

Xi Jinping på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum placerer udvikling i centrum for global styrelse

17. jan., 2017 – I en vidtrækkende tale, der åbnede Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum i Schweiz, fremsatte den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping krav om en reform af det globale styrelsessystem med noget, man kunne karakterisere som »globalisering på kinesisk«. Med en advarsel om faren ved at trække sig tilbage til en defensiv protektionisme, stillet over for de finansielle storme, sagde han, at det ville være ligesom at smække sig inde i et mørkt værelse, hvor man ganske vist er beskyttet mod regnen udenfor, men også vil mangle lys og frisk luft at indånde.

Samtidig fordømte han det nuværende, globale systems nederlag, den voksende ulighed, voksende fattigdom og arbejdsløshed. Og dog, »menneskets historie fortæller os«, sagde Xi, »at man ikke bør frygte problemer, men at de må konfronteres. Vi må møde udfordringerne og udstikke den rette kurs for økonomisk globalisering ... Hvis man er ræd for stormen og for at udforske en ny verden, vil man før eller siden drukne i havet.« Med henvisning til Kinas egen erfaring sagde han, »Vi har haft vores andel af at kvæles i vandet, og vores andel af malstrømme«, men »den globale økonomi er et stort hav, og man kan ikke undfly det, og heller ikke trække sig tilbage fra det«. Xi advarede også mod en handelskrig og sagde, at »ingen vil blive vinder i en handelskrig«.

Om den globale finanskriser sagde Xi, at dette ikke var forårsaget af »globalisering«, men snarere af, at »finanskapitalen udtog overdrevne profitter og af, at finansiell lovgivning ikke har håndteret dette«. Alt imens

globalisering har skabt betydelige problemer, så har mekanismerne for at løse disse problemer svigtet.

»Utilstrækkelig global styrelse gør det vanskeligt at håndtere disse problemer«, sagde Xi. »Der er et rungende krav fra det internationale samfund om en reform af det globale styrelsessystem, og som nu er en presserende opgave«, sagde Xi. »Og alle lande er ligeværdige medlemmer af det internationale samfund og fortjener at høres«. Desuden, fortsatte han, »må globale konnektivitet udvikles for at alle kan opnå velstand«. I centrum for denne »globalisering« er udvikling, og udvikling er baseret på udviklingen af videnskab og teknologi, sagde Xi. »Dette er et produkt af os alle sammen, og ikke produktet af et enkelt individ«, sagde Xi. Med et citat af Lincoln, (og også Sun Yat-sen, uden at nævne nogen af dem), sagde Xi, »Udvikling er af folket, ved folket og for folket«.

Verdenssamfundet må udvikle en »dynamisk innovationsdrevet model«, sagde han. Kun gennem innovation og reform kan vi håndtere den sløve økonomi. For det andet, »bør vi udvikle en åben og indbyrdes forbundet fremgangsmåde for en udvikling af et åbent, win-win-samarbejde«. Og for det tredje, »er det afgørende at have en sund udviklingsfilosofi og model«, som er »afbalanceret, retfærdig og inkluderende«. »Nedbringelse af fattigdom, arbejdsløshed og uretfærdighed bør prioriteres«, sagde Xi.

Xi forsikrede sine tilhørere om, at Kina ville holde kursen, opretholde en solid vækstrate, fortsætte med sin strukturelle reform og åbenhed mod omverdenen, samt spille en større rolle i at dele sin vækst med andre. Xi pegede på G20-topmødet i Hanzhou, der placerede innovation i centrum for økonomisk udvikling, og på Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, som vil afholde et stort topmøde i maj måned i Kina. »Hvis vi fortsætter med at bygge et fællesskab for en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden«, sagde Xi, »kan vi skabe en bedre verden«.

Xi Jinping i Davos: Vær ikke bange for at udforske en ny verden

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 17. januar, 2017 – Med verdens blik rettet mod ham, holdt den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping hovedtalen for Davos Verdensøkonomiske Forum den 17. januar, hvor han fremlagde det, hans Udenrigsministerium beskrev som »en gennemarbejdet plan for det menneskelige samfunds fremtidige fremskridt«.

Xi sagde, at den globale finansielle krise var forårsaget af, at »finanskapitalen udtog overdrevne profitter og af, at finansiell lovgivning ikke har håndteret dette«, og at der er voksende internationale krav om fundamentale reformer. Han præsenterede Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ som et åbent tilbud til alle nationer, fordi »udvikling er af folket, ved folket og for folket« og er baseret på voksende produktivitet baseret på udviklingen af videnskab og teknologi. Og han understregede, at menneskets historie »fortæller os, at man ikke skal frygte problemer, men at de må konfronteres ... Hvis man er ræd for stormen og for at udforske en ny verden, vil man før eller siden drukne i havet«.

Den totale intellektuelle og moralske bankerot af det gamle, døende paradigme reflekteredes godt af en forvirret establishment-deltager i Davos, Moises Naim fra Carnegie Institut, der blot kunne sprutte: »Der er enighed om, at der foregår noget enormt, på globalt plan og på mange måder uden fortilfælde. Men vi ved ikke, hvad årsagerne er, eller hvordan man skal håndtere det.«

Men dét ved Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin, og dét ved ligeledes Lyndon LaRouche og de amerikanere, der er kloge nok til at lade sig lede af hans videnskabelige og strategiske tænkning. Inkluderer dette mon den næste præsident i USA, Donald Trump?

Som Putin sagde ved en pressekonference i Moskva, mens Xi endnu talte i Davos: »Jeg kender ikke hr. Trump ... Jeg ved ikke, hvad vil gøre på den internationale arena, så jeg har intet belæg for hverken at angribe ham, kritisere ham eller forsvare ham.« Det, der står klart, fortsatte han, er, at der foregår »et 'Maidan' i Washington for, at Trump ikke skal indtage embedet ... [og] at binde den nyvalgte præsident på hænder og fødder, med hensyn til implementeringen af hans løfter forud for valgkampagnen til det amerikanske folk og det internationale samfund«. Med hensyn til dem, der lakkede det løgnagtige dossier, så »er de værre end prostituerede, de har ingen moralske grænser«, udtalte Putin med eftertryk.

Det, der står på spil, er epokegørende, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede i en strategisk vurdering, der udgives i det kommende nummer af *EIR* (se hele artiklen på dansk: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17403>)

»Det uhørte hysteri hos de etablerede medier og de neokonservative på begge sider af Atlanten over Donald Trumps valgsejr giver stof til et førsteklases lærestykke i den faktiske dynamik, der netop udfolder sig på den strategiske scene. Det demonstrer med al mulig tydelighed og for selv den mest naive tilhænger af den politiske korrekthed, at det her ikke drejer sig om det ene partis interesser over for det andet parti. Det drejer sig om et døende imperiums metoder over for frembruddet af et nyt paradigme, hvis præcise indhold endnu ikke er entydigt defineret, men som i hvert fald er et nej til globaliseringen ...

Dette imperium er ikke det samme som nationerne USA eller Storbritannien; det er de oligarkiske kræfter, der får opfyldt deres krav om magten fra det neoliberale, transatlantiske

finanssystem og det militære forsvar af den unipolære verdensorden, og som er fuldstændigt ligeglade med de undersåtters ve og vel, der tilfældigvis også bor i deres stater. Det er mod dette imperium, at der er en global revolution i gang, og som er kommet til udtryk i både Brexit, i Trumps valgsejr og i nejjet til Renzis folkeafstemning i Italien ...

Imens vokser det nye paradigme frem i form af en ny, økonomisk verdensorden, hvor BRIKS-staterne og Kinas politik med Den nye Silkevej tilbyder et win-win-samarbejde til alle verdens nationer, hvor alle kun kan vinde gennem gensidig fordel. Såfremt det lykkes for Trump at samarbejde med denne nye kombination, hvilket man først vil få at se, når han er indsat i embedet, kunne en ny æra for menneskeheden begynde, hvor suveræne nationer samarbejder om et skæbnefællesskab for menneskehedens fremtid, og hvor imperiets æra (endelig) bliver lagt i graven.«

Den britiske efterretningstjeneste afslører sig selv i sine operationer mod Trump. Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Imens vokser det nye paradigme frem i form af en ny, økonomisk verdensorden, hvor BRIKS-staterne og Kinas politik med Den nye Silkevej tilbyder et win-win-samarbejde til alle verdens

nationer, hvor alle kun kan vinde gennem gensidig fordel. Såfremt det lykkes for Trump at samarbejde med denne nye kombination, hvilket man først vil få at se, når han er indsat i embedet, kunne en ny æra for menneskeheden begynde, hvor suveræne nationer samarbejder om et skæbnefællesskab for menneskehedens fremtid, og hvor imperiets æra bliver henlagt.

