jeremy Corbyn ville vinde et valg, hvis det kommer dertil, som det kunne, og Torierne sakker bagud i meningsmålingerne over de forestående lokalvalg. I dag udfordrede Corbyn direkte Mays handlinger mod Rusland i parlamentet og spurgte, om hun ville følge reglerne i Organisationen for forbud mod kemiske våben, OPCW, og give Rusland prøver på den nervegift og vente de krævede ti dage. May råbte op om, at hun havde givet russerne tid nok, og at der var konsensus fra alle menige i parlamentet om, at Corbyn trådte ved siden af, og at hun ville udvise 23 russiske diplomater. Med en manøvre, der nok skal jage russerne en skræk i livet, annoncerede hun ligeledes, at kongefamilien ikke ville deltage i World Cup i Rusland.

Men de britiske oligarkers frygt er legitim. Imperiet vil ikke overleve, at USA, Rusland, Kina, Afrika, Latinamerika – og endda befolkningerne i Europa og UK – kommer sammen i det nye paradigme, repræsenteret af den Nye Silkevejsånd. Disse oligarker er villige til at løbe risikoen for en atomkrig for at forhindre dette nye paradigme, men deres tid er ved at være forbi. Dette er et øjeblik med et stort potentiale, hvis den menneskelige race lever op til lejligheden.

Foto: George W. Bush og Tony Blair udveksler håndtryk efter at have modtaget besked om, at Coalition Provisional Authority havde genetableret fuld suverænitæt i Irak og overfört kontrol over nationen til den midlertidige irakiske regering, 28. juni, 2004.

Britisk geopolitisk imperiepolitik kollapser; Theresa May forsøger desperat at kontrollere Trump

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 13. marts, 2018 – Den britiske premierminister Theresa May har opført et show à la Churchill over det, der fremstår som en forgiftning af en russisk dobbeltagent i London. Hun og udenrigsminister Boris »Col. Blimp«[\[1\]](#) Johnson har givet Rusland et 24-timers ultimatum og krævet NATO's støtte til, at UK konfronterer Rusland og et muligt angreb mod Syrien. Tirsdag eftermiddag kontaktede May præsident Donald Trump pr. telefon for at forsøge at overtale ham til at angribe Rusland.

Uheldigvis for hende var Churchill selv en ivrig bruger af giftvåben på slagmarken, »udslettelsesbombning« – som han udtrykte det – og af giftgasangreb mod civile fra »laverestående racer«. Mange i verden husker Det britiske Imperiums historie og er bevidst om dets aktuelle bevæbning og styring af den saudiske folkemordskrig mod Yemen.

Og UK er selv i besiddelse af den sjældne, kemiske nervegift, som May hævder, blev brugt af russere i London.

Men Mays desperation kommer i realiteten af den kendsgerning, at den geopolitiske doktrin, briterne i århundreder har fremmanet, kører på pumperne. Den er i færd med at blive besejret af en ny politik, kendt som den Nye Silkevej og af Kinas præsident betegnet som »menneskehedens fælles fremtid«.

Kina har bragt et nyt, produktivt, globalt boom med infrastrukturbyggeri ind i verden og sammen med det, en idé om stormagtsrelationer, baseret på respekt og gensidig udviklingshjælp til andre nationer. Præsident Trump har gentagne gange valgt at understrege sin fremragende, gensidigt respektfulde relation med Kinas

præsident Xi Jinping, og deres samarbejde kunne endda stabilisere Koreahalvøen.

De af britisk efterretning skabte »Russiagate«-skandaler i USA, der har til formål at enten tvinge Trump ind i en konfrontation med Rusland, eller også tvinge ham ud af embedet, fortsætter med at kollapse – nu med Husets Efterretningskomite, der har afsluttet sine efterforskninger og erklæret, »intet at finde«.

Præsident Vladimir Putins tale 1. marts har erklæret NATO-politikken med omringning af Rusland med NATO's strategiske førsteangrebskapacitet for forældet og død. Det kan ikke ignoreres. Selveste USA's Forsvarsministerium har nu erkendt, at USA's ABM-systemer ikke vil virke mod Ruslands strategiske våben. Som præsident Putin sagde, så er forhandlinger, baseret på gensidig respekt, den bedste politik for begge lande.

May kunne være på nippet til at blive udskiftet som premierminister af leder af Labour-partiet, Jeremy Corbyn, der faktisk har massiv støtte i den britiske befolkning, til dels for at have afvist krigskonfrontation med Rusland.

Hvad enten den britisk PM kan få præsident Trump til at sige »Rusland gjorde det« i dag eller ej, så er hendes problem af en dybere karakter. Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag kommenterede, så er det establishment, som May repræsenterer, allerede besejret i en kamp, de har tabt på forhånd – og hvor de kæmper for britisk imperiepolitik til den bitre ende. Det nye paradigme for stormagtsrelationer, som Kina står i spidsen for, er i færd med at skubbe den længe dominerende, britiske, geopolitiske doktrin ud af den historiske scene.

USA under Trump kan undgå »Thukydid-fælden« og samarbejde, til gensidig fordel for alle nationer.

Men kan det genoplive sin industri, produktivitet, sin storhed som rumfartsnation, sin videnskabelige dygtighed – eller endda sine borgeres forventede levetid? Kan det skabe kredit for at udskifte sin nedbrudte, økonomiske infrastruktur?

Det er her, både Trump og Kongressen er ved at forlise. Og det er, hvad en tilslutning til den Nye Silkevej vil betyde.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump køber tydeligvis ikke PM Theresa Mays B-S-, under konferencen i Davos, 2. jan., 2018. (Public Domain)

[\[1\]](#) Britisk tegneseriefigur fra trediverne. Blimp er pompøs, opfarende,

chauvinistisk og en britisk stereotype. Figuren er opkaldt efter en spærreballon, kendt som en 'blimp'. (-red.)

[LaRouchePAC Mandags- opdatering 12. marts 2018, med bl.a. uddrag af Putin-interview](#)

Vært Matthew Ogden: I sidste uge dækkede vi det, Helga Zepp-LaRouche karakteriserede som et »Sputnik-chok«, med den russiske præsident Putins annoncering af en helt ny generation af strategiske våben, som gør alle ballistiske missilsystemer impotente og forældede, kunne man sige, for på en noget ironisk vis at låne et udtryk fra præsident Reagan. Disse nye våbensystemer, der nu er blevet testet og bevist af det russiske militær, reflekterer et virkeligt gennembrud i fysisk videnskab; det må man ikke se bort fra. Nye anvendelser af højt avancerede principper, såsom Mach 20 hypersonisk flyvning; fremdrift ved atomkraft i miniatureformat; styret laserteknologi; plasmaer, styresystemer; listen fortsætter. De har alle fuldstændig ændret den strategiske spillebane. Som vi fastslog sidste mandag, så har Putins annoncering på meget dramatisk vis lagt den omgående nødvendige skabelse af en ny sikkerhedsarkitektur frem på bordet; en sikkerhedsarkitektur, der ikke er baseret på strategiske magtbalancer som under den Kolde Krig og gensidigt garanteret ødelæggelse (MAD-doktrinen), men én, der i stedet er baseret på gensidigt garanteret udvikling og win-win-samarbejde. Dette anerkendes på forskellig vis af ledende personer i USA og andetsteds, og dette adresseres meget, meget direkte af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som fastslog denne pointe og krævede denne nye sikkerhedsarkitektur i sin internationale webcast i fredags. Her er, hvad Helga Zepp-LaRouche havde at sige:

»Tiden er inde til at gøre det, udenrigsminister Lavrov og præsident Putin begge har opfordret til – at sætte sig sammen ved forhandlingsbordet om en ny, global sikkerhedsarkitektur, som garanterer alles sikkerhed; USA, Rusland, Kina, Europa og naturligvis også mindre lande som de to Korea'er og mange andre lande, der stadig har mange problemer.

Øjeblikket er virkelig kommet for en komplet ændring af den strategiske organisation mellem nationer, for at satse på en global sikkerhedsarkitektur og gøre det, min mand foreslog med SDI, for sluttelig at gøre atomvåben teknologisk

forældede. For, denne kurs, der kunne føre til den menneskelige arts udslettelse, må virkelig absolut forsvinde for evigt.«

Det, hun selvfølgelig refererer til, er de termonukleare våbens konstant stigende destruktive kraft, som kunne slette ikke alene menneskeligt liv, men alt liv på Jorden, flere gange, hvis disse våben nogensinde faktisk blev brugt.

Den selv samme dag, hvor præsident Putin kom med denne annoncering i sin årlige tale til den føderale forsamling, havde han tilfældigvis et interview med Megyn Kelly på programmet. [\[1\]](#) Hun var tidligere hos Fox og er nu hos NBC News; og naturligvis dominerede præsident Putins overraskelsesmeddelelse hovedparten af interviewet og gav ham en chance for at uddybe netop dette punkt, nemlig de presserende nødvendige, åbne og ærlige forhandlinger mellem USA og Rusland og skabelsen af en eller anden form for ny sikkerhedsarkitektur. Hvor NBC kun udsendte en forkortet og meget redigeret version af dette interview, så blev det komplette udskrift af interviewet imidlertid offentliggjort, og det er vigtigt at høre et par uddrag af denne diskussion om dette spørgsmål, hvad præsident Putin sagde om dette spørgsmål:

Putin: »Alt det, jeg talte om i dag, skete ikke på vores initiativ; det er en respons på USA's ballistiske missilforsvarsprogram og Washingtons ensidige opsigelse af den Antiballistiske Missiltraktat (ABM) i 2002. Hvis vi taler om våbenkapløbet, så begyndte den i det øjeblik, hvor USA trak sig ud af ABM-traktaten. Vi ønskede at forhindre dette. Vi opfordrede vore amerikanske partnere til, at vi arbejdede sammen om disse programmer. For det første bad vi dem om ikke at trække sig ud af traktaten, ikke at ødelægge den. Men USA trak sig ud. Det var ikke os, der gjorde dette, men USA. Alligevel foreslog vi igen, at vi samarbejdede, selv efter dette. Jeg sagde til min daværende kollega, 'Forestil dig, hvad der ville ske, hvis Rusland og USA slog kræfterne sammen i det afgørende område for strategisk sikkerhed. Verden ville ændre sig i lang tid fremover, og niveauet af global sikkerhed ville nå op på sit hidtil højeste.' Vær venlig at lytte til mig og bring videre til jeres lyttere, hvad jeg nu vil sige. Vi holder diskussioner med vore amerikanske venner og partnere, folk, der i øvrigt repræsenterer regeringen, og når de påstår, at nogle russere blandede sig i de amerikanske valg, siger vi til dem – det gjorde vi for ikke så længe siden på et forholdsvist højt niveau: 'Men I blander jer konstant i vores politiske liv'. Vil I tro det, de benægter det ikke engang.

Ved du, hvad de sagde til os sidste gang? De sagde, 'Jo, vi blander os, men det har vi ret til, for vi spreder demokrati, og det gør I ikke, og derfor kan I ikke gøre det.'

Mener du, det er en civiliseret og moderne fremgangsmåde i internationale anliggender?

I går talte vi to om atomvåben, og om, at da USA og Sovjetunionen først indså, at de var på vej mod mulig gensidig ødelæggelse, så aftalte de regler for opførsel inden for sikkerhedssfæren, i betragtning af, at masseødelæggelsesvåben var tilgængelige ...

Det er stadig uvist, hvad den amerikanske politik over for Rusland vil være under den nuværende administration.

Mange ting er fortsat uafklaret, eftersom det endnu ikke har været muligt for os at etablere normale kontakter.

Det står imidlertid absolut klart, at den nuværende amerikanske præsident vedtog en specifik holdning med hensyn til indenrigspolitikken og besluttede at række ud til de mennesker, der var parat til at støtte hans kampagneløfter. Dette førte til hans valgsejr, og ikke en eller anden form for udefrakommende indblanding ...

Jeg mener, han er en erfaren person, en forretningsmand med stor erfaring, og han forstår, at, hvis man må gå i partnerskab med nogen, så må man behandle sin fremtidige eller nuværende partner med respekt, i modsat fald vil intet komme ud af det. Jeg mener, at dette er en rent pragmatisk fremgangsmåde ... Selv om dette er hans første embedsperiode som præsident, så lærer han hurtigt, og han forstår ganske udmærket, at udveksling af beskyldninger eller fornærmelser på vores niveau er en vej, der ikke fører nogen steder hen. Det ville kun betyde at fratage vore lande deres sidste chance for en dialog, simpelt hen den sidste chance. Dette ville være yderst beklageligt ... Hør her, Rusland og USA bør sætte sig ned og gennemdiskutere det for at sætte tingene på plads. Det er mit indtryk, at dette er, hvad den nuværende præsident ønsker, men han bliver forhindret i at gøre det af visse kræfter. Men vi er parat til at diskutere ethvert spørgsmål, det være sig spørgsmål relateret til missiler, cyberspace eller kontraterrorbestræbelser.

Vi er parat til dette når som helst. Men USA må også være parat til det.

Den tid vil komme, hvor den politiske elite i USA vil blive tvunget af den offentlige mening til at gå i denne retning.

Vi er parate i samme øjeblik, vore partnere er parate.«

Ogden: Jeg mener, at dette er et meget direkte tilbud om, at USA og Rusland kunne sætte sig sammen og genåbne denne form for strategiske diskussioner, som var blevet lukket ned i den følgende periode af Bush-administrationen og især, absolut taget af bordet under Obama-administrationen.

Denne annoncering fra præsident Putin har interessant nok haft en virkning med at vække nogle mennesker her i USA, inkl. folk, der tidligere havde givet sig selv lov til at blive revet med i hele dette Russiagate-hysteri à la McCarthy-tiden, og som absolut bragte os til et punkt for meget farlig konfrontation. Her kommer et eksempel: En erklæring er blevet offentliggjort af nogle ledende, Demokratiske senatorer, der kræver den omgående indledning af nye, strategiske forhandlinger med Rusland. Disse senatorer er Bernie Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Dianne Feinstein og Ed Markey, som man ser af denne pressemeddelelse, som blev udlagt på senator Markeys webside. Her kommer et uddrag af, hvad denne pressemeddelelse siger:

»Midt i en forhøjet spændingstilstand over for Rusland, opfordrede de følgende senatorer Edward J. Markey (D-MA), Jeff Merkley (D-OR), Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) og Bernie Sanders (I-VT) indtrængende udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson til at indlede en ny runde af strategiske forhandlinger med Rusland, uden tøven:

Kære udenrigsminister Tillerson:

Vi skriver for at indtrængende at opfordre Udenrigsministeriet til at sammenkalde til den næste Strategiske Dialog mellem USA og Rusland så snart som muligt. En Strategisk Dialog mellem USA og Rusland er mere presserende nødvendig i kølvandet på præsident Putins offentlige tale den 1. marts, hvor han refererede til flere nye atomvåben, som Rusland angiveligt er i færd med at udvikle, inklusive et krydsermissil og en atomundervandsdrone, og som i øjeblikket ikke er begrænset af New START-traktaten, og som ville være destabiliserende, om deployeret.

USA bør som hastesag engagere i dialog med Rusland for at undgå fejlregninger og mindske sandsynligheden for en konflikt ...

Der er ingen garanti for, at vi kan gøre fremskridt med Rusland om disse spørgsmål. Men selv på højdepunktet af spændinger under den Kolde Krig var USA og Sovjetunionen i stand til at gå ind i en dialog om spørgsmål om strategisk stabilitet.

Ledere fra begge lande mente, som vi også bør i dag, at atomvåbens utrolige, destruktive kræfter er grund nok til at gøre enhver indsats for at mindske

chancen for, at de nogensinde igen vil blive brugt.«

Ogden: Dette er selvfølgelig særdeles signifikant og er en refleksion af det faktum, at Putins annoncering er kommet som en slags alarmopkald. Andre ledende personer har genlydt af den samme alarm; prof. Stephen Cohen har sagt, at vi omgående må indlede denne form for strategiske forhandlinger med Rusland; hr. Ray McGovern har fastslået samme pointe i en artikel, der blev udgivet på ConsortiumNews. Men jeg mener, at det faktum, at disse fire, Demokratiske senatorer har udstedt dette krav, bør ses som et meget signifikant, potentielt brud i hele denne kontrollerede narrativ, som er blevet påtvunget Washington, og især det Demokratiske Parti. Og alt imens Demokraterne har givet sig selv lov at falde ind i denne form for partiske spil og er blevet overtaget i de seneste måneder af denne Obama-Hillary-krigsmagermentalitet; på trods af dette, og på trods af hele denne igangværende Russiagate-narrativ, så har præsident Trump fortsat fastholdt sin overbevisning om, at samarbejde med Rusland og med Kina, for den sags skyld, ville være 'en meget god ting, ikke en dårlig ting', med hans ord. Der er virkelig reelle kriser, som denne planet konfronteres med lige nu, som kun kan løses gennem denne form for samarbejde mellem stormagterne, og ikke ensidigt gennem et enkelt lands handlinger. Et eksempel er antiterrorstyrken, som præsident Putin har opfordret til i form af en alliance mellem USA, Rusland og andre lande for faktisk at bekæmpe international terrorisme; eller, et andet fremragende eksempel, og som nu giver gevinst, er det, præsident Trump har været i stand til at opnå gennem samarbejde med Kina og hans direkte relation til præsident Xi Jinping inden for området for at fremme muligheden for fred på Koreahalvøen i en grad, der går langt længere end vi har set i årtier.

Følg resten af Matthew Ogdens opdatering på videoen. Vi kan desværre ikke udlægge et engelsk udskrift.

[1] Se https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9mhi_Ay0Ayw

Vesten er blevet overlistet; men krigsmagerne er i panik og tilskynder til krig

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 11. marts, 2018 – Vesten har »gået i søvne i deres arrogance«, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche i denne weekend; først kom de for sent til båden med Kinas Nye Silkevej, og nu er de blevet overlistet af Vladimir Putins dramatiske annoncering den 1. marts om, at Rusland med held har udviklet våbensystemer, baseret på nye fysiske principper, der gør missilforsvarssystemet, der er deployeret omkring Rusland og Kina, ubrugelige og forældede. Det ynkelige forsøg på at miskreditere Putins annoncering som værende et svindelnummer, baseret på den kendsgerning, at de brugte animationer snarere end videoer til at demonstrere det nye, hypersoniske missil, faldt i dag til jorden med det Russiske Forsvarsministerium, der udlagde videoer af den succesfulde testning af Kinzhal aero-ballistiske, hypersoniske missil (se nedenstående rapport).

Responset fra den kriminelle bande, der udgjorde Obama-administrationen – og som i stigende grad nu afsløres af modige medlemmer af Kongressen som medskyldige i det britiske MI6's bestræbelse på at bringe Donald Trumps amerikanske regering til fald – har nu åbenlyst bekendt kulør og etableret en ny organisation ved navn, »National Security Action«. Organisationen, en bogstavelig talt 'blå bog' over persongalleriet i Obama-administrationen, har udtrykkeligt til formål at fjerne Trump fra præsidentskabet og vende tilbage til Obamas forberedelse til krig med Rusland og Kina. Sammensat af 68 af de ledende medlemmer af Obama-administrationen (de bør kaldes »68-erne« til ære for udløsningen af modkulturen i 1960'erne, som drev landet ud i økonomisk og social disintegration), så erklærer deres politiske programmer, at Trump er »uegnet til at lede«, at han har vist »ansvarsløshed« for at have afsløret og udrenset korrupsionen i FBI og andetsteds og, det mest åbenlyse, at, »i stedet for at konfrontere Vladimir Putin for dennes skamløse og fortsatte angreb på vort demokrati, så bukker Trump for Moskvas luner« og nægter at »forsvare sig over for Kina«. Mens sandheden er, at Trumps besøg til Beijing sidste november hjembragte \$283 mia. i kinesiske investeringer i amerikansk infrastruktur, industri og landbrug som en del af Trumps forpligtelse over for en genrejsning af amerikansk økonomi, så bliver dette ignoreret af de ynkelige »68'ere«, der i stedet klager (uretmæssigt) over, at »Trump's familieføretagender fik særlige aftaler, efter Trump mødtes med den kinesiske præsident«.

Ironisk nok, så går en af deres klager ud på, at »Trumps uberegnelige opførsel har hævet risikoen for en katastrofal konflikt med Nordkorea«. Dette dokument blev udgivet den 27. februar, blot få dage før det historiske gennembrud 8. marts for en løsning af Koreakrisen, da Trump aftalte at mødes med Kim Jong-un til atomnedrustningsforhandlinger. Det var Obama-administrationen, der nægtede at forhandle med Nordkorea – ja, de hilste faktisk Nordkoreas atomvåbenbyggeri velkommen, eftersom det udgjorde et påskud for den massive oprustning af atomvåben og missilsystemer omkring Kina, kendt som Obamas doktrin, »omdrejningspunkt Asien«. Trump har erklæret dette »omdrejningspunkt« for forbi og har opnået gennembruddet i Korea ved at arbejde tæt sammen med Kina og Rusland. Så hvem er det, der »hævede risikoen for en katastrofal konflikt«, og som stadig gør det i dag?

Kendsgerningen er, at Silkevejsånden er i færd med at vinde, og de nationer, der bliver ladt tilbage, har kun sig selv at takke for at holde fast ved City of London og Wall Street snarere end at lytte til Lyndon LaRouches vise ord om at genindføre det Amerikanske System for fysisk økonomi og tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej.

Foto: Vladimir Putin besvarede spørgsmål fra NBC-ankerman, Megyn Kelly. Interviewet blev optaget i Kreml den 1. marts, 2018, og i Kaliningrad den 2. marts. (en.kremlin.ru)

[Obama-administrationen mobiliserer for krig og impeachment](#)

11. marts, 2018 – Otteogtres medlemmer af Obama-administrationen har dannet en organisation, [National Security Action](#), (som måske burde hedde »68'erne«), der har til formål at ødelægge præsident Donald Trump og stå i spidsen for en mobilisering for krig mod Rusland og Kina. De har tydeligvis set skriften på væggen og er desperate for at trodse skæbnegudinderne.

Med fælles formandskab bestående af Ben Rhodes (Obamas nationale vicesikkerhedsrådgiver) og Jake Sullivan (viceassistent til Obama og Hillary Clintons chefrådgiver), overlader websiden ikke meget til fantasien:

* »At rette et skarpt lys mod Trump-administrationens ansvarsløse politikker, understrege deres farlige konsekvenser og udstyre amerikanerne med argumenter

til at imødegå dem.«

* »Under præsident Trumps ansvarsløse lederskab står USA svagere i verden, er mindre sikkert og mere isoleret. Han trækker USA tilbage fra verdensscenen, underminerer vore efterretningstjenester og retshåndhævelsesorganisationer, der bevarer vores sikkerhed, underminerer det diplomati, der forhindrer krige, fornærmer vore allierede, angriber demokratiske traditioner og slesker for diktatorer og opgiver samtidig Amerikas forpligtelse over for universelle rettigheder og menneskeværd. Hans udbrud på Twitter har en destabiliserende virkning i udlandet og er under vort lands højeste embedes værdighed. Impulsiv, uberegnelig og rystende uvidende om, hvordan verden fungerer, er Trump uegnet til at lede vore mænd og kvinder i uniform, og han forringer vort lands anseelse i verdens øjne.«

* »I stedet for at afslutte Amerikas krige, fører han vort militær dybere ud i dyndet i udenlandske konflikter, uden at have nogen strategi eller planer for at nedtrappe dem.«

* »Præsident Trumps uberegnelige opførsel har øget risikoen for en katastrofal konflikt med Nordkorea [bemærk, at dette blev offentliggjort én uge før gennembruddet med fred i Korea! -LPAC's red.], og hans trussel om at omstøde atomaftalen med Iran er en invitation til endnu en atomkrise eller krig i Mellemøsten. Ved at trække USA ud af Paris-klimaaf-talen, Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) og internationale organisationer – ofte imod indvendinger fra sit eget nationale sikkerhedsteam – overlader han kappen for global forvaltning til konkurrenter som Kina, som ikke deler vore interesser eller værdier.«

* »Med hans angreb mod vore demokratiske institutioner har præsident Trump forrådt vore grundlæggende idealer – som er blevet holdt i hævd af Republikanske og Demokratiske præsidenter før ham – heriblandt vore forfatningsmæssige friheder, retsstatsprincippet og opbakning til universelle værdier. På hjemmefronten sætter han den frie presse i fare ved at angribe journalister, truer retsstatsprincippet ved at angribe dommere og FBI og forsøger at unddrage sig at stå til regnskab ved at blande sig i efterforskninger.«

* »I stedet for at konfrontere Vladimir Putin over dennes skamløse og fortsatte angreb mod vort demokrati, bukker Trump for Moskvas luner samtidig med, at han underminerer efterforskninger af sine egne, skjulte finansinteresser. I stedet for at hævde sig over for Kina, så fik Trumps familieforetagender særlige aftaler, efter Trump mødtes med den kinesiske præsident.«

* »Ingen – end ikke præsidenten – står over loven, og de, der overtræder

forfatningen eller begår forbrydelser, må stilles til regnskab. Vi arbejder også sammen med Kongressen for at gøre det, præsident Trump og hans parti ikke vil: konfrontere Rusland for dets fortsatte angreb mod vort demokrati og opbygge vort forsvar til at beskytte vor nation imod krænkelser mod vor suverænitet.«

68'erne er en 'blå bog' over besætningen i Obama-administrationen og deres medløbere, inklusive:

Rand Beers, Tony Blinken, Barbara Boxen, Nicholas Burns, Kurt Campbell, Joe Cirincione, Brian Deese, Tom Donilon, Michele Flounoy, dr. Colin Kahl (som fik Nunes-spørgsmålene i sidste uge), Samantha Power, Penny Pritzker, Susan E. Rice, Wendy R. Sherman, Anne-Marie Slaughter og Jim Steinberg.

Foto: Daværende nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump, venstre, og tidligere præsident Barack Obama, ankommer til Trumps indsættelsesceremoni i Capitol i Washington, D.C., USA, 20. januar, 2017.