14. januar, 2017 – Det uårte hysteri hos de etablerede medier og de neokonservative på begge sider af Atlanten over Donald Trumps valgsejr giver stof til et førsteklases lærestykke i den faktiske dynamik, der netop udfolder sig på den strategiske scene. Det demonstrer med al mulig tydelighed og for selv den mest naive tilhænger af den politiske korrekthed, at det her ikke drejer sig om det ene partis interesser over for det andet parti. Det drejer sig om et døende imperiums metoder over for frembruddet af et nyt paradigme, hvis præcise indhold endnu ikke er entydigt defineret, men som i hvert fald er et nej til globaliseringen.

Præcis på selve aftenen før Trumps første pressekonference som nyvalgt præsident, bragte den amerikanske fjernsynsstation CNN og internetfirmaet BuzzFeed som en kæmpesensation historien om et dossier på 35 sider, hvor det ud over usigelige anekdoter om Trumps påståede seksuelle vaner også blev påstået, at man havde beviser for, at Trump faktisk var en russisk agent. Efter den af cyberekspertter for længst gendrevne kampagne om, at Rusland skulle have hacket den demokratiske nationalkomites (DNC) e-mails, systematisk have tilsmudset Hillary Clintons anseelse og dermed have hjulpet Trump til sejren, skulle denne nye aktion lægge grunden til en snarlig rigsretssag, før Trump endnu havde indtaget Det Hvide Hus.

Forfatteren til dette dossier hedder Christopher Steele, en ruslandsekspert fra den britiske udenrigs-efterretningstjeneste MI6, der havde fabrikeret dossieret allerede i sommeren 2016. Det cirkulerede i flere måneder blandt amerikanske mediekredse og ansås for så utroværdigt, at der selv i valgkampens heftigste periode ikke var nogen, der

ville offentliggøre det. Dossieret blev overgivet direkte til FBI-chefen Comey og derefter endnu engang af senator McCain til FBI, efter at McCain på en sikkerhedskonference i Canada fik en lovprisning at høre fra den tidligere britiske diplomat i Moskva, Sir Andrew Wood, af Steele og dennes troværdighed.

Efter at bølgerne over Ruslands påståede tyveri af det amerikanske valg gik højt, og Trump meddelte, at han stolede mere på Julian Assange fra Wikileaks end på de amerikanske efterretningstjenester, informerede de tre chefer for USA's efterretningstjenester – Clapper, Brennan og Comey – både USA's Senat, såvel som præsident Obama og den nyvalgte præsident Trump om deres version af hændelsen. Dossieret ville på grund af dets manglende troværdighed ikke have spillet nogen rolle, hvis ikke disse tre chefer havde tilføjet et resumé på to sider. Efter at det tvivlsomme dossier på denne måde havde fået en påtegning som et pålideligt efterretningsdokument, var dette startskuddet til, at CNN, BuzzFeed og derefter de øvrige medier offentliggjorde samtlige 35 sider.

Dagen efter ringede Clapper til Trump for at gøre opmærksom på, at dossieret ikke stammede fra de amerikanske efterretningstjenester, og at han hverken kunne stå inde for dets troværdighed eller det modsatte. Og helt usædvanligt offentliggjorde han så en tilsvarende skriftlig erklæring. Efter at de tre efterretningschefer selv havde udløst aktionen, fulgte Clapper den altså op med endnu en aktion, hvilket i disse kredse betegnes som en »CIA-operation«, hvad der oversat kan gengives med at tilrettelægge en diplomatisk flugtrute.

Så hvad drejer det sig altså om? Eric Denécé, direktør for det franske Center for Intelligence Research, offentliggjorde den følgende analyse under overskriften: »En chokerende mangel på beviser«, efter at han havde læst beretningen fra Ministeriet for Homeland Security og fra FBI om det angivelige russiske indgreb i den amerikanske valgkamp. »Washingtons establishment

blev fuldstændig overrasket over Trumps valgsejr og indså, at der ville følge en større hovedrengøring, hvor mange af dets medlemmer ville miste deres politiske stillinger og dermed deres økonomiske privilegier, der var et resultat af deres internationale økonomiske alliancer.«

Denne vurdering stemmer givetvis, men den beskriver kun ét aspekt af sagen. Det er indlysende, at det transatlantiske, neoliberale establishment har yderst svært ved at acceptere den kendsgerning, at Trump blev valgt på demokratisk vis. For dem er »verden gået op i fugerne«, som Merkel siger; den er »stærkt chokeret«, som [den tyske forsvarsminister Ursula] von der Leyen udtrykte det. Den verden, der er gået op i fugerne, er den unipolære verden, som de neokonservative i Bush senior-administrationen i tiden efter Sovjetunionens opløsning besluttede, skulle være den enerådende. De proklamerede dengang »The Project for a New American Century« (PNAC), der skulle grundlægge et verdensrige på grundlag af det særlige, britisk-amerikanske forhold. De regeringer, der ikke ville underkaste sig denne unipolære verden, blev lidt efter lidt væltet af politikken for regimeskift, for eksempel gennem de udefra finansierede 'farvede revolutioner', sådan som Victoria Nuland uforblømt indrømmede det i tilfældet med Ukraine. Alene her betalte USA's Udenrigsministerium \$5 mia. til NGO'er. Men det drejede sig også om direkte militær indgriben under påberåbelse af forsvar for demokrati og menneskerettigheder, som i tilfældet med Irak, Libyen, Syrien osv. Og naturligvis var Rusland og Kina den egentlige, sluttelige målskive for denne politik med regimeskift.

I dette arrangement var EU-bureaukratiet den hemmelige juniorpartner, der selv nød frugterne af dette globaliseringssystem, selv var opsat på den størst mulige udvidelse af sit imperium, sådan som Robert Cooper åbent indrømmer det, og kun lejlighedsvis konkurrerede om dominansen med City of London og Wall Street. En forudsætning for medlemskabet i denne unipolære verdens establishment-klub var

naturligvis også, at man overtog den officielle fremstilling («narrativ»), at det, som det drejede sig om i alle disse destabiliseringer af demokratisk valgte regeringer og disse krige, var »frihed«, »demokrati« og »menneskerettigheder«, alt imens det hos de andre altid drejede sig om »diktatorer« og »dæmoner«. Og naturligvis ville alle de, der havde disse unipolære briller på, i en analyse af »flygtningekrisens årsager« ikke slippe godt fra at nævne dette ved navn, for det ville have betydet, at man måtte have fordømt de ulovlige krige, der har kostet millioner af menneskers livet, og så var man blevet smidt ud af klubben.

Med Donald Trump har nu en person vundet valget, der, som Obama udtrykte det om Putin, »ikke var med på holdet«, og som er enig med (senator) Tulsi Gabbard og en række konservative militærpersoner i, at disse krige for regimeskift må holde op, og som, med den ultimative overtrædelse af tabuet, oven i købet atter vil normalisere forholdet til Rusland!

Den ansete amerikanske journalist Robert Parry sammenlignede de amerikanske efterretningstjenesters metoder mod Trump med J. Edgar Hoovers afpresningsmetoder. Christopher Steeles grove taktikker minder imidlertid også om den ligeledes af den britiske efterretningstjeneste inspirerede »Troopergate«-skandale, hvor det med en vis succes i begyndelsen af Bill Clintons præsidentskab blev forsøgt at fremstille ham som en hæmningsløs sexgalning, forarbejdet, så at sige, for den senere lancerede Lewinsky-affære, der havde til formål at ødelægge Clintons præsidentskab.

Det spektakulære i operationen mod Trump er imidlertid, at den britiske efterretningstjeneste og dens amerikanske modpart, der i årtier har arbejdet som »spøgelser« i det skjulte, nu er tvunget til at stille deres totale nøgenhed offentligt til skue. Den sidste dilettantiske påstand fra Steele, der i øvrigt også var en ledende aktør i afsløringen af korrupsionsskandalen i FIFA og var den vigtigste MI6-agent i sagen om mordet på Litvinenko, demonstrerer de direkte

interventioner i USA's interne anliggender på vegne af Det britiske Imperium, som blot er et synonym for begrebet »globalisering«.

Dette imperium er ikke det samme som nationerne USA eller Storbritannien; det er de oligarkiske kræfter, der får opfyldt deres krav om magten fra det neoliberale, transatlantiske finanssystem og det militære forsvar af den unipolære verdensorden, og som er fuldstændigt ligeglade med de undersåtters ve og vel, der tilfældigvis også bor i deres stater. Det er mod dette imperium, at der er en global revolution i gang, og som er kommet til udtryk i både Brexit, i Trumps valgsejr og i nejtet til Renzi's folkeafstemning i Italien.