For at overvinde dødkulturen, må der komme en renæssancebevægelse; USA må tilslutte sig Bælte & Vej

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 28. feb., 2018 – I dag adresserede Helga Zepp-LaRouche den globale, strategiske situation og den nationale debat, som det nylige skoleskyderi i Florida har udløst i USA, med følgende udtalelse:

»Der er to udviklinger, som oligarkiet er utilfreds med. Den ene er, at den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping vil forblive efter år 2020 for at sikre, at Bælte & Vej-transformationen af verden og Kinas udviklingsmål frem til 2020, 2035 og 2050 går fremad på bedst mulig måde. Og den anden er, at Donald Trump har meddelt, at han genopstiller til præsidentvalg i 2020. Og jeg er fuldstændig sikker på, at begge disse begivenheder vil gøre visse mennesker ekstremt utilfredse – hvilket er en god ting.«

Zepp-LaRouche identificerede de to baner, verden står overfor.

»Den ene er en meget optimistisk bane med hensyn til Bælte & Vej Initiativets potentiale for at transformere verden. Den anden bane er, at dele af Vesten

stadig lider under det, guvernøren fra Kentucky har kaldt en 'dødkultur'. Som VIPS-whistleblower Coleen Rowley for nylig udtalte, så er dette, i det mindste for en stor del, resultatet af en politik for evindeligt krig. Man kan i realiteten sige, at både de voldelige videospil og masseskoleskyderierne indirekte eller direkte har været et resultat af disse evindelige krige – hvilket gør det absolut klart, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme.

På den optimistiske side går Bælte & Vej hurtigt fremad, og det er opmuntrende for alle, der kender til det. Det er også vigtigt, at der finder et meget signifikant præsident-til-præsident-diplomati sted. Den seneste udvikling er, at det kinesiske politbureau-medlem Liu He kommer til USA i fem dage til intensive diskussioner med Trump-administrationen om spørgsmål om økonomi og handel. Dette kommer kun to uger efter, at statsråd Yang Jiechi var i USA. Så denne personlige dialog mellem Trump og Xi er ekstremt vigtig.»

Zepp-LaRouche mindede om den pointe, som en kinesisk kommentator er fremkommet med, nemlig, at Bælte & Vej er en irreversibel tendens, og de lande, der ikke ønsker at komme med om bord, vil ende med at stå og kigge på kabyssens baglygter, når den forlader stationen. »Dette er en meget opmuntrende dynamik; og jeg mener, at den kendsgerning, at både Trump og Xi vil blive om bord, er ekstremt gode nyheder.«

Dernæst adresserede Zepp-LaRouche efterspillet af skoleskyderiet i Florida i USA. »Der er afgørende tegn på en omstilling. Som Kentuckys guvernør Matt Bevin udtalte, så har dette intet med skydevåben at gøre; det har til gengæld alt at gøre med den absolut morbide dødkultur, man ser i nutidens sangtekster, film osv., og det er, hvad vi må ændre. Selvfølgelig talte guvernør Bevin ikke om løsningen, nemlig at få en opløftende, klassisk kultur, som ville vaccinere børn mod dette. Men det er i det mindste en begyndelse, og han opfordrede til en national debat om problemet.«

Fr. Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede til, at LaRouche-bevægelsen spiller en central rolle i denne diskussion.

»Stigningen i selvmord, nedgangen i den forventede levealder, alt dette er resultatet af en manglende vision og det rædselsfulde paradigmeskift, der har fundet sted i USA, især i de seneste 50 år efter JFK's død.

Som VIPS-whistleblower Rowley sagde, så er henved 1.800 film blevet produceret med hjælp fra Pentagon og CIA, og hvor man har sindsforstyrrede veteraner fra krige i udlandet, der har PTSD (posttraumatisk stress-syndrom), og så går amok i skydeorgier. Dette er, hvad Lyndon LaRouche adresserede i sin udtalelse efter

Littleton-skyderiet. Efter dette har der været 31 skoleskyderier med dødelig udgang i USA. Og nu, efter Florida-skyderiet, har der været 50 rapporterede tilfælde [af trusler] om dagen«,

sagde hun med henvisning til rapporten fra 22. feb. fra Educators School Safety Network.

Dette fremkalder chokvirkninger i befolkningen, rapporterede hun, hvilket kræver, at en løsning på denne krise må fremlægges. Men denne diskussion og denne løsning, formanede hun,

»kan ikke være begrænset til kun ét enkelt spørgsmål. Hvorfor finder dette kup mod Trump sted? Hvorfor står Det britiske Imperium bag? Hvorfor går efterforskningerne i Kongressen nu efter dette? Og hvorfor er det, at Trump spiller en potentielt ekstremt vigtig, strategisk rolle? Dette er alt sammen en del af det samme billede, og det må tackles som en helhed.

Vi må sige til folk, at den eneste måde, hvorpå denne dødkultur kan overvindes, er at løfte befolkningen op, atter skabe forbindelse til USA's bedste traditioner og bevæge sig ind i et Nyt Paradigme for et win-win-samarbejde med kinesernes tilbud om at gå med i Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Dette betyder naturligvis at gennemføre Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, og det betyder, at folk intensivt må studere den økonomiske metode, som LaRouche har udviklet.

Vi må optrappe i denne retning og virkelig forstå, at dette er et historisk øjeblik, hvor en stor del af det, der finder sted, og en endnu større del af vores organisations aktivitet og succes, er afhængigt af den subjektive faktor.

Det er en stor ting, men det kan gøres!«,

konkluderede Zepp-LaRouche.

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche kort før sin optræden på et engelsksproget TV-dialogshow under sit besøg på Bælte & Vej Forum i Kina, maj, 2017.

[EIR: Man det britiske kup i](#)

[jorden: Muellers anklageskrifter mod russiske sociale medietrolde platter det amerikanske folk](#)

Som vi gentagne gange har vist, så er den strategiske sammenhæng for kuppet mod Trump en fuldt optrappet bestræbelse på at bevare den anglo-amerikanske orden imod det, der opfattes som Kinas fremvoksende magt, som nu er allieret med Rusland. Kina har kontinuerligt og konsekvent inviteret USA til at gå med i dets Bælte & Vej Initiativ, det største infrastrukturprojekt, man nogen sinde har påtaget sig i historien. Præsident Trumps fornuftige fremgangsmåde over for både Rusland og Kina ses som en eksistentiel trussel mod det fortsatte anglo-amerikanske partnerskab, der har domineret verden, siden Franklin D. Roosevelts død.

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

[Mueller-dossieret revideret: Hvordan briterne og Obama plattede USA LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 23. feb., 2018](#)

Vært Matthew Ogden: I takt med, at Muellers anklageskrift mod 13 såkaldte russiske 'trolde' fortsat dominerer overskrifterne hen over weekenden, er amerikanerne i stigende grad begyndt at fatte det iboende hykleri i hele denne Russiagate-narrativ. Fra tidligere CIA-direktør James Woolsey, der af Laura Ingraham på Fox News bliver spurgt, om USA nogen sinde har blandet sig i et

andet lands valg – til hvilken han måtte rømme sig og hoste og sige, »Jamen, det har vi sandsynligvis, og vil sandsynligvis fortsætte med«; og til en række blogindlæg i denne uge på tidligere forsvarsefterretningsofficer Pat Langs webside, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. Man ser her [Fig. 1] titlen på et af de seneste indlæg: »Robert Muellers Amerika – En farce pakket ind i hykleri«. Dette blev postet den 20. feb., og her er et kort uddrag af hans blogindlæg, hvor han siger:

Under overskriften »Robert Muellers Amerika – En Farce pakket ind i hykleri«, fremfører Tacitus, at anklageskriftet er »intet mindre end en køreplan for despotiske regeringer, der ville ønske at behandle enhver, der vover at udlægge afvigende materiale på internettet, som en kriminel.« I virkeligheden »er det ikke andet end en gang harsk butterdej. Det prætenderer at have et bjerg af beviser på russernes misgerninger. Men, hvis man begynder simpelt hen at stille kritiske spørgsmål om det underliggende bevis for disse misgerninger, opdager man hurtigt, at dette dokument er et stykke politisk teater snarere end en faktisk opremsning af kriminelle gerninger.«

»Der er ikke et eneste stykke solidt bevis i hele dokumentet, der underbygger« påstanden om Internet Research Agency (IRA), det russiske selskab, der angiveligt skulle have haft tilsyn med den beskudte propagandakrig mod intetanende amerikanske vælgere. »Det er blot en konstatering af en overbevisning. Det er ikke sådan, man skriver et anklageskrift, der beskylder en for kriminelle handlinger.«

»Denne sag er således meget langt fra at være en 'slam dunk' for Mueller-teamet. Skulle det nogen sinde komme for retten, er der signifikante huller og sårbarheder i anklageskriftet, som en kompetent forsvarsadvokat kunne splitte ad. Niks. Det her handler ikke om at straffe folk, der overtræder loven. Dette er et politisk teater, der er designet til at nære memet for at promovere antirussisk hysteri.« Tacitus understreger, at enhver objektiv efterforskning af angivelig »indblanding« fra IRA kun ville kunne konkludere, at »IRA's aktiviteter er på grænsen til irrelevante og uden indvirkning«. Ingen stor afsløring her: Rusland har gennemført efterretningsoperationer i USA i 80 år. Men USA har gennemført lignende operationer »i og imod Rusland / USSR og har været involveret i hemmelige indblandinger i valg i hele verden. Dét er det hykleriske. Vi har et hysterisk anfald over latterlige internet-narrestreger, udført af en lille gruppe russere, der var dårligt finansieret og genererede liden aktivitet samtidig med, at vi ignorerer vores egen historie, hvor vi rent faktisk har væltet andre lovligt valgte regeringer. Der har vi det. Farce og hykleri.«

Hør så dette næste indlæg, publiceret i dag, den 23. feb., med titlen »Amerika blander sig i Ukraine« [Fig. 2]. Han siger:

»Historikere vil bemærke den enorme ironi, der ligger i USA's engagement i undergravende virksomhed og indblanding i valget i Ukraine, som overgår alt, Rusland har forsøgt.

De ideologiske spaltninger, der vokser i USA, begynder at ligne de krigsførende lejre, der karakteriserer den politiske verden i Ukraine. Splittelsen i Ukraine sætter grupper, der beskrives som »højrefløj«, og mange er ideologiske efterkommere af ægte nazister og nazi-sympatisører, op imod grupper med et stærkt tilhørsforhold til Rusland.

Hvem støtter USA's regering og medierne? *Nazisterne*. Du tror, jeg laver grin!«

Han fortsætter dernæst med at fremlægge OUN's historie [Organisationen af Ukrainske Nationalister] og Stephan banderas støtte til Hitler og fortsættelsen af denne arv med Sektor Højre i dag. Dernæst fortsætter han:

»Regn mig med blandt de mennesker, der er oprørt over det hykleri og den stupiditet, der nu kommer frem i USA.

Der foregår helt tydeligt indblanding i det det amerikanske politiske landskab. Men det er altså ikke den russiske regering. Nej. Der er fremmede og hjemlige kræfter i alliance, som er ivrige efter at portrættere Rusland som en trussel mod verdensordenen, og som må modgås med højere forsvarsudgifter og hårdere sanktioner. Det er den propaganda, der dominerer medierne i USA i disse dage. Og det er i sandhed farligt for vores nations sikkerhed og frihed.«

Det står klart, som Pat Lang pointerer her i dette blogindlæg, og ligeledes, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche pointerede i sin internationale webcast i går, at hele denne Russiagate-historie, og desuden hele Kina-hysteriet, der i stigende grad nu oppiskes; at dette forkyndes med det formål at portrættere disse lande som en dødbringende trussel mod den herskende verdensorden, og som må tilintetgøres. Som Helga LaRouche sagde i dette klip, vi nu skal se, så man se dette som intet mindre end førkrigs-propaganda. Her er, hvad Helga havde at sige:

(her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.)

(Hele Helga Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra 22. feb. kan læses på dansk, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23890>)

Henvisninger i den engelske tekst:

Nyt Paradigme undervisningsserie, Indtegning, program:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23703>

Helga Zepp-LaRouches introduktion 10. feb. (dansk):

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23855>

Harley Schlanger, lektion 2 17. feb., video, (engelsk):

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xy87_gzTTTU

“The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States”,

<https://larouchepac.com/20180220/mueller-dossier-revisited-how-british-and-obama-diddled-united-states>

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE

: This is a case which will never go to trial, because these are people living in Russia. It's an old case, it was already discussed in 2014, and since there is no extradition treaty between the United States and Russia, the trial will never take place; and therefore Mueller does not have to provide any evidence for any of his accusations. So it's a very convenient way to keep beating the drums in an anti-Russian hysteria and it's a big, big "nothing-burger" as people have been pointing out. But it is actually a fraud against the population, because if you keep building this kind of enemy image, such as against Russia and China – and people should understand, this has nothing to do with Russian hacking, or Russian collusion; as a matter of fact, there were several people, but one of them was a leading member of the Russian Duma who said that there are 102 very well documented cases for the United States meddling in the internal affairs of other countries, and it's fairly well known how many coups and regime-change operations. So obviously, at minimum, you could say is that both sides are doing it, but the United States has a very long record of having tried to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries in multiple ways. So, this should be understood as pre-war propaganda, and people easily fall for things which are in the mainstream media, and rather, they should think twice. What Russia is doing and what China is doing, is they are building a completely different model of international relationships, explicitly modeled on

noninterference, and respect for the social system of the other country. And therefore, this propaganda is just a terribly dangerous scenario of lies which actually is serving as a preparation for war, and that is what people really must get straight.