Påstanden om, at Putin har stjålet valgsejren fra Hillary Clinton, eller at han også vil blande sig i de kommende valg i flere europæiske stater, er et desperat forsøg fra dette synkende imperiums side på at bevare fortolkningsoverhøjheden.

Imens vokser det nye paradigme frem i form af en ny, økonomisk verdensorden, hvor BRIKS-staterne og Kinas politik med Den nye Silkevej tilbyder et win-win-samarbejde til alle verdens nationer, hvor alle kun kan vinde gennem gensidig fordel. Såfremt det lykkes for Trump at samarbejde med denne nye kombination, hvilket man først vil få at se, når han er indsat i embedet, kunne en ny æra for menneskeheden begynde, hvor suveræne nationer samarbejder om et skæbnefællesskab for menneskehedens fremtid, og hvor imperiets æra bliver henlagt.

Oxfam

Globale

Velfærdsrapport:

de 8 rigeste = de 3,6 mia. fattigste

16. jan., 2017 – Ifølge en netop publiceret rapport fra den britiske NGO, Oxfam, »er svælget mellem de superrige og den fattigste halvdel af den globale befolkning skarpere end tidligere antaget, med blot otte personer, der ejer lige så meget rigdom, som 3,6 mia. mennesker tilsammen«. For et år siden skulle der 62 af verdens rigeste mennesker til at udgøre det samme som halvdelen af planetens befolkning. Disse otte personer omfatter seks amerikanere, en mexicaner og en spanier; alle for nær en enkelt får deres rigdom fra finansaktiviteter eller fra informationsteknologi-sektoren.

Det er sandsynligt, at disse otte personer ikke er blevet så meget rigere, men – som det ses at den uafbrudte tidevandsbølge af flygtninge, der strømmer ind i Europa fra briternes, saudiernes og Obamas krige, eller fra det igangværende folkemord i Yemen – så er et udsnit af verden blevet meget fattigere.

Oxfam-rapporten, der har timet sin publikation til at falde samtidigt med den årlige samling af de globale, politiske eliter og forretningseliter i Davos, Schweiz, dokumenterer virkningerne i den virkelige verden af imperiepolitikken med »langvarige krige«.

»Ifølge Forbes-listen«, siger rapporten, »er grundlæggeren af Microsoft, Gates, den rigeste person, med en nettoværdi på \$75 mia. De andre er, efter rangfølge, Amancio Ortega, den spanske grundlægger af modehuset Inditex, finansmanden Warren Buffett, den mexicanske forretningsmagnat Carlos Slim Helu, Amazon-

bossen Jeff Bezos, Facebook-skaber Mark Zuckerberg, Oracles Larry Ellison og Bloomberg, New Yorks tidligere borgmester.«

Oxfam rapporterede ligeledes, at indtægterne for verdens 10 største selskaber overstiger de samlede indtægter for 180 nationer.

Dette er frugterne af det gamle paradigme, der nu bliver afvist i nationale valg og erstattet af BRIKS-paradigmet med udvikling gennem Den Nye Silkevej.

Foto: Citat af Mahatma Gandhi: 'Fattigdom er den værste form for vold'.

Til refleksion.

Trump kræver atomvåbenaftale med Rusland; støtter EU's opløsning

16. jan., 2017 – Det transatlantiske establishment er blevet kastet ud i endnu en runde, hvor de må bide i gulvtæppet, af nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps første interview med europæiske medier, et fællesinterview, han gav til Londonavisen *The Times* og den tyske avis, *Bild Zeitung*, udgivet den 15. og 16. januar. Ledere lige fra Frankrig til Storbritannien og videre udtrykte oprør over, at Trump vovede at foreslå en ophævelse af sanktionerne mod Rusland til gengæld for en atomvåbenaftale, over, endnu engang at kalde NATO for forældet, og for at antyde, at, ikke alene var Storbritanniens udgang, Brexit, af Den europæiske Union en »fremragende ting«, men »hvis man spørger mig, vil flere andre

lande også gå ud«.

»De har sanktioner mod Rusland – lad os se, om vi ikke kan indgå nogen gode aftaler med Rusland. For det første mener jeg, at atomvåben skal være langt færre og reduceres væsentligt, det er en del af det«, sagde Trump til sine interviewere.

Der vil også komme forandringer i NATO, annoncerede Trump: »Det er forældet, for det første, fordi det blev designet for mange, mange år siden«, for det andet, fordi europæiske »lande ikke betaler, hvad de skal«, og også, fordi NATO-alliancen »ikke håndterede terrorismen«.

Trump's kritik af Ruslands intervention i Syrien som værende en »meget dårlig ting«, der førte til en »forfærdelig humanitær situation«, oprørte ikke den transatlantiske elite, og det gjorde hans gentagne erklæring om, at det var »en stor fejltagelse« af Tyskland at have taget syriske flygtninge ind, heller ikke.

Men det samme kan bestemt ikke siges om Trumps påmindelse om, at det, der oprindeligt skabte denne krise, var USA's intervention i Irak.

»Hele denne sag burde aldrig være sket. Irak burde ikke være blevet angrebet ... Det er ligesom at kaste sten mod et hvepsebo. Det er alletiders værste roderi«, sagde Trump. Hans prioritet, som militær øverstbefalende? »ISIS«, svarede Trump.

Obamas ambassadør til Den europæiske Union, den »indflydelsesrige finansekspert«, Anthony Gardner, var allerede apoplektisk over, at det første spørgsmål, som EU-embedsmænd, Trumps overgangsteam havde talt med, blev spurgt, var, »Hvilket land efter UK er det næste til at forlade [eurozonen]?«, og således udbredte den idé, »at 2017 er året, hvor EU vil falde fra hinanden« (*Time*-magasinet, 13. jan., 2017).

Fra Trump selv kom den påstand, at »Brexit vil ende med at være en god ting«.

Det faktum, at interviewet til *The Times* blev udført af Michael Gove, er ved at drive City og London-kredse amok. Gove er den førende Brexit-tilhænger i det Konservative Parti. Efterson han blev fyret sidste år af premierminister Theresa May, ses det som endnu et nap i næsen, i lighed med, at Trump mødtes med Nigel Farage, stifter af anti-EU partiet, Independence Party (UKIP). Trump dryssede også her salt i såret og spurgte Gove mod slutningen, »Hvordan har vores Nigel det? ... Jeg synes, han er en storslået fyr.«

Det, der blev rapporteret i *The Times*, men ikke i *Bild*, var hans referencer til Tyskland og dets kansler.

»Hvis man ser på Den europæiske Union, så er det Tyskland. Grundlæggende set, et instrument for Tyskland. Det er derfor, jeg syntes, det var intelligent af UK at udtræde«, sagde han til de to redaktører. »Jeg mener, andre også vil udtræde. Jeg mener ikke, det bliver så nemt at holde sammen på det, som mange mennesker mener.«

Briterne forsøger at forgifte Trump-Putin relation med en falsk annoncering af Reykjavik-møde om få uger

15. jan., 2017 – I dag rapporterer londonavisen *Sunday Times*, at Donald Trump og Vladimir Putin har aftalt at mødes inden for et par uger i Reykjavik, Island, for at tage de første skridt

til en forbedring af relationerne mellem de to lande. Både Sean Spicer, Trumps pressesekretær, og Kremls talsmand Dmitry Peskov, benægtede hurtigt denne rapport. Spicer tweetede: »100 % falsk.« Peskov sagde til RIA-nyhedsbureauet, at »der hidtil ikke har fundet forhandlinger sted om noget møde«.

Den russiske ambassade i London slog hovedet på sømmet og sagde til RIA, at historien i *Sunday Times* var »et forsøg fra briternes side på at underminere Donald Trumps præsidentskab. Det vil de tilsyneladende fortsætte med til sidste øjeblik«.

I sin dækning af historien i *Sunday Times*, bekræftede den britiske avis *Guardian* stort set, at briterne gør alt, hvad der står i deres magt, for at torpedere enhver tilnærmelse mellem USA og Rusland under Trump: »Det er ikke sandsynligt, at nyhederne [om et Trump-Putin møde] vil blive hilst velkommen af højtplacerede personer i den britiske regering, der frygter, at en intensivering af relationerne mellem USA og Rusland under Trump kan risikere at efterlade Storbritannien ude i kulden. Det er forstået, at Downing Street forventer, at Theresa May vil besøge Trump i Det Hvide Hus i anden halvdel af februar. Storbritannien har krævet sanktioner mod Moskva over Putins aggression i Ukraine og Syrien. Det er forstået, at britisk efterretningstjeneste har søgt forsikringer fra CIA om, at britiske agenter i Rusland vil blive beskyttet, når der sker udveksling af efterretninger, rapporterer *Times*.«

»En britisk efterretningskilde med udstrakt transatlantisk erfaring sagde, at amerikanske spioner havde givet Trump og hans rådgiveres forbindelser til Kreml etiketten problematiske. 'Indtil vi har fastslået, om vi kan have tillid til Trump og højtplacerede medlemmer af hans team, vil vi være tilbageholdende', sagde kilden til *Times*. 'For at sige det ligeud, så kan vi ikke løbe den risiko at forråde kilder og metoder til russerne'.«

Med Trump, der ser den nye internationale virkelighed, er Obama og EU rasende

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. januar, 2017 – Nyvalgte præsident Trumps seneste og mest substantielle interview gør det ganske klart, hvad det nye paradigme for verden er, i den umiddelbare fremtid. Trump prioriterer en aftale om reduktion af atomvåben og sandsynlige reduktion af sanktioner mod Vladimir Putins Rusland. Han erklærer, at NATO er »forældet«, og at dets europæiske medlemmer hverken støtter dets militær eller bekæmper jihadistisk terrorisme. Han forudsagde, at Den europæiske Union sandsynligvis vil opløses, og at dette vil være en god ting.

Til trods for de hysteriske udbrud, som dette interview med Londonavisen *Times* og det tyske *Bild Zeitung* har frembragt fra den europæiske elite og Obamas ambassadører dér, så ser Donald Trump ganske enkelt den nye virkelighed – det nye paradigme – og indikerer, at han *muligvis* vil være med til at skabe den.

Putins Rusland er ansvarlig for muligheden af at afslutte 15 års uafbrudte krige i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og for et nyt sikkerhedskoncept, som han deler med Xi Jinpings Kina, og som kan brække ryggen af international terrorisme. I morgen vil Xi holde hovedtalen på Davos Verdensøkonomiske Forum. Han er ansvarlig for at være drivkraft bag en meget stor andel af den økonomiske og produktive vækst i verden, og for at tilbyde »et fællesskab af en fælles bestemmelse« gennem den Nye Silkevejsinfrastruktur, gennem at lede forskning og udvikling af fusion, og gennem at lede udforskning af Månen.

Et USA, der er blevet af med Nobels Krigspris-præsident Obama, tilbydes at tilslutte sig dette nye paradigmes institutioner og handlinger.

Frygt for og had til denne udsigt er kilden bag den intense kampagne for anti-russisk, anti-Trump propaganda i USA, der dirigeres fra britisk efterretning, men rækker dybt ind i en »få Trump ned med nakken-specialenhed« i efterretningstjenester under Obama. Denne kampagne er forgæves og destruktiv, og amerikanske »progressive« bør ikke lade sig forlede til at tilslutte sig den.

Som *EIR's* stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche udtrykte det, »Som Trump i øjeblikket går frem, vil der komme en stor forandring internationalt. Det er ikke kun Trump. Det er de andre elementer i systemet, der kommer sammen for at bringe en kraft i spil, som vil dominere planeten.«

Vil den amerikanske befolkning, der har stemt for at afvise det gamle paradigme med »globalisering, afindustrialisering«, få den nye administration og Kongressen til at gøre det, der er nødvendigt for at tilslutte sig den nye drivkraft for vækst og videnskabeligt fremskridt?

En bevægelse fra en national, upartisk appel er i gang – og er på denne webside – som kræver, at Trump, der lovede »det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov« under sin valgkamp, foreslår dette for Kongressen i sin første tale til dem. At gøre en ende på Wall Street-kasinoets forgiftning af den amerikanske økonomi er et første skridt. Men så findes der ingen statslig kreditinstitution efter Hamilton-princippet, til at genskabe Amerikas forældede, økonomiske infrastruktur – selv, når Kinas statsmidler, som det her rapporteres, netop søger at få en sådan institution, som gør det muligt for dem at investere i en ny, amerikansk infrastruktur. Obama sagde til vælgerne, at han anså revolutionen med fusionskraft/plasmateknologi for totalt unødvendig, og privatiserede NASA's store udforskningsprogrammer, med en forværende virkning.

Tiden er nu inde til, at amerikanerne handler for deres fremtid, ikke deres frygt.

Tidligere tjekkisk præsident kræver ophævelse af sanktioner mod Rusland

14. januar, 2017 – I et eksklusivt interview sagde den tidligere præsident for den Tjekkiske Republik, Vaclav Klaus, til Sputnik: »Jeg mener, det ville være fornuftigt at ophæve [sanktionerne mod Rusland], intet er opnået med disse sanktioner, og den Tjekkiske Republik, mener jeg, er ikke fanatisk tilhænger af disse sanktioner. Jeg mener, at disse sanktioner utvivlsomt har svækket den russiske økonomi. Jeg ville ved Gud gerne se en form for kvantitativ vurdering, hvor det udtrykkes konkret. Jeg mener, at, på den ene side, så har det svækket handel, men hvad der er vigtigere, så har det forværret investeringssituationen og ført til, at flere udenlandske selskaber ikke længere investerer i Rusland – og det er en alvorligere virkning end indsnævringen af vareudvalget. Jeg ved selvfølgelig, at nogle af vore foretagender har betalt prisen. Jeg synes simpelt hen, det er dumt.«

Anton Denisov fra Sputnik påpegede i sin artikel, 'Tjekkere ønsker handel med Rusland og afviser euroen, siger ekspræsident til Sputnik', at Klaus ikke er den første tjekkiske leder, der kræver en ophævelse af sanktioner mod Rusland. Nuværende tjekkiske politikere, inkl. præsident Milos Zeman og parlamentsformand Milan Stech, har også opfordret til en ophævelse af de anti-russiske sanktioner, skrev Denisov.

Klaus, der var landets anden præsident fra 2003-2013, langede også ud efter euro-enhedsvalutaen. Han sagde: »Jeg er stor modstander af euroen, jeg er stor modstander af en europæisk enhedsvaluta for meget forskellige lande. Og jeg mener, dette er blevet bekræftet i praksis. Jeg kan heller ikke se nogen grund til, at den Tjekkiske Republik skulle gå med i eurozonen. Derudover viser alle opinionsundersøgelser, at folk ikke vil have det.«

Foto: Tidligere præsident for den Tjekkiske Republik, Vaclav Klaus.

Kinas permanente repræsentant til FN om menneskehedens fælles mål og Xis 'Win-Win'

14. jan., 2017 – Forud for præsident Xi Jinpings besøg i Schweiz og deltagelse i Davos-mødet, skrev Kinas permanente repræsentant til FN i Genève, Ma Zhaoxu, i dag en kronik i *Peoples Daily* om Xis hensigter ved begivenheden.

»Den internationale orden og ditto mønster oplever dybtgående forandringer«, skrev Ma, »som et resultat af verdensøkonomiens langsomme genrejsning, den hastige udvikling af anti-globalisering, intensiv geopolitik og voksende terrorisme. En række 'sort svane'-begivenheder har forbløffet planeten. Verden har mistet orienteringen gennem en mangel på effektivt lederskab og styrelse som følge heraf. Mod et sådant bagtæppe har det internationale samfund nu desperat behov for en løsning.«

Ma refererede til Xi Jinpings tale i FN i 2015 om »et samfund af menneskehedens fælles bestemmelse«. Han sagde, at Xis ideer »stammer fra den dybe visdom i den kinesiske kultur, der ligeledes er i overensstemmelse med kinesiske, diplomatiske traditioner, såsom de Fem Principper for Fredelig Sameksistens ... Ideen om et samfund for hele menneskehedens fælles bestemmelse vil udvide sin indflydelse med Kinas dybtgående deltagelse i global styrelse.«

Ma afsluttede med konceptet om Silkevejen: »Den gradvise forbindelse mellem Kinas 'Bælt-og-Vej'-initiativ og andre landes strategier langs med ruten har forbundet den kinesiske drøm med hele verdens drøm. Idet det følger princippet om at opnå fælles vækst gennem drøftelse og samarbejde, vil Kina indskyde ny kraft og nyt håb til den økonomiske udvikling af det eurasiske kontinent, og endda af verden som helhed.«

Foto: Kinas permanente repræsentant til FN i Genève, Ma Zhaoxu.