OGDEN: So the stakes are very high, and in the same broadcast yesterday, Helga LaRouche made the point that there are ongoing investigations coming out of the House Intelligence Committee under Devin Nunes, and also the Senate Intelligence Committee under Chuck Grassley, into the role of Christopher Steele as a central figure in this entire Russiagate narrative. As she said, this leads directly to the role of British intelligence. So, here's a second clip from yesterday's broadcast.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Yes, it is directly British intelligence. It's not "former" MI6 agent, but it is an MI6 operation, and it involves the Foreign Office of Great Britain itself, as we saw in a case which was launched by one of the Russians who were accused of hacking, who took the Steele case to court, and then the Foreign Office intervened directly to block any revelations coming from the Steele operative of theirs. Now, that it is an incredible story: It means the British have intervened, not only in the coup against the Yanukovich government, but also in the case of the coup against President Trump. That whole Russiagate as some people funnily say is a big "regurgitated nothing-burger" – there is absolutely no substance to it. And we should just note the fact that the continuous investigations coming from the two Houses of Congress, under the leadership of Nunes and Grassley, they are still pointing absolutely to the coup-plotters who were involved with the British in this coup.

In the recent developments, [House Intelligence Chair] Congressman Nunes has sent out 10 or 11 other letters to officials of the existing or former government, where they have to answer very pointed question – when did you know first about the Steele dossier? Did you discuss it with anybody else? Did Obama know it? When did he know it? And these individuals have

to answers these questions by March 2nd, so it's not a long-term investigation, but it's something extremely hot. And it's not yet decided how this coup will go: If the Congress has the courage to go after those Obama intelligence officials who colluded with Great Britain, but if they do, a lot of people could not only lose their position, but actually end up in jail, as some judges are now already demanding.

OGDEN: So, as Helga said, this investigation continues and it continues to escalate. This is the question of the role of the British and their fellow-travellers in the American intelligence community in actually meddling in the US electoral process. Chairman Devin Nunes is scheduled to appear at the CPAC [Conservative Political Action Conference] conference today; he's scheduled to be the closing speaker. We'll see what he has to say there, but as Helga mentioned, Nunes has continued to march forward with Phase Two of his investigation into this entire Christopher Steele matter. He issued a series of questions; this is letter that was just published yesterday which was sent to the FBI and officials within the State Department. The letter is asking for questions regarding information contained in the Steele dossier, which was funded by the DNC [Democratic National Committee] and the Clinton campaign, and used in a FISA [Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act] application targetting Carter Page. He notified them, as Helga mentioned, that if their responses are not received by March 2nd, which is a week from today, then subpoenas will be issued. He said, "If you do not provide timely answers on a voluntary basis, the Committee will initiate compulsory process."

So, included in these questions is one which directly asks what did Obama know and when did he know it? So, here are a few of the questions that are asked by Chairman Nunes [Fig. 3]:

"1. When and how did you first become aware of any of the information contained in the Steele dossier?

"2. In what form(s) was the information in the Steele dossier presented to you? By whom? ...

"3. Who did you share this information with? When? ...

"6. When did you first learn or come to believe that the Steele dossier was funded by a Democrat-aligned entity?

"9. Was President Obama briefed on any information contained in the dossier prior to January 5, 2017?

"10. Did you discuss the information contained in the Steele dossier with any reporters or other representatives of the media? If so, who and when?"

So clearly it is very significant that this investigation is going all the way to the top, with Obama himself being implicated. Now recall that Chairman Grassley of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has also been asking questions about what Obama knew and when did he know it. Take the example of the very bizarre email that was sent by Susan Rice to herself on Inauguration Day at 12:15pm on the day that President Trump was inaugurated; literally right before she walked out of the doors of the White House for the last time to attend this inauguration. The email describes a January 5, 2017 Oval Office meeting between President Obama, former FBI James Comey, former Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, as well as Vice President Joe Biden and Rice herself. The email that Susan Rice sent to herself obviously has been publicized by Chairman Grassley, and in this letter [Fig. 4] that you're looking at, he published the relevant excerpt from this email. Again, this is Susan Rice, addressed to Susan Rice; 12:15pm, January 20, 2017. This is what she says:

"On January 5, following a briefing by IC leadership on Russian hacking during the 2016 Presidential election, President Obama had a brief follow-on conversation with FBI Director Jim Comey and Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates in the Oval Office. [She mentions that Biden and herself were also present.]

"President Obama began the conversation by stressing his continued commitment to ensuring that every aspect of this issue is handled by the Intelligence and law enforcement communities 'by the book'. The President stressed that he is not asking about, initiating or instructing anything from a law enforcement perspective. He reiterated that our law enforcement team needs to proceed as it normally would by the book.

"From a national security perspective, however, President Obama said he wants to be sure that, as we engage with the incoming team, we are mindful to ascertain if there is any reason that we cannot share information fully as it relates to Russia.

"The President asked Comey to inform him if anything changes in the next few weeks that should affect how we share classified information with the incoming team. Comey said he would."

Now, what Senator Grassley asks in his open letter to Susan Rice is the following:

"It strikes us as odd that, among your activities in the final moments on the final day of the Obama administration, you would feel the need to send yourself such an unusual email purporting to document a conversation involving President Obama and his interactions with the FBI regarding the Trump/Russia investigation. In addition, despite your claim that President Obama repeatedly told Mr. Comey to proceed 'by the book,' substantial questions have arisen about whether officials at the FBI, as well as at the Justice Department and the State Department, actually did proceed 'by the book.'..."

"4. Did anyone instruct, request, suggest, or imply that you should send yourself the aforementioned Inauguration Day email memorializing President Obama's meeting with Mr. Comey about the Trump/Russia investigation? If so, who and why?"

"12. Did President Obama have any other meetings with Mr. Comey, Ms. Yates, or other government officials about the FBI's investigation of allegations of collusion between Trump associates and Russia? If so, when did these occur, who participated, and what was discussed?"

So, these questions and these investigations are beginning to hit very close to home. Remember, Susan Rice was also caught and has admitted to requesting the unmasking of several individuals associated with the Trump campaign; Americans whose communications were collected under NSA wiretaps and surveillance. Susan Rice and other officials have now been caught on repeated occasions requesting the unmasking of these American officials; raising many questions as to what the motives were.

Now Chairman Nunes has been appearing on several talk shows and media interviews over the last several weeks. Obviously, since the publication of his memo. But he appeared last weekend on "The Full Measure" show with host Sharyl Atkinson. In that interview, he continued to keep a laser focus. Let me just read you a few excerpts of what Chairman Nunes had to say in that interview.

"We have a Russian Investigation going on whether or not there was collusion between any campaign and the Russians. That's coming to a close. We've never had any evidence of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians! There's nothing there";.

"[I]n that investigation, we've unearthed things that are very concerning. We know that there are un-maskings that occurred and probably were leaked to the media". [W]hat we found was happening is, in the last administration, they were unmasking hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of American's names. They were unmasking people for what I would say, for lack of a better definition, were for political purposes". [N]ames were unmasked. And those names ended up in the newspaper.

"[I]t's like political dirt to create a narrative and a spin with the mainstream media". [T]here were unmaskings that we unearthed, then there are the FISA abuse that we've discovered. [T]his is where the FBI and the Justice Department – because they're involved in this FISA Abuse, because they're the ones who " go before the secret court to get the warrants, they're all involved, they're all implicated in this".

"It really boils down to this. You had a campaign. The Hillary Campaign and the Democratic Party went out and paid for dirt". Then they used that dirt and funneled it into the FBI. The FBI then used that dirt to get a warrant on a US citizen who was part of the other campaign". [T]o do that, it's wrong.

"... As it relates to Department of Justice and the FBI, if they need to be put on trial, we will put them on trial. The reason that Congress exists is to oversee these agencies that we created. DOJ and FBI are not above the law. Congress created them, we oversee them, and we fund them. And if they're committing abuse for a secret court, getting warrants on American citizens, you're darn right that we're going to put them on trial.

"I think people are just starting to learn now what really happened. Because as we peel more and more of this back, I think more and more Americans get educated. And I think that they're gonna demand that changes are made."

Remember that this entire line of investigation is exactly what was suggested in the original LaRouche PAC special report. Obviously, this special report on Mueller was published now over six months ago. But this continues to be very timely and very relevant. An update to that report will be forthcoming, but we have a preview now available on the website of what will be contained in that updated dossier. That preview is available under the title "The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States". There you can see a screen shot [Fig. 5] from that updated preview. This is obviously

available in full on the LaRouche PAC website, and we would encourage you to read it in its fullest extent. It's a fairly long update. But what I'd like to do is just read you from the beginning of how this report is set up, a little bit of a retrospective on the effect that this Mueller dossier has had over its six-month circulation; but also the context in which you have to understand always the big strategic picture behind the events that are now unfolding on a day-to-day basis. So, this is what this updated report has to say:

"On September 29, 2017, LaRouchePAC published the original version of the dossier 'Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will do His Job If You Let Him'. To date, that dossier, now being circulated nation-wide by LaRouchePAC, represents the most thorough and the most accurate assessment as to the character of Robert Mueller, as well as the utterly fraudulent nature of the ongoing treasonous effort to bring down the Trump Presidency.

"This present report is an update to that dossier, with the emphasis on the dramatic significance of two documents which were released in the first days of February. The first is the House Intelligence document known as the 'Nunes Memo', and the second is the – by far more substantive – un-redacted document authored by Senators Grassley and Graham.

"We shall examine the importance of these two documents in depth, as well as significant other developments which flow from the impact of their release. Before doing so, however, it is of critical importance that a matter of primary overriding concern be re-stated here, at the beginning of this update.

"The British Origin of the Coup

"Nothing of any truth about the current assault on President Trump can be understood, unless one addresses the question of *why* all of this is occurring, along with the subsumed question of "cui bono?" This requires transcending the world of partisan politics and inside-the-beltway gossip, and the necessity for examining the *strategic* setting and implications surrounding the coup plot.

"Everything that is now transpiring must be viewed within that truthful strategic context. During the eight years of the Obama Presidency, and the prior Administration of George W. Bush, a profound shift in U.S. strategic policy took place. Obama,

working closely with – and often under the direction of – the British, committed the United States to enforcing a global policy of Anglo-American hegemonism, what is sometimes referred to as a ‘uni-polar world’. This took the form of escalating provocations against Russia, and more recently the targeting of China.

Currently, this imperial Anglo-American faction is determined to thwart China’s gigantic Belt and Road Initiative infrastructure development of Eurasia, Africa, Southwest Asia (the Middle East), and nations in Central and South America. This largest infrastructure development project in human history now involves more than 68 countries.

“For the British, such geo-political designs are nothing new. British strategic policy since before World War I has been based on geopolitics. Under the theories of Lord Halford Mackinder, completely embraced by today’s Anglo-American foreign policy establishment, control of Eurasia dictates strategic mastery of the world. China is now establishing vast transportation and other infrastructure throughout Eurasia, a region which Anglo-American policy up until now had reserved as a primitive looting ground.

“Unable to break from imperial axioms and join China’s offer of win-win cooperation, let alone offer a viable alternative model which promotes the general welfare, Barack Obama and the British adopted a strategy of geopolitical containment and provocation, a New Cold War policy. It began with the Anglo-American coup in Ukraine in 2014, pushing NATO right up to Russia’s borders, and involves hostile encirclement strategies against both Russia and China, employing color revolutions, economic sanctions, overt economic, cyber, and information warfare, provocative military maneuvers, development of new nuclear and other warfare capacities, and military support of insurgents and terrorists in states friendly and/or trading with Russia or China, such as Iran and Syria. All of this, of course, threatens the extinction of the human race.”

Now, the final aspect of that memo which is now available goes through the fact that with Trump’s election, this entire agenda was derailed. As it says:

“In November 2016, it was the intention of Obama and the British that Hillary Clinton would continue this dangerous geo-political gambit. Donald Trump’s victory in that election stopped this mad drive to war just as it was turning very hot. “As we detailed in our original Mueller dossier,

'Russiagate,' – which has roiled our nation since Summer 2016, has driven most members of Congress into a McCarthyite insanity so severe that you can literally picture them braying at the Moon at night, and has critically undermined Donald Trump's Presidency – has absolutely nothing to do with any hostile action by Russia against the United States. Its origins are to be found in the desperation of the British and American establishments, among individuals and interests who are frantic to re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama Administration."

I would strongly encourage you to read the entirety of this report, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website now. It's crucial, but let me just pick up on that picture, which was just laid out in that prefatory section. As is very apparent from developments in the recent week and a half, these frantic attempts to impose the re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama administration, which the Hillary Clinton administration clearly would have continued full-bore; this attempt to re-impose that track is now in full swing. One only has to look at the escalations that have occurred in Ukraine, the escalations which have occurred in Syria, the calls for a response to that, and absolutely the very heated rhetoric and hysterical speeches which were delivered at the so-called Munich Security Conference which just occurred this week. We saw just raid anti-Russia, anti-China speeches, one after another after another, attacking the One Belt, One Road policy as an imperialistic scheme; trying to identify a full spectrum intelligence operation that's being allegedly run by the Chinese against every nation in the West, and so forth and so on.

In contrast to that, the spokesperson from China at the Munich Security Conference, very calmly and very undefensively laid out the picture of what the New Paradigm of win-win relations that China is offering to the world really entails. That was originally elaborated by Xi Jinping at his speech at the United Nations General Assembly several years ago, but it involves non-confrontation, non-meddling in foreign countries' affairs, an understanding of differences in approach and differences in political and cultural systems. But overall, not an attempt to impose one nation or one system's view of the world on other nations in a sort of unipolar or hegemonic way; but a way to say, "Let's take our differences and use them to our collective advantage. Let's put together a system of shared, mutual benefit under a vision of common destiny for mankind."

Which is the way the Chinese have put it. But this is characterized as a win-win approach, as opposed to the Cold War mentality of winner take all, zero-sum game type of geopolitics. So, Helga LaRouche in her broadcast yesterday strongly encouraged people to actually read the text of the speeches from the Munich Security Conference, both the anti-China, anti-Russia war-mongering speeches so you can see for yourself just how rabid and hysterical this prewar propaganda actually is. But also, go and read that speech from the representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, and you can see how the Chinese are responding. This is the time where we desperately need a New Paradigm of international relations; and it comes under the form of that win-win relationship. The way that you can see that playing out on the ground, not from 300,000 feet with rhetoric; but really look at the reality on the ground, in places such as Africa, Central and South America, countries in Eurasia. These countries are already benefitting from the infrastructure, the modern technology and the infrastructure which is being brought to those countries by China and the One Belt, One Road initiative. It's high time that the United States and other countries in Western Europe come to the table and say what China is doing is very good. This is for the benefit of these countries, and instead of trying to shut this down and beat the drums of war, we should finally reciprocate what China is doing. We should come to the table with intentions of good will, and we should join together and as a community of nations, build this future which will be for the common benefit of all.

So, the LaRouche PAC class series, which we've been promoting now for several weeks, and is already ongoing, could not be more timely and more urgent. This is titled, "The End of Geopolitics; What Is the New Paradigm?" You can register, if you haven't already, at discover.larouchepac.com or at the link that you see here on the screen – <http://lpac.co/np2018>. Again, there are public classes which have been available on YouTube; two so far. The first inaugural speech by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and then the second follow-up by Harley Schlanger last Saturday; which was "What Is Geopolitics? Part I, the History". That was very informative and very in-depth. But there are also aspects of this class series that you cannot access unless you are a registered participant; such as the discussion period which will occur tomorrow, which will only be open to those who are registered for this class series. So, we strongly encourage you,

if you haven't yet, to register. Also, to encourage other people that you know to register for this class series at that link that's on the screen and to become active participants in this entire series.

The time has come. We must take very seriously what's at stake here in this current unfolding battle over the soul of the United States and the soul of the US Presidency. The ugly nature of this operation and this apparatus continues to come to light, but we have to continue – as the LaRouche PAC dossier does very well – to put it into its proper strategic context and to understand *cui bono?* and what is the strategic context for this unprecedented assault on the US democratic system and the US Presidency that we now see ongoing.

So, thank you very much for joining me here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do.

**Rusland og Kina er ikke en trussel,
men en stor mulighed.
Politisk Orientering 15. feb. 2018.**

2. del:

De neokonservatives voksende hysteri

over

Kina er bevis på, at Silkevejsånden

er

ustoppelig. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 15. feb., 2018.

Introduktion v/ Harley Schlanger:

De voksende krigstrømmer, der høres mod Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ, og som kommer fra transatlantiske geopolitiske institutioner og deres politiske marionetter, såsom den amerikanske senator Marco Rubio, udgør et vidnesbyrd om den voksende indflydelse, som Xi Jinpings »win-win«-diplomati har. Det, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche først identificerede som et »Nyt Paradigme«, har vundet tilhængere i hele verden med den smitsomme »Nye Silkevejsånd. Nationer i Afrika, Asien og Syd- og Mellemamerika, der er blevet udplyndret under IMF's og Verdensbankens krav om nedskæringspolitik, vender sig nu mod BVI, der demonstrerer, at reelt økonomisk fremskridt er muligt. BVI-processen tilbyder et håb om, at fattigdom kan elimineres i hele verden på samme måde, som den er blevet dramatisk reduceret i Kina.

I stedet for at fejre denne proces eller gå med i den, så har de transatlantiske eliter gang i deres gamle tricks i et desperat forsøg på at forhindre det Nye Paradigme i at lykkes. Deres gamle paradigme, med regimeskifte og krige, med anvendelse af terroroperationer, med frihandelsaftaler kombineret med nedskæringspolitikker, der producerer morderisk økonomisk ødelæggelse, fortsætter, selv med et væsentligt svækket fundament for deres overlevelse.

I USA er operationen for regimeskifte mod præsident Trump afsløret som et kupforsøg, Made in London. Nye afsløringer fra senatorerne Grassley og Graham forventes at vise, hvor dybt involveret, folk fra Obama-administrationen – og Obama selv – var i at brygge svindelhistorien om »Russiagate« sammen. Vi er nu nærmere end nogensinde før på at knække denne operation, som ville befri præsidenten for de begrænsninger, der er påtvunget ham, og til at forfølge de mål, han førte kampagne for.

Hør Helga Zepp-LaRouches analyse af udviklingerne omkring disse spørgsmål:

(her følger engelsk udskrift af videoen):

Harley SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger with the Schiller Institute. I'd like to welcome you to this week's webcast with the Schiller Institute Founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Helga, I think what we need to start with this week, is the issue of geopolitics. You've always emphasized, that geopolitics is an imperial game, it's part of the old paradigm and the greatest threat to mankind. This was on display yesterday in the U.S. Senate: The Intelligence Committee has the Threat Assessment hearing; Dan Coats, the Director of National Intelligence, said, "Frankly the United States is under attack." And Marco Rubio said, "China is the biggest threat." He said, "it's aggressively promoting infrastructure as part of its long geopolitical arm."

What's behind this?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think it is very clear that, as it becomes clear that China is becoming sooner or later the largest economy in the world, it's already bypassing the United States in certain respects, – I mean, there is obviously a freakout on the side of those people in the West who are sticking to the conception of an unipolar, the idea of a *Pax Americana*, where, basically the United States is the only remaining superpower. And the fact that a nation which is after all, 1.4 billion people, is eventually becoming stronger, especially if it has the kind of science and technology oriented policy which China is pursuing, it is clear that some people respond to that with the idea to contain that country.

Now, I think it should be clear to anybody that that is a complete impossibility, unless you go to war.

Now, China has answered to the recent attacks, which are really ranging from Australia, to the United States, to certain European think tanks, in a very calm way. For example, there was a response to the formulation that China would be a "competitor" or a "rival," as Trump said it in his State of the Union address, where there was a quite reasonable article in *Global Times*, answering to this, and making the point that the United States has to make an historic choice: That it is clear that the rise of China has caused certain strategic phobias among certain people, who recognize or help to see that China is offering a different development model which is especially attractive for developing countries, and that they are now reacting in this way; but that

obviously, cooperation is the only way for these two largest countries in the world – the United States and China. And if they find a way of cooperation, then they have a bright future. This is completely crazy to say that everything China does – the Chinese culture, the Chinese system – all of this would be a threat to the West. It is absolutely not the case, and China has offered cooperation, and anything else can only lead to a catastrophe.

Now, I would make still a big difference between how President Trump reacts; while all of these attacks were going on, he met with State Councillor Yang Jiechi in Washington, and they reopened the four-level strategic dialogues, that they will continue. And I think this is very good. But obviously, the propaganda campaign against China right now is reaching an absolutely unprecedented pitch.

SCHLANGER: At the same time, we're seeing the changes going on with Russiagate. You hear very little these days about questions of what Russia did, what Trump did, but there are new things emerging. I think it's quite interesting: The Obama role is starting to be talked about, Joe diGenova had another statement. What's your assessment of what's going on with the whole Russiagate story?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Essentially, I think what this Joseph diGenova points out, which I think is quite relevant, that the counter-memo to the Nunes memorandum which was basically coming from Adam Schiff, was kept back by the FBI and the DOJ, diGenova says, because there are certain formulations in it which need to be redacted according to these two institutions, and he points out to the fact that the formulation because there is a criminal investigation going on, is very interesting. And he points to the fact that all the culprits who were involved in this Russiagate coup attempt eventually will face criminal prosecution. So that's one thing.

And also the role of former President Obama is now an issue. There was a funny email which Susan Rice sent to herself as a kind of memo, reminder, on Jan. 20, 2017, where she reported about a meeting involving Obama, Biden, Comey, herself, in which this was discussed that the incoming President Trump should not be told by the secret services, things relating to Russia, because of the suspicion of a collusion with Russia. Now, that's

quite incredible, that the outgoing President would instruct the intelligence services to withhold information from an incoming President. And this refers to a meeting which apparently took place on Jan. 5th, and then, one day later, the four heads of the intelligence services went to Trump in the Trump Tower, – this was still in the transition period – and they told him about the supposed collusion with Russia. And later, when Comey made this big speech in front the Congress, he said this was his “Edgar Hoover moment.”

This is all now in the public domain, and I think everything we said in the dossier on Mueller, which we published last September, is now proven absolutely to the point by these congressional investigations. [“Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin; He Will Do His Job If You Let Him!”] So, I think the battle where the United States will go looks much better for Trump than the people who tried the coup against him.

SCHLANGER: To go back to what you said about the Susan Rice memo: if you look at the Intelligence Committee hearing yesterday, it seems as though the heads of intelligence today are still holding to the same line that they did under Obama.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, they keep saying it, but that doesn’t mean that these investigations in the House and Senate will not continue. Some mills are grinding slowly, but they’re grinding.

SCHLANGER: The other big news from the United States was the introduction of the so-called infrastructure bill. What’s your assessment on that? It doesn’t seem to be what it was cracked up to be.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think it’s noted as a good thing by many people that there is, finally, somebody proposing an infrastructure program, because infrastructure is a phenomenon which lasts 30, 40, 50 years, or maybe sometimes even longer, but then eventually it ages, it’s disintegrating, and that’s what we see in many instances in the United States – the roads, the nonexistent fast-train system, the general condition of bridges and so forth. So it’s a good thing that somebody talks about that.

But I think the way how Trump is going about it, by hoping there will be private investors, and a lot of burdens on the

state and local governments will not function. And I think that China has noted that point in commenting that the political system in the United States is making it impossible. Because the moment Trump said anything about his program, the Democrats completely opposed it. And obviously infrastructure is in the national interest, and therefore, should be a nonpartisan issue. But the fact that you have this partisan system in the United States and elsewhere in the West, as part of the so-called "democratic" system, this prevents any progress in this respect and therefore, it's all the more important that a professor from Beijing University offered to use the large foreign exchange reserves which China has, especially in the form of U.S. Treasuries and U.S. bonds, to invest those in the infrastructure in the United States.

This is a proposal which we have made from the very beginning, because obviously, China has the financing, China has the infrastructure expertise; they have built an enormous amount of fast train systems, and other infrastructure. So I think that that would be the only way to make this function. But I think short of that, you need Glass-Steagall, you need a National Bank in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, and a credit system, and then the cooperation with the Belt and Road Initiative; and then it would function.

So that remains the task, basically in the United States, our colleagues are encouraging state legislators and others to make pressure from the base, so that neo-con pressure in the Republican Party and the Democratic opposition to Trump's proposals are overcome, through such a program in the national interests of the United States, which would also be a peace-building measure. So that is the battle right now.

SCHLANGER: We also have this fairly interesting article on Bloomberg about the Chinese economy, where they say, our models show that it should have crashed, but it hasn't crashed, and they say they're confounded by this. It's obvious, these models don't work, but the Chinese are aware of that, aren't they?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yes. As a matter of fact, as these attacks against China have escalated, they had a very interesting counterattack on "democracy," saying that "democracy" is the hobby-horse of many people in the West, but in reality, it is not in the common interest, it's basically a weapon to defend the

interest of an oligarchy. And also the West are not the only ones who can claim to have a democratic system. And then they say basically that this goes back to Mencius, who already demanded that the government must follow the Mandate of Heaven, and in China it is the highest obligation of the party to follow the Mandate of Heaven, which means following the common good of the people.

So, they basically say democracy is being used for regime change, that when they target a country, they demand people should follow "democracy," then they play up through the mainstream media some demonstrators and if everything goes well it leads to regime change and if it doesn't go well, they go for a nice color revolution.

So I think these kinds of renewed, sharp responses coming from China reflect the fact that they do not intend at all to be intimidated, and that they're quite aware of double standard of the so-called "liberal system" which claims they're liberals, but then demand global hegemony and controlling the rules on a global scale, and that this double standard is visible for anybody who wants to see it.

So there is a new tone of self-confidence and self-assuredness in the Chinese responses to these accusations.

SCHLANGER: And I would assume the Chinese have to be asking the question, "What's wrong with reducing poverty?" And here we see this situation where poverty is growing in the West, it has been growing from the 2001 period on, and yet, Chinese efforts to alleviate poverty, not just in China, but also in their neighbors and all around the world as well, is seen as somehow an imperial, expansionist policy.