Kina vil dramatisk forøge investeringer i Nigerias økonomi

12. jan., 2017 – Efter et møde i Abuja med Nigerias udenrigsminister, lovede den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi i går yderligere investeringer til \$40 mia. i Nigeria, som kommer oven i de \$45 mia., Kina allerede investerer i Afrikas mest folkerige land. Wang understregede også, at de to nationer var strategiske partnere.

»I Kina har vi allerede finansieret for i alt \$22 mia.

projekter i Nigeria«, sagde Wang, »og for \$23 mia. projekter er i gang. Vi er også i færd med at følge op på for yderligere \$40 mia. investeringer i en olieledning«, meddelte han, rapporterer *Daily Trust of Nigeria*. Kina er også involveret i det afgørende, regionale Transaqua-projekt. I december blev et forståelsesmemorandum underskrevet i Nigeria – som er leder af de fem lande, der er mest berørt af vandkrisen i dette område – med PowerChina, der vil betale for en foreløbig undersøgelse af muligheden for projektets gennemførelse.

Minister Wangs nigerianske modpart, Geoffrey Onyeana, genoptog de foregående møder om økonomisk samarbejde med kinesiske regeringsfolk og understregede Nigerias mangeårige og fortsatte økonomiske bånd til Kina. Han sagde, at »inden for infrastrukturområdet, som er et af den føderale regerings prioriteter mht. et program for diversifikation [fra olie], har den kinesiske regering vist en masse samarbejde med os i dette felt, og har hjulpet os inden for transportområdet – især projekter for jernbaner og lufthavne«.

Nigeria lovede også at lukke et handelskontor, som Taiwan har i landet, som en demonstration af standhaftig tilslutning til politikken med Ét Kina.

STUDIEKREDS 1. lektion den 12. januar 2017: Lyndon LaRouches lærebog om økonomi:

Så du ønsker at lære alt om økonomi?

Klik her for en pdf af bogen: Så du ønsker at lære alt om økonomi? (So You Wish to Learn All About Economics)

Diabillederne og supplerende materiale findes nedenfor.

I den første studiekreds om Lyndon LaRouches lærebog om økonomi *Så du ønsker at lære alt om økonomi?* gav Michelle Rasmussen en indledning om LaRouches baggrund og "LaRouches opdagelse". Derefter læste vi bogens indledning, og uddrag fra *The Roots of the American System*, som uddyber begrebet kameralisme. Lydfilen er i to dele.

1. del:

2. del:

Næste studiekreds på tirsdag den 24. januar 2017, kl. 19

Schiller Instituttets kontor:

Sankt Knuds Vej 11, kld. t.v., Frederiksberg

Eller ring inden for at være med via Skype eller telefon: 53 57 00 51

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 16. januar
2017:**

**1. del: Briterne forsøger at
bremse Trump med LaRouche-
behandling//**

**2. del om at bygge Kra-
kanalen i Thailand og
Transaqua-projektet omkring
Tchadsøen i Afrika**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

1. del:

2. del:

Briterne apoplektiske ved

tanken om, at USA kunne tilslutte sig Menneskehedens fælles skæbne sammen med Kina og Rusland

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. januar, 2017 – I dag ankom den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping i Schweiz, til både et statsbesøg i denne nation, og for at holde hovedtalen i Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum den 17. jan. Der ligger en særlig ironi i Xis meget ventede tale for denne organisation: Davos er måske *det* emblematiske, internationale forum for den døende imperieorden, der hastigt er i færd med at blive erstattet af det Nye Paradigme, under Xis og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putins lederskab.

En artikel i *Xinhua* i dag gav forskud på nogle af de centrale temaer, som Xi forventes at adressere, mht. indholdet af denne nye orden »Et fællesskab af en fælles bestemmelse, et fælles hjem for menneskeheden. Siden Xi for første gang fremlagde dette koncept i slutningen af 2012, har det formet Kinas tilgang til global styrelse«, skrev *Xinhua*. Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, konceptet med win-win-samarbejde og et »nyt sikkerhedskoncept« for at skabe universel sikkerhed, er alle en del af Xis politik. *Xinhua* citerede Tanq Qifang, en forsker ved Kinas Institut for Internationale Studier, der forklarer: »Konceptet med et fællesskab for en fælles bestemmelse transcenderer alle former for forskelligheder i menneskelige samfund og har de størst mulige fordele for alle som sit mål.«

Med alt at tabe er Det britiske Imperium intet mindre end apoplektiske over den amerikanske, nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps udtalelser om, at han har til hensigt at normalisere

relationerne med både Kina og Rusland, som han atter gjorde det klart i et interview med *Wall Street Journal* den 13. jan. Briterne afslører sig selv voldsomt, i deres forsøg på at invalidere Trump og torpedere enhver forsoning med Rusland i særdeleshed. Som Londonavisen *Guardian* indrømmede, så »frygter briterne, at en mere intens relation mellem USA og Rusland under Trump kan risikere at efterlade Storbritannien ude i kulden«.

I dag kommenterede Lyndon LaRouche, at »som han [Trump] i øjeblikket går frem, vil der komme en stor international forandring. Det er ikke Trump alene. Det er de andre elementer i systemet, der kommer sammen for at bringe en kraft i spil, som vil dominere planeten. Ikke, fordi de bruger knytnæver, men fordi de bruger hjerner. Jeg har altid foretrukket hjerner frem for knytnæver«, bemærkede han.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche forklarede, at det, som briterne »forsøger imod Trump, er en 'farvet revolution'. Trump udsættes for tiden for en kampagne med løgne og »falske nyheder«, i lighed med det, briterne i årtier hemmeligt har orkestreret imod Lyndon LaRouche, som deres dødelige fjende. Der er ét enkelt slag, der kan leveres for at gøre en ende på denne farvede revolution, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche: Indiker, at det, man gjorde mod Lyndon LaRouche, var den største uretfærdighed, for hvilken USA har betalt en høj pris i årtier, og implementer omgående LaRouches Fire Love, begyndende med en tilbagevenden til FDR's Glass-Steagall.

Hun fortsatte: Det er, fordi i hele verden, på højeste regeringsniveau, som vi har fået direkte og indirekte at vide, »Lyndon LaRouche anses for at være den eneste amerikaner, de kan stole på – simpelt hen fordi, han har bevist, at han er en verdensborger såvel som en amerikansk patriot. Han har altid befundet sig på dette niveau, som Xi Jinping nu taler om«, med et fællesskab af en fælles bestemmelse for hele menneskeheden, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche.

Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping med frue ankommer til Schweiz, til både statsbesøg og deltagelse i Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på seminar i Stockholm, 11. januar, 2017. Video; engelsk udskrift.

Stockholm EIR/Schiller Institute Seminar Wednesday, January 11, 2017

[The video is available on the Schiller YouTube channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdl0Hxg_Ubc

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm

HUSSEIN ASKARY: Thank you very much everybody for attending the seminar, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Your Excellencies, and ladies and gentlemen, we are very, very pleased that we have a special guest. It's all clear that the interest for this theme is very big, and this is a very special; there are many expectations on the new administration and new policy, but there are also many challenges around the world. And we have the honor of having Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and chairwoman of the International Schiller Institute, who has not only followed at very close range, followed developments internationally, both strategic, economic and cultural, but she herself and her association were actually contributing to what we call this new paradigm in international politics. But this new paradigm

in international politics of course, we will hear from Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

We will have Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche's presentation and then I will make a short presentation and then we'll have a break.... [applause]

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Good day, ladies and gentlemen. We are in indeed in very, very fascinating times. And I think there is much reason to be hopeful. I know that for the last 16 years, most people in the United States and Europe thought there is no great future. But I think that there is [annulation? 2.29] of strategic realignments which have shaped up over the last three years, but especially in the last year, where one can actually see the potential for a completely new kind of relation among nations is on the horizon and that we may actually have the chance to bring a peaceful world.

Now, obviously, in the system of globalization as we have known it, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, that system is completely unhinged and this is cause for a lot of freaked out reactions by those people who were the beneficiaries of that system of globalization, but I will hopefully be able to develop that this is a temporary phenomenon, and it will be replaced by some more optimistic developments.

What we see right now is a completely new paradigm emerging, a system which is based on the development of all, a "win-win" potential to cooperate among nations and obviously the idea for what was the axiomatic basis of the globalization system since '91 to insist on a unipolar world, is failing, or has failed already. And with that, a system which tried to maintain this unipolar world with the policy of regime change, of color revolution, or humanitarian intervention, or so-called humanitarian intervention to defend democracy and human rights, which obviously has led the world to a terrible condition, but this is now coming to an end.