I mean – do the Chinese have a reaction to that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yeah. They have right now the most impressive program to alleviate poverty inside China by 2020. For those people who are interested in that, there is a documentary on CGTN, the Chinese Global Television Network, where they show how they absolutely map out every spot, every village where you have poverty, they have a file on every family to look at what are the reasons for it, what can be done to overcome it – education, infrastructure, industrialization, relocation of people to better-off areas – and President Xi Jinping is very much hands-on. He travels to these villages – not all of them,

but some; he talks to the families; he makes it clear that it is his personal concern that the goal of eliminating poverty by 2020 is reached. And this is very, very impressive.

There was another article in the Chinese press, where they say, infrastructure development and poverty alleviation is also an area of competition. And not only is the economic growth of China absolutely incredible and outstanding, but so is the infrastructure building and the poverty alleviation.

So the West has to basically suffer to be judged: Who is doing more for their people, is it China, or is the West, with their so-called austerity systems, which in the case of, if you look at Europe, there is now a new study out by the European Center for Economic Research [ZEW], which looked at what was the difference, after the 2008 crisis, in those countries which an anti-cyclical focus on basic research and development, R&D, and they had a massive increase in productivity. The countries that did that were Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Finland. As compared to those countries which were hit by with EU Troika austerity policy – namely, Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland, . Czech Republic, Lithuania – which had to make cuts also in the basic research and development, and as a result had a terrible collapse in productivity.

I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators, so that the rich become richer, and the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking.

This article by Bloomberg, which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to his theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he says that China is doing everything which according to his theory are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says, he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections.

There will be a lot more corrections, because I think we need a public debate, what are the economic criteria for a functioning economy? And obviously, the works of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and his development of physical economy, going back to Leibniz, to Friedrich List, to Henry C. Carey, to Wilhelm

von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things.

We need a discussion about that, because the notion of what is economy, equating that with money, has really become one of the axiomatic assumptions of a failing system. So we need a debate about that.

SCHLANGER: One of the great contributions of your husband was making the connection, between geopolitical doctrine as an imperial doctrine, and the imposition of these kinds of economic policies, which only work for the handful of the most wealthy. Now, we had talked earlier – actually, it's been a focus of the Schiller Institute for a while – extending the Silk Road into the World Land-Bridge, and we're seeing that now with the bioceanic railway, the progress in Africa. What can you tell us about how these projects are advancing?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Oh, I think they're on a very good development: There was just a reiteration in Brazil coming from the Chinese Embassy, that the bioceanic railway, connecting the Pacific and the Atlantic from Brazil to Peru, is still very much on the agenda, that a feasibility study has been made. So this is on a good trajectory, and all the projects agreed upon at the China-CELAC meeting – the Caribbean and Latin American countries meeting with China; and naturally, also the Africa projects are all progressing very nicely. So I think the World Land-Bridge is becoming a reality, very quickly, to the benefit of all countries that participate in it.

SCHLANGER: I'd like to come back, as we wrap this up, to the question of geopolitics. We got a question from a viewer, who wanted to know why you always blame British geopolitical manipulations for World War I and World War II? And they ask the question, what did they do, and what were they responding to? Why don't you give us the answer to that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: If you look at the British Empire's policy toward the Continent in the 19th century, they clearly were extremely upset about the industrial revolution in Germany, introduced by Bismarck. Bismarck, as I mentioned earlier, was a free-trade follower in the beginning, working with the Prussian Junkers. But then he got acquainted with the theories of Henry C. Carey: He had this friend, Wilhelm von Kardorff who was the head of the German business association at the time, and they recognized the fundamental difference between what Friedrich List had called the "American System," and the British system. So Bismarck changed to a proponent of protectionism, and this led to a very quick industrial revolution in Germany. Now, the British, through relatives in the oligarchy, manipulated so that Bismarck got ousted, which was really a tragedy, because Bismarck was very smart and he had basically established a peace order on the European Continent, by having many diplomatic treaties with every nation, and especially with Russia, he had the Reinsurance Treaty, which was a very important element to prevent a possible outbreak of war, in case there should be some French-German tensions.

His successors were not so smart, so they didn't pay attention to this Russia Reinsurance Treaty, and then the British started to manipulate the chessboard of the European countries, step by step, by creating incidents to create the Entente Cordiale; the Triple Entente; the war between Russia and Japan; the Balkan Wars; so that basically, every country was set already, ready to go so that the shooting in Sarajevo was only the trigger but not the cause for World War I.

Now, what was behind that, also, was the idea of geopolitics as it had been developed by Mackinder, Milner, and later by Haushoffer, which was the crazy idea that whoever controls the Eurasian land-mass is in control of the world, to the disadvantage of the Atlantic rim countries, in that case, United States and England. So basically, that idea that you have to orchestrate conflict in order to prevent such a development, that became an issue, naturally, with the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was built essentially in the 1890s; and the plans to build a Berlin-Baghdad Railway, was regarded by the British at that time, as a fundamental threat to their control of the sea trade. Now, obviously, today, with the New Silk Road, if you think in terms of geopolitics, you could easily arrive at the same mistaken conclusion, and I think that is the British thinking.

And as we can see now, in the case of Mr. Rubio, or the intelligence heads of the United States, that is their thinking. But as I had said, many, many times, geopolitics led to essentially all the wars in history. It led to two World Wars, because the idea with the Second World War, was everybody who had read *Mein Kampf* and knew the background of Hitler, knew that eventually a war between Russia and Germany would result, and there were backers who wanted Hitler to come to power – [Bank of England Governor] Montagu Norman, in the United States, the Harriman interests and others – so this was a manipulation where it was clear it would result in such a war.

It should be clear to everybody who is not completely losing his marbles, that in the age of thermonuclear weapons, you cannot continue this game, if you do not want to risk the extinction of civilization! And I think what China has proposed with their “win-win cooperation,” with their offers for China and the United States to cooperate on the basis of a special relation among major powers, the offer for European countries to cooperate, that is catapulting humanity to a higher level of cooperation and reason! And I think it is so much in our self-interest – what is the problem with the United States? It’s not that China is rising, the problem is that the United States has moved away from the policies of the Founding Fathers, of Lincoln, of Franklin D. Roosevelt, of Kennedy. And the United States, indeed, could become great again, if they go back to these policies, and then they would not regard China as a threat. It’s only when the West is collapsing that there is ferment to see a rising power as a threat. But as the Chinese ambassador to Washington Cui Tiankai, he said – and I think that that is definitely something to think about – that in history, there were 16 cases where one nation would rise and the dominant one up to that point would be faced with such a situation: In twelve cases, there had been war, and in four cases, the rising country had just bypassed the old, dominant one and that would have been the new situation. And the Chinese ambassador said: China does not want the twelve cases where it led to war, but they also don’t want the four cases where China would just take over and become the unipolar, dominant country; but that they want to have respect for the sovereignty of each, and that is what all the developing countries that are participating in the Belt and Road Initiative are experiencing. That’s why they cooperate, they have benefits from it, and they have, now for the first time, the chance to

overcome their underdevelopment and poverty.

And I think it would be absolutely dangerous to listen to these people who are now saying everything China represents is a threat. Because if you look at China, it's actually a very well-functioning economic model: The people are happy, the philosophy is for the common good, and it is not a threat. And I want to keep insisting on that, because nothing would be more dangerous than if you get into a complete anti-China hysteria, anti-Russia hysteria, and the only consequence of that could be a terrible catastrophe for all of us.

SCHLANGER: I think from what you just said, it becomes increasingly clear for people, why Donald Trump's desire to have good relations with Russia and China, is seen as such a threat to the City of London, and its extended worldwide interests. Helga, that brings us to the end of the program today. We'll see you next week!

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, till next week.

'Demokrati': Betyder det princippet om det Almene Vel eller partipolitisk lammelse og krige for regimeskifte?

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 14. feb., 2018 – Senatets Efterretningskomites høring i går med lederne af de amerikanske efterretningstjenester, var anti-russiske, anti-kinesiske optøjer fra både senatorer og vidner. Den nye 'politiske korrekthed' i ånden fra McCarthy dominerede enhver diskussion af det faktiske emne, »trusler mod Amerikas nationale sikkerhed«. Hvis der hersker noget tvivlsspørgsmål om, hvorfor, det er mislykkedes præsident Trump at forfølge sine hensigter – stormagtssamarbejde med både Rusland og Kina om bekæmpelse af terrorisme og regionale krige – så blev de besvaret af forestillingen i Senatet i går, og som også omgiver ham i Det Hvide Hus.

De ledende folkevalgte i USA og Europa har, med deres skrigeri om, at Kina og Rusland er en trussel mod »demokratiske værdier«, demonstreret deres totalt manglende evne til at praktisere demokrati succesfuldt. Deres partier gør dem ude af stand til at regere – eller, som vi ser det i Tyskland, blot at danne en regering og forsøge at regere. De kan ikke reducere fattigdom, hvor Kina er ved at fjerne det; de kan ikke stoppe en epidemi af narkoafhængighed og selvmord. De ser et neokonservativt militær/Wall Street-kompleks føre krige for regimeskifte »imod autoritære regimer, og for demokrati«; disse krige er årsag til katastrofale menneskelige lidelser og død, og ødelæggelse af rigdomme, spreder international terrorisme og massive flygtningestrømme. De står nu over for et nyt finanskrak, der er under udvikling, og lammes af Wall Street i at agere for at stoppe det sådan, som Kinas myndigheder har gjort. I stedet skriger de år efter år, at »Kina vil krakke«, mens Kinas bidrag til verdensøkonomiens vækst faktisk konstant stiger.

Det kræver samarbejde med Kina og Rusland at løse disse problemer, hvilket tydeligvis var, hvad Trump havde i sinde, da han indtog embedet. Men selv om gerningsmændene til »Russiagate«, som startede kupforsøget imod ham, nu er godt og grundigt miskrediterede, fortsætter processen med at tvinge præsidenten til at indtage en anti-russisk, anti-kinesisk holdning selv i hans egen administration.

To kronikker i de seneste par dage i en af Kinas førende aviser, *Global Times*, sætter Kinas evne til at tjene sit folks almene vel – regering ved og for folket – i kontrast til USA's ekstreme partipolitiske lammelse og forfølgelse af »demokrati« i fremmede lande ved hjælp af krige. Den anden kronik tog et spørgsmål op, der nu er centralt i denne amerikanske, partipolitiske lammelse: økonomisk infrastruktur.

Som præsidenten gentagne gange har erkendt: USA behandler ikke problemet med sin smuldrende infrastruktur, forsvarer ikke sine borgere mod tilbagevendende oversvømmelser under orkaner, fatale sammenbrud i transportsystemet, broer og dæmninger, der kollapser, inficeret drikkevand – og forbedrer da slet ikke deres liv med nye infrastrukturplatforme, som Kina, der har udbygget 15.000 mil moderne højhastighedsjernbaner og revolutioneret sit folks bevægelighed. Hvis USA insisterer på, at Kina er dets konkurrent, skrev *Global Times*, »så er infrastrukturbyggeri også en form for konkurrence«.

Dette er en konkurrence om at tjene det almene velfærd. Præsident Trumps infrastrukturplan, påtvunget ham af Goldman Sachs bank, vil ikke gøre det; men der er heller ikke kommet noget tilbud fra nogen af de politiske partier om et brugbart alternativ – til at rette op på mere end et halvt århundredes forfald

og sammenbrud.

Det eneste alternativ, der vil virke, er det, der som sit mål har det amerikanske folks og hele menneskehedens generelle velfærd. Dette alternativ begynder med at bryde Wall Street bankerne op – med en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven – og udstede for milliarder af dollars ny, produktiv kredit gennem en ny nationalbank eller Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for at bygge en ny, højteknologisk infrastrukturplatform for USA. Denne fremgangsmåde er en del af Lyndon LaRouches nu berømte Fire Love, der også specificerer NASA's tilbagevenden til et niveau af rumforskning, der svarer til Apolloprojektet, samt at genoplive forskning og udvikling af teknologier til fusionskraft gennem et forceret program.

Infrastrukturspørgsmålet bliver nu en del af de partipolitiske valg i 2018. Lad menneskehedens fælles mål og fælles velfærd dømmes i denne konkurrence, som de vil dømmes Kina, Amerika og »demokratiet«.

Foto: State of the Union 2018

[Russiagate? Alle veje fører til London!](#)

[LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 9. feb., 2018.](#)

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Russiagate? Alle veje fører til London«. Planen er virkelig blevet kompliceret i løbet af en uge til halvanden, med offentliggørelsen af Nunes-memoet fra Husets Efterretningskomite, der efterforsker Christopher Steele; og dernæst afklassificeringen af senator Grassleys brev, som henviser Christopher Steele til Justitsministeriet til efterforskning for kriminelle handlinger. Sandheden bag det, der er blevet kaldt Russiagate, er nu hastigt ved at komme i fokus. Hver eneste tråd i denne historie, når man trækker i dem og følger dem, fører dig direkte til London.