So obviously, the statement by Francis Fukuyama at the end of the Soviet Union that this was the "end of history" and that there would be now only democracy, was really pretty sure; because you have a complete backlash right now, which takes

different forms in different in different parts of the world against this system of globalization, and in the Asian countries it takes the form of more and more countries joining with the New Silk Road perspective offered by China, the offer to work

together in a "win-win" cooperation with the Belt and Road Initiative which is now already involving more than 100 nations and international organizations; and is already engaged in the largest infrastructure project in the history of mankind.

This new paradigm economic system, already involves 4.4 billion people; it is already in terms of spending, in terms of buying power in today's dollars, 12 times as big as the Marshall Plan was after the Second World War, and is open for every

country to join, including Sweden, including the United States, including every other country on the planet. And I will talk about that in a little while.

And in the trans-Atlantic sector you have a different kind of anti-globalization revolt, which is still ongoing, it's not yet settled how this will turn out. It started in a visible form with the vote of the British population in June last year with the Brexit, which was the first real upset; everybody was totally unexpected it, except a few insiders.

This anti-globalization revolt was obviously continued with the election of President Donald Trump in the United States; it was continued with the "no" to the Italian referendum organized by Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, to change the Constitution. And it's coming to all of these developments, Brexit, Trump, no to the referendum in Italy, is that is caused by a fundamental feeling of injustice of ever larger parts of the population which were victims of that

system, which increasingly made the rich richer, made more billionaires richer, but destroying successively the middle range of society, and making the poor poorer. It is my deepest conviction that

that revolt will continue until the causes of this injustice are removed, and it will continue, it will hold the measuring rod to President Trump, if he will fulfill his election promises; and if he would not do that I believe the same people would turn against Trump as they turned against Hillary.

So that means that the future of the European Union and the euro is very doubtful. We have elections coming in this year in France in April. This election as of now is completely up in the air. There is no firm prediction possible. You have a very tumultuous situation in Italy, where a coup was just attempted by Beppe Grillo and Verhofstadt [in the European Parliament] which failed, trying to get the Five Star Party into the Liberal Group [ALDE] in the European Parliament, which was rejected by the Liberal Group so it didn't function. Then you will have elections in Holland, and in September in Germany which, you know, the star of Mrs. Merkel is also no longer as shiny as it may have been a while ago.

So we are looking into dramatic changes.

Now, let me start with the Trump election. Now, I have in my whole political life, which is now becoming quite long, several decades – I have never in my whole political life, seen such hysteria on the side of the neo-cons, on the side of the

mainstream politicians, on the side of the liberal media, as concerning Trump. Now, admittedly, Trump does not fulfill the behavior code of Baron von Kligel, who was a German in the 18th century who developed the code for good diplomatic behavior. But what was caused Trump, is that he simply promised end the political paradigm which was the basis of eight years of

George W. Bush and eight years of Barack Obama, which was a direct continuation of the Bush-Cheney policy.

And it was a good thing, because it was very clear that if Hillary Clinton would have won the election in the United States, that all the policies she was pursuing, including an no-fly zone over Syria, and an extremely bellicose policy towards Russia and China, would have meant that we would have been on the direct course to World War III. If you have any doubts about that I'm perfectly happy to answer questions about that, in the question & answer period.

So the fact that Hillary did not win the election was extremely important for the maintenance of world peace. And I think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the fact that he said, and by the appointment of these different cabinet members, if they all get through the nomination process in the Senate, that he will normalize the relationship between the United States and Russia, is, in my view *the most important step*. Because if the relationship between the United States and Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I think there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world. And if that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world peace is in extreme danger.

So from my standpoint, there is reason to believe that this will happen. The Russian reaction has been very moderately, but optimistic that this may happen. If you look at the appointments, you have several cabinet members and other people in other high posts who are also for improving the relationship with Russia, such as Tillerson who is supposed to become Secretary of State; General Flynn, who is a conservative military man but also for normalization with Russia, and many others, so I think this is a good sign.

Now, if you look at the reaction of the neo-con/neo-liberal faction on both sides of the Atlantic to this election of Trump, you can only describe it as *completely* hysterical. The *Washington Post* today has an article "How To Remove Trump from Office," calling him a liar, just every derogative you can

possibly imagine, just an all-in-one unbelievable; the reaction in Germany was – von der Leyen, the Defense Minister, in the morning after the election said she was "deeply shocked," this was "terrible," this was a catastrophe, and it keeps going like that. So they have not recovered.

And then naturally, you have the reports by the different U.S. intelligence services, Clapper, Brennan, Comey from the FBI, they all put out the fact that that it was Russian hacking of the emails of the DNC and Podesta which would have stolen the election, because they would have shifted the view of the Americans to vote for Trump.

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many cyber experts, also in Europe but also in the United States, already said that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an insider leak giving this information out, is more and more likely, and there's absolutely zero proof that it was Russian hacking. Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is that was the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved that Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie Sanders! That is not being talked about any more; but if there was any thought, I would say, look there, and there are many people who recognize, for example, a very important French intelligence person with the name of Eric Denécé who is a top-level think tanker in France who said: Well, it is quite clear why they put out this story, because the neo-cons had to expect the great cleanup and many of them would lose their positions, and this is why they basically all agreed on this story and changed the narrative.

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the neoliberal system of globalization which simply violated the interests of the majority of the people, especially in the "rust belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so arrogant that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states which are formerly industrialized. Where, you have to see that the United States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western media in Europe, the United States is in a state of economic collapse. They have for the first

time, a shrinking life-expectancy; there is one indicator which shows if a society is doing good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first time for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment. There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

So the vote, therefore, the narrative, that was the reason why Hillary was voted out because she was being perceived as the direct continuation of these 16 years, and so the attempt to change that narrative by saying it was "Russian hacking" is pretty obvious.

Now, however, we have now I think ten days or nine days left, until the new President comes in. And this is not a period of relaxation, because again, in an unprecedented way, the old team of Obama is trying to create conditions for the incoming President Trump to force him to continue on the pathway of Obama. For example, just a couple of days ago, they started a deployment of a U.S. and NATO troops to be deployed at the Russian border in the Baltics, in Poland, and Romania, through the German city of Bremerhaven, where 6,000 troops landed with heavy military equipment; for example, the U.S. Abrams tanks, Paladin artillery, Bradley fighting vehicles, 2,800 pieces of military hardware, 50 Black Hawk helicopters, involving 1,800 personnel; 400 troops to be attached to the 24 Apache helicopters.

Now, obviously, the deployment of this is supposed to be a provocation against Russia and it's supposed to make it very difficult for Trump to start to improve relations.

A second area where you can see this effort to pin Trump down is the question of the THAAD missiles in Korea, where basically now North Korea has claimed to be able to be able to launch their ICBM anywhere, any time; and according to Chinese experts, the United States is entirely to blame why North Korea is behaving this way.

South Korea with the outgoing President Park Geun-hye, who may be impeached soon, actually in days or weeks, she agreed to have a special brigade of 1,000-2,000 task force which is supposed to eliminate the Pyongyang command under conditions of war, including Kim Jong-un; and obviously this is aggravating the situation because given the history of such things, one is not sure when is the moment of such action.

Thirdly you can see it with the deployment of the U.S. aircraft carrier group *USS Carl Vinson* to the Asia, in the vicinity of China. This aircraft carrier is of the Nimitz-class nuclear-powered, and it will arrive exactly on 20th of January, the day Trump is will take office. *Global Times*, the official Chinese newspaper, said that this deployment is set to disrupt potential talks between China and other countries in the region; naturally, also it's supposed to put a sour note on the U.S.-China relations.

There are other efforts to change and determine the narrative in the post-Obama period. Ash Carter, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, just gave a press conference where he said that it was only the United States which was fighting ISIS in Syria. Now, that takes some nerve to say that, because everybody in the whole world knows that without President Putin's decision to militarily intervene in Syria starting in September 2015, and with the tremendous support of the Russian Aerospace Forces for the fighting of the Syrian troops, this military situation in Syria would have never developed. And it was to the contrary, the very dubious behavior of the United States supporting various kinds of terrorist groups which prolonged this process and slowed it down.