Denne Russiagate-skandale er faktisk blevet til »Londongate«; og historien om det virkelige, aftalte spil er nu ved at blive åbenlys. Der var virkelig en fremmed efterretningstjeneste, der forsøgte at intervenere, blande sig, og forme udfaldet af valget i USA. Men denne efterretningstjeneste havde sit hovedkvarter hvor? I London, på Themsens bredder ved Vauxhall Cross; lige dér, i MI6's hovedkvarter. Historien kommer nu i fokus. Det er præcis, som vi oprindeligt beskrev det i LaRouche PAC's brochure, som vi udgav i september 2017. Det eneste aftalte spil, der fandt sted, var dét mellem USA's og UK's hemmelige efterretningstjenester, i liga med DNC og Hillary Clintons kampagne. Undermineringen af vores demokratiske valgsystem kom fra vore såkaldte nærmeste allierede – briterne; som ikke skyede noget middel for at forhindre, at deres geopolitiske verdensorden blev afsat, og der i stedet voksede en stormagtsrelation frem mellem USA, Rusland og Kina.

Lad os huske på, hvad denne brochure, som blev udgivet for seks måneder siden, sagde. Brochuren er nu i færd med at blive revideret og opdateret og vil snart udkomme i andet oplag. Men lad os se på [brochuren](#) og se, hvad den siger.

»[Præsident Trump] truede det angloamerikanske, britiske imperiesystem efter krigen ... ved at afvise evindeligt krigsførelse, søge bedre relationer med Rusland, kræve gennemførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, gå ind for det, han refererer til som det Amerikanske System for politisk økonomi og love massiv infrastrukturudvikling og en moderne varefremstillingsplatform for produktive jobs.«

»Briterne kræver skalpe, på baggrund af deres opfattelse af at være truet, der specifikt findes i ønsket om en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og en afslutning af den 'unipolære' ramme for relationer mellem nationer.«

Den fortsætter med at sige:

»Kuppet mod Donald Trump startede faktisk i 2013-2014. Den populære forklaring på nederdrægtighederne og forbrydelserne mod præsidenten er, at Hillary Clinton og Barack Obama ansatte deres netværk, inklusive oversiddende loyalister i regeringen og efterretningssamfundet, med det formål at ændre resultatet af det amerikanske valg og at iscenesætte det igangværende kup. Denne forklaring, der primært fokuserer på begivenheder i 2016, overser, alt imens det er sandt nok i en umiddelbart national forståelse, det større billede. Som vi vil vise, så begyndte briterne at kræve Donald Trumps hoved, iflg. deres egen redegørelse, i 2015 og blandede sig og blandede sig i USA's valg og [har forsøgt at iscenesætte] et kup for at omstøde valgresultatet hver eneste dag herefter.«

Herefter sporer brochuren den relevante historie, der går helt tilbage til kinesernes annoncering af en ny, international, økonomisk orden i 2013, i form af det, de kaldte Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Som de ligeledes annoncerede, ville blive tæt koordineret med Ruslands Eurasiske Økonomiske Union i en bestræbelse på økonomisk udvikling til hele det eurasiske kontinent. Dette er præcis, hvad Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i over 20år har været fortalere for, i form af den Eurasiske Landbro, og som dernæst blev kendt som den Nye Silkevej.



Fig. 1

Denne del af verden, som Kina og Rusland nu aktivt forfølger udviklingen af; dette eurasiske område af verden er, hvad geopolitikens fader, den britiske geopolitiks fader – Halford Mackinder – kaldte Hjertelandet. Han skrev en artikel i begyndelsen af det 20. århundrede ved navn, »Historiens geografiske omdrejningspunkt«. Den blev udgivet i 1904. Det, han sagde i denne artikel, og som gjorde ham til faderen af moderne geopolitik, det 20. århundredes britiske geopolitik, er, at Hjertelandet er det geopolitiske omdrejningspunkt for hele verden. Vi ser her hans kort [Fig. 1], og lige i centrum finder vi Eurasien med betegnelsen, »omdrejningspunkt«. Hele hans geopolitiske teori opsummeredes i denne udtalelse: »Den, der regerer over Østeuropa, hersker over Hjertelandet. Den, der regerer over Hjertelandet, hersker over verdensøen. Og den, der regerer over verdensøen, hersker over verden.«

Spørgsmålet om, hvem, der regerer over Østeuropa, handler stort set om, hvem, der regerer over Ukraine. Og da den behørigt valgte ukrainske præsident Victor Janukovitj annoncerede, at han ikke ville underskrive Memorandaet for Samarbejde med den Europæiske Union og i stedet ville opretholde sin tætte relation med

økonomisk samarbejde med Rusland, var det det sidste strå. Mange af de samme personer, vi nu ser nævnt i Grassleys og Nunes' efterforskning af Udenrigsministeriet, såsom Victoria Nuland; mange af de samme personer besluttede, at tiden for regimeskifte var kommet. Ved at aktivere et netværk af oversiddere fra højrefløj og ekstreme ukrainske nationalister, der under Anden Verdenskrig havde samarbejdet med Hitler; denne flok – Victoria Nuland og andre – iscenesatte et voldeligt kup i Ukraine; det såkaldte Maidan. De væltede den demokratiske valgte, ukrainske regering og installerede deres egen regering; Victoria Nuland er berømt for at være blevet taget på fersk gerning i at indrømme dette, på bånd.

Den, der således regerer over Østeuropa, hersker over Hjertelandet. Den, der regerer over Hjertelandet, hersker over verden. Dette er britisk geopolitik, og i årtier har den særlige, amerikansk-britiske relation været et instrument for håndhævelse af dette Mackinders synspunkt af, hvad verdensordenen bør være. Når som helst en præsident; når som helst en ledende, politisk person i USA kom og truede dette synspunkt, ville elementer i de amerikanske og britiske efterretningssamfund slå alarm og på den ene eller anden måde neutralisere denne trussel. Som LaRouche PAC's brochure dybtgående forklarer, så var det præcis, hvad der skete i kampagnen imod Lyndon LaRouche. Som brochuren forklarer, så må man forstå, at dette præcis er tilfældet med den operation, der køres imod præsident Trump. For at kunne forstå operationen imod præsident Trump, må man forstå det ud fra dette perspektiv. Fra det øjeblik, det stod klart, at Trump var en seriøs deltager i kapløbet om USA's præsidentskab, og at han helt tydeligt hældte mod at afslutte Obama-Clinton-Bush-politikken med inddæmning, begrænsning og konfrontation med Rusland og Kina og i stedet hældte mod et gensidigt fordelagtigt, økonomisk og strategisk samarbejde med disse to lande – Rusland og Kina. Og fra det øjeblik blev han mål for dette apparat.

Så vær ikke naiv og lad dig blive indfanget i det daglige mediespin på talkshows på fjernsynet. Dette handler ikke om, hvorvidt du rent personligt støtter eller bryder dig om Donald Trump. Dette er et opgørets øjeblik i den årelange kamp for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl og kampen for at frisætte, befri, USA fra dette britiske Mackinder-synspunkt om geopolitik, der har bragt os helt ud på kanten af atomkrig. I stedet bør USA fuldt og helt deltage i det Nye Paradigme, der nu er vokset frem, med at bringe økonomisk udvikling og moderne økonomisk fremskridt til enorme områder af den tidligere tilbagestående, koloniserede og underudviklede del af verden.

Som vores brochure, der blev udgivet i september 2017, for seks måneder siden, stiller spørgsmålet: »Har vore efterretningstjenester faktisk ulovligt anstiftet aktive forholdsregler for et kontraefterretningsprogram, imod en siddende

præsident?« Vi ved nu, at Comey løj eller vildledte Kongressen om aflytningerne af Trump Tower. FISA-kendelserne beviser dette. Senator Grassley har spurgt FBI, hvorfor, hvis I aflyttede en nær medarbejder til præsidenten, ville I ikke advare præsidenten imod ham, som det er sædvanen? Det sande svar er, at præsidenten selv var og er målet for et hidtil uset og illegalt kupforsøg, udført af dem, der har aflagt ed på at overholde Forfatningen og nationens love.

Så nu ved I det. Siden valget, og før valget, har vi siddet fast i et meget uddybende og farligt, britisk svindelnummer; med et hasardspil om vores nations fremtid i et koldt kup imod en valgt præsident. Der er begået regulære forbrydelser; ikke af præsidenten, men mod præsidenten og Forfatningen. Det, der er sket, er, at divergerende, politiske standpunkter, ideer, er blevet gjort til noget kriminelt; den selv samme fare, som de fleste bestemmelser i vores Forfatning og dens borgerlige frihedsrettigheder (Bill of Rights) blev udtrykkeligt udarbejdet for at værne imod. Vi har fortalt jer den virkelige årsag til, at præsidenten er blevet angrebet af en fremmed magt – briterne og deres allierede i vort land.

Så igen: Denne brochure blev udgivet i september 2017; for næsten seks måneder siden. Men alt det, vi dengang hævdede, bekræftes nu som sandt af kendsgerningerne efterhånden, som de kommer ud; som med tilfældet med Nunes-momoet, Grassley-brevet og hvad vi ellers kan forvente, vil komme ud af disse efterforskninger i den nærmeste fremtid. Hvis man træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede her, og ser på det ud fra dette perspektiv, er det nu uigendriveligt. Hvis man vil identificere den virkelige kilde til forbrydelserne mod vores republik og mod vort demokrati, så træk blot i tråden, og man vil finde, at alle veje fører til London.

I sin ugentlige webcast (torsdag) talte Helga Zepp-LaRouche meget direkte om dette. Jeg vil gerne afspille et kort klip for jer fra dette webcast af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, hvor hun identificerer netop dette aspekt; at alle tråde i denne sag, hvis man følger dem hele vejen, viser, hvorfra den virkelige kriminalitet kommer. Her kommer Helgas klip:

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Planen bliver mere kompliceret, som man siger. Historien er faktisk helt utrolig, og jeg er stolt over at have skrevet en artikel helt i begyndelsen af denne affære, hvor jeg sagde, at der er et aftalt spil med briterne, og ikke med russerne – og det er præcis det, der nu kommer frem og er ved at blive et offentligt spørgsmål. Jeg vil begynde med sagen mod Steele, som det var meningen, skulle for retten i Højesteret i London, hvor Steele skulle møde frem, men i sidste øjeblik blev repræsenteret af sin advokat; argumentet var, at dette kunne berøre britiske nationale sikkerhedsinteresser.

Og minsandten, om ikke en repræsentant fra Udenrigsministeriet også var til stede med deres advokater, og de kom med den samme erklæring.

Så den britiske regerings, britisk efterretnings rolle er nu et spørgsmål, og det står helt klart, at Christopher Steele ikke var en eller anden tilfældig, tidligere MI6-agent, men at han derimod virkelig var en agent for ikke alene briterne, men også for FBI. Denne pointe er kommet frem i en meget interessant artikel på Pat Langs weblog, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. En fast, respekteret bidragyder til denne blog, som udlægger på bloggen under pseudonymet »Publius Tacitus«, spørger i sin overskrift, »Forsøgte britisk efterretning at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab?«, hvilket er præcis, hvad vi har for os.[\[1\]](#)

Værten for denne blog, Pat Lang – for folk, der ikke kender ham; han er en pensioneret, højtrespekteret efterretningsmand i USA, og slet ikke en eller anden russer eller en anden kilde, der kunne være tvivlsom i denne sammenhæng – han arbejdede i lang tid for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) – og han er højt respekteret.

Hvorom alting er, så peger »Publius Tacitus« på den kendsgerning, at de nye memoer, der er kommet frem fra senatorerne Grassley og Graham, og fra Senatskomiteen for Homeland Security og Regeringsanliggender, som alle bekræfter det, der står i Nunes [Husets Efterretningskomite]-memorandaet. Og der er virkelig kommet mange nye aspekter frem. De indikerer, at Comey måske løj under ed, for, da han holdt den berømte pressekonference, der frikendte Hillary Clinton, påstod han, at han ikke havde koordineret dette med nogen andre. Dette står imidlertid i skarp kontrast til nogle flere beskeder, som blev udvekslet mellem Peter Strzok og Lisa Page, to FBI-ansatte, der var involveret i både Hillary Clintons e-mail-affære og ligeledes i Russiagate. I disse beskeder indikerede de, at Hillary vidste, der ikke ville komme nogen anklager mod hende. Der er behov for yderligere efterforskning herom.

Der er desuden fremkommet et andet, meget ildevarslende resultat, og det er en anden udveksling af tekstbeskeder mellem de to, hvor de den 2. sep. 2016 siger, at »POTUS«, dvs. 'President of the United States', nemlig Obama, ønskede at vide alt, de foretager sig. Hvad refererer dette »alt« til? Det refererer enten til efterforskningen af Hillary Clinton, eller også til Russiagate, og sidstnævnte ville betyde, at Obama nu er direkte forbundet med Russiagate og ikke kun indirekte via betalingen til Fusion GPS og Steele, hvor Obama-administrationen også betalte, sammen med DNC og Hillary Clintons kampagne.

Dette er alt sammen ekstremt, ekstremt varmt, og vi har nu alle disse Senats- og Kongreshøringer og komiteer, der efterforsker det. Kongresmedlem Nunes, der

havde offentliggjort dette memo – eller rettere, præsident Trump havde godkendt at få det afklassificeret og offentliggjort sidste fredag – han sagde, dette er kun »Fase 1«. Der kommer flere faser, og de vil blandt andet omfatte Udenrigsministeriet, hvilket selvfølgelig også involverer Victoria Nuland, hvis navn nu er dukket op. Der har ligeledes, omkring et andet spørgsmål, været mange udvekslinger mellem Christopher Steele og Victoria Nuland med hensyn til kuppet i Ukraine, det berømte Maidan-kup i februar 2014.