But also in the attempt to pin down the narrative, of

course, John Kerry, who a week or so ago, gave a speech saying that it was the British Parliament which would have prevented the U.S. military intervention in Syria. Now – I mean, all of these

people must think that the whole world has a very short memory, because I remember very vividly that it was Gen. Michael Flynn, in his capacity as head of the DIA, [Defense Intelligence Agency], who had put out a public statement that it was the

intention of the Obama administration to build up a caliphate in the region, in order to have regime-change against Assad, and he was then fired by [DNI] Clapper. And it is of a certain irony that just on Friday, when Trump met with Clapper, Brennan and

Comey, in the Trump Tower where these three gentlemen wanted to impress Trump with their story about the Russian hacking; the other person who was with Trump was General Flynn, who is now in the driver's seat [to be National Security Advisor]. So anyway, you can expect the truth not be suppressed forever. And as a matter of fact, it was in the moment shortly before the U.S. military intervention in 2013, the U.S. military action was prepared to occur Sunday evening; we had gotten that from

well-informed circles in Washington, and then in the very last minute the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Martin Dempsey went to Obama and said, "You should not a start a war where you don't know how it ends. And if you don't ask the Congress you will be impeached, or you run the risk of being impeached." And only because of that Obama went to ask the U.S., Congress, the U.S. Congress voted no, and the U.S. military intervention was prevented.

So this was quite different. And you know this attempt to fix the narrative will not be successful.

Now, I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about: I think we will see probably only by February or even into March who will be actually in his cabinet, who

will get approved by the Senate. But there are other interesting elements, for example: Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion into the renewal of the infrastructure in the United States. That is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in North Carolina, that he would implement the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and *only* if you have a Glass-Steagall law in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure.

But one step in a positive direction is the fact that for example the former deputy foreign minister of China, and chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs committee of the National People's Congress, Mme. Fu Ying, made a speech in New York, about six weeks ago, where she said that indeed the Trump infrastructure program can be a bridge to the New Silk Road program of China. And that is quite the case: Just yesterday, Trump met with Jack Ma who is the chief executive of Alibaba, a Chinese e-commerce firm, and Jack Ma said that he can help Trump to create 1 million jobs in the United States by initiating a platform for U.S. small businessmen to sell to Chinese consumers over the next five years, and vice versa, how the Chinese can invest in the United States. Trump afterwards said this was a great meeting, we will do great

things together; and Jack Ma said that Trump was a very smart man and they got along very well.

So this is very good, because the Schiller Institute already in 2015 published a report for the United States to join the New Silk Road, which is a whole approach how you have to have a fast train system for the United States; as you know, China built as of the end of 2014, 20.000 km high-speed train systems. China wants to have to 50,000 km by 2020, connecting every major city in China with a fast train system. And the United States has none.

So the United States urgently needs a fast train system connecting the East Coast, the West Coast and the Midwest. Build some new science cities in the South, get rid of the drought in the Southwest, California and the other states. So there are many, many things which urgently need to be done.

OK. Now, let me make a few remarks about the Schiller Institute, given the fact that many of you may not know much about us. And I want to underline the fact that we are not commentators on this whole question, but that we are responsible for many of the ideas which are now coming into effect.

The Schiller Institute was created by me in 1984, and it was, at that time we had the still the intermediate-range missile crisis, which brought the world to the verge of World War III; if you remember, the Pershing 2, the SS20, where there was a very short warning time, in permanent alert; and the relationship between Europe and the United States was really in a terrible condition.

So I created the Schiller Institute with the idea that you needed an institute, a think tank to put the relations among nations on a completely different basis. One of the most important aspects of the work was to work towards the establishment of a just, new world economic order, in the tradition of the Non-Aligned Movement. And there, my husband, already in 1975, had proposed to replace the IMF with an

International Development Bank, which would organize large credits for technology transfer from the industrialized countries to the developing sector, to overcome the underdevelopment.

That proposal went into the Colombo Resolution of the Non-Aligned Movement in 1976 in Sri Lanka. So we had the idea that that policy had to come back on the agenda, that we had to create economic development in the southern hemisphere, so that every human being on this planet could have dignified potential their lives, develop all the potentialities embedded in them.

But from the beginning, we said that such a new world economic order can only function if it's combined with a Classical Renaissance, that we have to reject the popular culture as it is associated with modern globalization, because it is

depraved and degenerate. And that we had to go back to the revival, a Renaissance of the best traditions of every culture and have a dialogue among them. For example, in Germany, obviously you would emphasize the German Classical culture of Schiller, Beethoven, the whole Classical music; in China, you would emphasize Confucius; in India you would emphasize the Vedic writings, Tagore, and so forth. So you would go and revive in every country simply what they have contributed to universal history and make that known.

Now, the present policy, of a "win-win cooperation", is exactly an echo of what we had proposed since '84, and to replace geopolitics with an approach of the common aims of mankind. In 1984, my husband, Mr. LaRouche, also uniquely predicted the collapse of the Soviet Union. He said if the Soviet Union would stick to their then-existing policies of the Ogarkov Plan, that they would collapse in five years. Now, there was nobody else who said the Soviet Union would collapse; it was completely unthinkable, but we observed the economic problems and on Oct. 12, 1988, my husband and I made a press conference in Berlin, in the Bristol Kempinski Hotel, where we said Germany will soon be unified – also nobody

believed that at the time – and Germany should adopt the development of *Poland* as a model for the transformation of the Comecon with high technology.

Now, in '89 therefore, when the Berlin Wall came down, we were the only ones who were not surprised. As a matter of fact, we immediately published a report, how the unified Germany should develop Poland, and we called this program, the "Productive Triangle Paris-Berlin-Vienna," which is an area the size of Japan; it had the highest concentration of industry and the idea was to develop development corridors from that Productive Triangle to Poland, Warsaw, to Kiev, to the Balkans, and transform the Comecon that way. It was before the D.D.R. collapsed; and here if that had been picked up, maybe the Soviet Union and the Comecon would not have collapsed.

Anyway: Because you had Bush, Thatcher and Mitterrand, they did not like this at all, so in '91, when the Soviet Union collapsed, we immediately proposed to prolong this program of the Productive Triangle into the Eurasian Land-Bridge: The idea that you would connect the population and industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. The Iron Curtain was no longer there, so it was the natural thing to have infrastructure corridors to develop the landlocked areas of Eurasia.

Now we proposed at the time to all the countries of Eurasia, and the only country which responded positively was China. So in 1996, they organized a very big conference in Beijing, called "The Development of the Regions along the Eurasian Land-Bridge," and I was one of the speakers there. And China at that point declared the development of the Eurasian Land-Bridge to be the long-term perspective of China until the year 2010.

As you know, then came '97 the Asia crisis; '98 the Russian GK0 crisis, so this whole development became interrupted. But it basically did not stop us from making

conferences about this proposal on five continents, all the U.S. cities, all the European cities; even in Latin America, São Paulo, Rio, New Delhi, even some African countries, Australia. We kept organizing for this idea that the natural next phase of the evolution of mankind would be the infrastructure connections of the entire planet.

Obviously, what happened in '99 also was the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act in the United States, which gave way to the unregulated speculation, leading to the present bubble.

Now, in September 2013, when Xi Jinping in Kazakhstan announced the New Silk Road, we simply took all the different studies we had made in these 24 years, and published them, and we called it: "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge." This is a comprehensive proposal which has the yellow line there in the middle between China and Central Asia; this was the initial One Belt, One Road proposal by China, and we added simply – they had the Maritime Silk Road – but we had a whole infrastructure program for Africa, for the South of Europe, the Balkans, many corridors, including a Bering Strait Tunnel connecting the Eurasian infrastructure with the American system, with highways and high-speed trains all the way to Chile and Argentina. And eventually, when all of this is built, you can go by maglev train from the southern tip of South America to the Cape of Good Hope in Africa.

We published this proposal; and the actual book you can find at the book table, including an early report about this, from 1997. The first report we published in German, in '91. This is not just about connection of infrastructure, but it has all the scientific conceptions of Mr. LaRouche's notion of physical economy.

Mr. LaRouche is probably the only economist in the West who deserves that name, because all the other neo-liberal economists have been so wrong in their predictions that they should probably take another job. Mr. LaRouche has given up

his own scientific method and in this report you find there such extremely important conceptions as the connection between energy flux density in the production process and the relative potential population density, which can be maintained with that energy flux density; and there are other such important conceptions.

So this report was immediately published in China; the Chinese translated it into Chinese. We presented it in China in 2015. It was recommended by all the people who presented to all Chinese scholars, as the standard text on the Silk Road; and it has been sent to all major faculties and universities in China.

It was also published in Arabic, as you will hear about from Hussein Askary. And it is now coming out shortly in Korean, in German, and we have requests in other languages to come out also.

So, while we were publishing these reports, the New Silk Road promoted by China which has a few different names – first they called it One Belt, One Road; now they call it the Belt and Road Initiative; I always call it the "New Marshall Plan Silk Road," so that people get an idea. In any case, this policy of China has taken on a breathtaking dynamic. (Next slide)

In the meantime, many of these proposals are in different phases of realization. It has the Maritime Silk Road which is the outer line. In the meantime, China is building six economic corridors – as I said, it involves 70 nations, and over 30 international large organization, 4.4 billion people, and trillions in investments. And as I said, already now it's 12 times bigger than the Marshall Plan was.