Dette er alt sammen meget interessant, meget 'varmt'. Russiagate er praktisk taget en død sild, men det, der nu i stedet er på bordet, er den britiske regerings, britisk efterretnings indblanding i valget i USA, der forsøgte at sabotere Trumps sejr, først, og da han alligevel vandt, da at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab ved hjælp af en totalt opdigtet anklage. Det er nu kommet offentligt frem, og det er stort! Jeg kan, selv om dette er foregået i nogen tid, stadig kun være totalt chokeret og overrasket over, hvordan de gængse vestlige medier lykkedes med ikke at dække dette, som tydeligvis er ved at nå dimensioner, der går langt, langt videre end Watergate.

(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet. Hele Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra torsdag kan læses på dansk her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23759>)

OGDEN: So, worse than Watergate, in Helga LaRouche's words. As Helga mentioned in her remarks there, earlier this week, there was a very significant article which was published on the blog "Sic Semper Tyrannis" by Pat Lang, who is former Defense Intelligence, a very high level, very connected person. The article is titled, "Did British Intelligence Try to Destroy the Trump Presidency?" Let me read you a few excerpts from Pat Lang's article. He says:

"Last night's release of the memo by Senator's Grassley and Graham asking the Department of Justice to open a criminal investigation of Christopher Steele for possible violations of 18 U.S.C. Â§ 1001 provides critical confirmation of charges presented in the HPSCI memo prepared under the leadership of Devin Nunes, but it also confirms that Christopher Steele was not just some random guy offering good gossip to the FBI. He was an official intelligence asset. He was, in John LeCarre's parlance, our 'Joe.' At least we thought so. But, there is growing circumstantial evidence that Steele was acting on behalf of Britain's version of the CIA—aka MI-6. If true, we are now faced

with actual evidence of a foreign country trying to meddle in a direct and significant way in our national election. Only it was not the Russians. It was our British cousins”.

“[T]wo developments in the last two days suggest that British intelligence officials, at least some key officials, were witting of Steele’s activities in gathering information for the FBI.

“First, Steele is resisting efforts to face a deposition in a lawsuit over his infamous dossier. Steele’s lawyers argued in a court in London this week that a deposition would endanger the former spy’s dossier sources as well as harm U.K. national security interests. If the Judge buys this claim then we will not have to speculate anymore about whether or not Steele was acting on his own or had a ‘wink-and-a-nod’ from his MI-6 bosses.

“Second, in my mind more telling, were the comments made this week by former MI-6 Chief, Richard Dearlove, on behalf of his former protege:

“Among those who have continued to seek his expertise is Steele’s former boss Richard Dearlove, who headed MI-6 from 1999 to 2004. In an interview, Dearlove said Steele became the ‘go-to person on Russia in the commercial sector’ following his retirement from the Secret Intelligence Service. He described the reputations of Steele and his business partner, fellow intelligence veteran Christopher Burrows, as ‘superb.’ But we do not have to rely solely on Dearlove’s glowing remarks about Steele. There is other information indicating that the Brits played a substantial, if not leading, role in spying on Trump and building the Russian meddling meme. The *Guardian* reported in April 2017 that:

“|’Britain’s spy agencies played a crucial role in alerting their counterparts in Washington to contacts between members of Donald Trump’s campaign team and Russian intelligence operatives, the {Guardian} has been told.

“|’GCHQ first became aware in late 2015 of suspicious “interactions” between figures connected to Trump and known or suspected Russian agents, a source close to UK intelligence said. This intelligence was passed to the US as part of a routine exchange of information, they added.

“|’Over the next six months, until summer 2016, a number of western agencies shared further information on contacts between Trump’s inner circle and Russians, sources said.’

“So much for our special relationship. As the evidence of

British intelligence meddling in the U.S. election piles up, it will create some strains in our bi-lateral ties. It has the potential to harm cooperation on military, law enforcement, and intelligence fronts. I suspect there is some scrambling going on behind the scenes to come up with a strategy to contain the damage while rooting out the sedition. Stay tuned.”

Now, speaking of Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI-6 and his relationship to Christopher Steele, there is a very significant article which was published this week in the *Washington Post*. And that article is published under the title, “Hero, or Hired Gun? How a British Former Spy Became a Flashpoint in the Russia Investigation”. And under the subtitle “He’s the Spy”, the article lays out Steele’s pedigree as a very high-level British intelligence operative, and his extremely close relationship with Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI-6. So, here’s what the article says:

“Steele had all the right credentials for the job.

“He was steeped in Russia early on after being recruited to Britain’s elite spy service from the University of Cambridge. He spent two decades working for the MI6 spy agency, including a stint in his mid-20s in Moscow, where he served undercover in the British Embassy.

“When he returned to work for the agency in London, he provided briefing materials on Russia for senior government officials and led the British inquiry into the mysterious 2006 death in London of Alexander Litvinenko, a former KGB official and Putin critic.

“In 2009, after more than two decades in public service, Steele turned to the private sector and founded a London-based consulting firm, Orbis Business Intelligence, drawing on the reputation and network he developed doing intelligence work.

“Among those who have continued to seek his expertise is Steele’s former boss Richard Dearlove, who headed MI6 from 1999 to 2004.

“In an interview, Dearlove said Steele became the ‘go-to person on Russia in the commercial sector’ following his retirement from the Secret Intelligence Service. He described the reputations of Steele and his business partner, fellow intelligence veteran Christopher Burrows, as ‘superb.’

“In the early fall, he and Burrows turned to Dearlove, their former MI6 boss, for advice. Sitting in winged chairs at the

Garrick Club, one of London's most venerable private establishments, under oil paintings of famed British playwrights, the two men shared their worries about what was happening in the United States. They asked for his guidance about how to handle their obligations to their client and the public, Dearlove recalled.

"Dearlove said their situation reminded him of a predicament he had faced years earlier, when he was chief of station for British intelligence in Washington and alerted U.S. authorities to British information that a vice presidential hopeful had once been in communication with the Kremlin.

"He said he advised Steele and Burrows to work discreetly with a top British government official to pass along information to the FBI."

Now, that entire story sounds very much like a scene directly out of a John LeCarre novel, if you ask me. But this character, Richard Dearlove, is somebody of whom Helga Zepp-LaRouche asks "What is his pedigree, and what is he famous for when it comes to dodgy dossiers?" in that webcast that she delivered yesterday. So, here's what Helga LaRouche had to say about Richard Dearlove:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE: The fact that Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI6, absolutely defended the reputation of Steele, is very interesting in this respect, because who is this Dearlove? He is the infamous author of the famous dossier which led to the attack on Iraq in the Second Gulf War, supposedly because Saddam Hussein was in the possession of weapons of mass destruction, which we know was a blatant lie, which led Colin Powell to make this infamous speech in the United Nations in February 2003, which he later characterized as the biggest mistake of his life, because it led to the intervention, including the United States, in the war against Saddam Hussein. That is something which eventually must also be tried. And I know that Ramsey Clark tried to make that an issue before the international legal authorities.

So, this is not just the attempt of a coup against the United States, but this is a paradigm of policies which have led to the present condition in the world, including the destruction of much of Southwest Asia, including the refugee crisis. So these are not small things, and I think it is high time that this whole paradigm should come out in the open and is being replaced

by a completely different policy.

So, I think the stakes here are extremely high, and I think people should really rethink everything and look at the material which is coming out, because it is an unbelievable scandal.

[T]he dossier which was published by LaRouche PAC, written by Barbara Boyd. This was written half a year ago, but if you read this dossier now, it is incredible, how absolutely on the mark this dossier was, concerning the role of British intelligence. So I think the circulation of this dossier is something which everybody can do very easily. Get it in the social media, get it in the alternative blogs, get it into any newspaper, which has the honesty to follow events in a truthful way. And right now, things are coming out in the open. There were articles by Ray McGovern, by William Binney, Pat Lang, by Russia Today, – naturally, they pick up on the fact that Russiagate is now completely falling apart. So I think the more people can do, to get the public attention on what is going on in this absolutely gigantic fight in the United States, the better; because some of these spooks shy away from daylight, and the more the Sun is shining on them, all the better.

OGDEN: So again, this pamphlet that was put out by LaRouche PAC six months ago, this was a very prescient and very insightful pamphlet. I guarantee you it has served a major role in informing the threat of the investigations for the people who are serious about getting at the truth of this. We've witnessed Russiagate transformed into Steelegate, and Steelegate means Londongate. All threads, if you follow them and pull them, will lead you back to London. This pamphlet is being updated as we speak, and it will be going into a second [sic] printing very soon, and you can expect that this will continue to have a very significant impact.

I just want to, in conclusion, recommend that our viewers, in understanding the context as I went through it earlier, and as that pamphlet elaborates it very clearly, the context of this entire thing is the fight over the soul of the US Presidency and the future of US policy on the world stage. We've witnessed decades and administration upon administration of this so-called US-UK special relationship; which has merely perpetuated this Mackinder geopolitics on the entire planet. It has brought us to the point of confrontation which could threaten thermonuclear

war. This has become all too real. The fight over the paradigm – will we remain the satrapy of this British geopolitical world order, or will we break from that? Will we be liberated from that? Will we embrace the New Paradigm which is now sweeping the planet? That is the question which is at stake here, and the stakes could not be higher.

For that reason, I want to strongly encourage all of our viewers to return here to larouchepac.com tomorrow, February 10th at 12noon. That's 12noon eastern time. We will be treated by a live address by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who be delivering the inaugural class in the LaRouche PAC 2018 online class series. That class series, as you can see here on the screen, is titled "The End of Geopolitics. What Is the Global New Paradigm?" It will be hosted at the url, which is on the top of the screen there – <http://discover.larouchepac.com>. This will be a 12-week class series, which will follow up on the very successful class series which we hosted here on larouchepac.com last year during 2017 on LaRouche's economic discoveries. The invitation to this year's class series is available there on <http://discover.larouchepac.com>. Let me just read to you from the invitation:

"The American people are faced with a historic choice: join China's revolutionary New Silk Road program and secure a new paradigm of win-win global development, or continue the suicidal geopolitical policies of Obama and Bush, guaranteeing confrontation with Russia and China and threatening world war. While President Trump is inclined to move in the direction of cooperation with China and Russia, he is being threatened with a palace coup by those desperately clinging to the old geopolitical view of unchallenged Anglo-American global dominance.

"You can play a role in this decisive point in history. Help secure the New Paradigm.

"LaRouche PAC is launching a new class series, "What is the New Paradigm?" to prepare you to lead the population at this critical time. 2018 must be the year we end geopolitics."

Then, it lists what these classes will cover:

"Introduction: What is the New Paradigm?" This is Helga LaRouche's address tomorrow.

"What is Geopolitics, Part I – History

"What is Geopolitics, Part II – Philosophy

"Culture – Beauty & Freedom vs. the CCF [Congress for Cultural Freedom]

“Confucian and Western Philosophy

“Science: Man’s Relation to the Universe

“Wrap-up and Mobilization – End Geopolitics”

So, the invitation invites you to register now for access to the syllabus, to the homework, to the reading assignments, and to the special live discussion sessions which will be available only for registered participants. Registration is now open at <http://discover.larouhepac.com>. Questions can be emailed to classes@larouhepac.com.

We strongly encourage you to register now for this class series, to become an active participant in this class series; to build class hosting sessions in your location wherever you are in the United States or even abroad, to build a group of people who will participate in these classes on a weekly basis with you. You can host it at your house, or at the local library, or on your college campus. And create a national mobilization of participants around this series of classes so that we have the cadre of people who are educated and who understand this global context for the ongoing fight that we now find ourselves in here in the United States.

So again, tomorrow at 12noon, Helga LaRouche will be addressing this class series live. This will be the inaugural address, and we encourage you to register now for the entire class series for 2018. That brings a conclusion to our webcast today. But I think if you reflect on the theme here – Russiagate has now become Londongate; all roads lead to London. Let me put the graphic of our title right back on the screen here one more time, and you’ll see the image there of the MI-6 headquarters. This is where all roads lead; pull the threads and you’ll discover the truth about who really colluded with US elections in 2016, and is continuing to meddle with our political system.

Thank you very much for joining me here at larouhepac.com and please stay tuned.

[1] http://turcopolier.typepad.com/sic_semper_tyrannis/2018/02/british-intelligence-tried-to-destroy-the-trump-presidency.html

[Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Lad os konsolidere det Nye Paradigme, Nu, hvor Det britiske Imperies kup mod Trump er afsløret. pdf og video](#)

Derfor er det så meget desto mere vigtigt, at den eneste løsning på denne finanskriser, nemlig gennemførelsen af Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingen og de Fire Love, min mand, Lyndon LaRouche, har udarbejdet; at de nu kommer frem på bordet, og at der kommer et krav fra befolkningerne i alle landene om, at deres regeringer responderer til Xi Jinpings tilbud om at samarbejde med den Nye Silkevej. Europa, Tyskland, Italien, Frankrig, USA; de har alle et presserende behov for en forbedring og modernisering af infrastruktur.

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