(Next slide). This is the original One Belt, One Road, connecting China and Central and West Asia through an economic corridor. In June 2015, China and the five Central Asian governments agreed to build that and additional routes are being planned to go into Afghanistan. One is already going into

Iran; when President Xi was in Iran last year, he promised, – or they both promised that they would extend this New Silk Road beyond Iran into Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Turkey.

(Next) This is the new Eurasian Land-Bridge which connects China with Western Europe and it has shortened already the transport time for cargo, to two to three weeks from China – different cities, Chengdu, Chongqing, Yiwu, Duisburg, Lyon, Rotterdam, Hamburg, from five weeks via ocean. Already by mid-2016, there were over 2,000 rail shipments from China to Europe, and it is picking up speed. All the cities in Europe that are termini, such as Madrid, Lyon, Duisburg, they're all happy; they realize that they have tremendous benefits from it.

(Next. No, the next one, the China-Mongolia) This is China-Mongolia-Russia corridor. In June 2016, the three presidents signed a trilateral economic partnership, at the 11th Shanghai Cooperation Organization meeting; and this corridor alone involves 32 projects.

(Next) This is the China-Pakistan economic corridor, which is creating 700,000 new jobs in Pakistan. It will produce 10,400 MW power capacity and the investment of 46 billion by the Chinese in this corridor equals all the foreign investment since 1970 in Pakistan.

(Next) This is the China-Myanmar-Bangladesh corridor. This creating for the first time an express highway between India and China, and it goes through Bangladesh and Myanmar. This corridor will be 1.65 million km long; it will encompass 440 million people.

(Next). The China-Indochina Peninsula corridor. This will be a highway/rail and high-speed transport system connecting the ten largest cities of the region.

(Next) Africa – Djibouti-Ethiopia. [showing picture of refugees instead] Leave this picture please; this is very important. Because as we know Europe has been in large part destabilized by the refugee crisis, and there *is* a very big

incentive, one would think, for Europeans to help develop Africa.

But so far, it is not coming from Europe, it's coming from China, India and Japan.

So, the Djibouti-Ethiopia railway just opened yesterday, so this is extremely good news. It opened yesterday, from Djibouti to Addis Abeba, 750 km and it was built by China; it employed about 20,000 Ethiopians and 5,000 Djiboutian, and it will be connected to the standard gauge railway in Kenya, which again, created 30,000 jobs. And this will obviously, among other things, transform the port of Mombasa and it will take cargo and passengers to the Ugandan border in one-tenth of the time it

takes by road. A professor from the University of 'Nairobi School of Diplomacy', Prof. Gerishon Ikiara, said, and I agreed, that this whole program will "radically transform African participation in global trade in the next two decades and will

catalyze the industrial transformation of Africa."

Now, there is another extremely important project (next), which is the Transaqua project. Here you see the cover story of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Lake Chad Basin Commission and the Chinese engineering firm PowerChina. Now PowerChina is the company which built the Three Gorges Dam and several other large projects so they really know what they're doing; and they agreed with this contract to do a feasibility study about the Transaqua project.

This is the largest infrastructure project ever entertained in Africa. It was developed in the late '70s by an Italian firm Bonifica, and there, in particular, Dr. Marcello Vichi. Mr. LaRouche has promoted this project since he got news of it,

because it was a perfect way of solving many problems at the same time. As you know, Lake Chad is shrinking; it is presently only about less than 10% of its original size, and it affects the life of the entire people, 40 million people,

in the Chad Basin. And naturally, it is already having drought effects and so forth.

The concept is simply to transfer the water from the Congo River, using the unused discharge of the Congo River water going into the ocean. Now, the Congo River is the second largest river in the world and it discharges 41,000 cubic meters/second into the ocean – unused. And the idea is to take only 3-4% of that water and bring it into Lake Chad. There was a big campaign trying to convince the people in the different states along the Congo River, that it's stealing their water, and so forth, but that was really an effort by the Greenies and it has no substance to it whatsoever.

First of all, the idea is not to take the water from the Congo River, but from the west bank tributaries at an altitude that allows to bring water per gravity until the C.A.R./Chad watershed, which is an elevation of 500 meters, and then pour it into the Chari River which is a tributary of Lake Chad. So this way you would create a 2,400 km long waterway which would bring eventually 100 billion cubic meters of water per year into Lake Chad and also create navigable infrastructure.

Obviously, the Republic of Congo would be also a big beneficiary because it would give them access to a navigable waterway, electricity production, regulation of rivers and so forth.

PowerChina is now financing a feasibility study for a first phase of the project which would involve building a series of dams in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, and the Central African Republic. It would also potentially generate 15-25 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectricity through the mass movement of water by gravity; it would potentially create a series of irrigated areas for crops, livestock, of an area of 50-70,000 sq km in the Sahel zone in Chad, in the northeast of Nigeria, in the north of Cameroon, and in Niger. It would also make possible an expanded

economic zone basically creating a new economic platform for agriculture, industry, transportation, electricity for 12 Africa nations.

So PowerChina has put up \$1.8 million for the first phase of the feasibility study and if the construction starts, this is a big project so it's not expected to be finished overnight, but it will take generations: But it will create livelihoods for 40 million people in the basin. And this is just one project, but there are many others. For example, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi is just on a five-nation tour through Africa [Jan. 7-12] and was already in Madagascar, in Tanzania, is going to Zambia, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, and he's inviting all Africa nations to join the Belt and Road Initiative.

(Next) This is the expanded program of railways, nuclear power, just transforming the entire African continent. (Next) These are development plans for Latin America. The blue lines you see there, these are the longstanding, proposed high-speed railway routes in Latin America, which the Schiller Institute has proposed. In 1982, when Mr. LaRouche was working with President José López Portillo of Mexico on these projects, he called it "Operation Juárez," to refer back to the best traditions of Mexican-American cooperation. And these are all projects which are obvious. If you look at the map of Africa or Latin America, you don't see that kind of infrastructure! If you see some railway, you see it as a small line from a mine to the port to exploit the raw materials, but you don't have infrastructure. And we had this idea, which Alexander von Humboldt, by the way, proposed in 19th century, so it's not that revolutionary; it's sort of obvious.

The red lines are the various Chinese proposals since the BRICS summit in Brazil in July 2014. The solid red line is the northern route of the Brail-Peru transcontinental rail line. This was already agreed upon between the governments of Brazil and China a year ago; but then they had the coup in Brazil, Dilma Rousseff was impeached, so this came to a halt; also the new government in Peru is very reluctant. But

there's a big movement: I just addressed a conference of economists in the Amazon region two months ago, and there's a whole movement, also associated with Fujimori party, who absolutely won the fight for that rail line because it is the step to the future.

There are three additional lines, one line would be including Bolivia into this rail line, and three additional lines through Argentina and Chile; China also wants to build three tunnels between Chile and Argentina to connect the Pacific and the Atlantic.

(Next) This is the Nicaragua Canal which is in the early stages of completion, also built by China. This will increase the speed of global shipping between Belem and Shanghai and cut the current route across the Atlantic and around Africa by 10% of the time.

So I can only mention the most important projects. There are many, many others. For example, China and Ecuador are building a science city in Ecuador where President Correa at the recent state visit of President Xi Jinping said that the collaboration between Ecuador and China will mean that Ecuador soon will be on the same level as all industrialized countries. They have the idea to overcome poverty forever. The science city is going to have the most advanced fields of science.

Bolivia – Bolivia, which used to be a coca producing country, is now cooperating on space projects with China, with Russia, with India. So there is a completely new mood! I talked with many Africans – there was a big conference in Hamburg just a couple of months ago, where the Africans said, there is a completely new mood in Africa, there is a new paradigm: China, Japan, India are all investing, and the Europeans, if they don't shape up, they will become marginal and irrelevant. So there is a completely new optimism caused by this dynamic.

Now, just on a diplomatic level, this process of integration is going absolutely rapidly, especially since September last year, when you had on Sept. 2-3, the Eastern

Economic Forum in Vladivostok where the integration of the Eurasian Economic Union and the Belt and Road Initiative was on the table. The Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe participated in that conference, and Japan is now massively investing in the Far East of Russia, in terms of energy cooperation. Putin was just in Japan, as a state visit; Abe will go on a state visit to Russia this year. They're talking about settling the conflict concerning the Northern islands, the Kuril Islands. They're talk about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan, and obviously there is a complete strategic realignment going on. President Duterte changed the role of the Philippines from being the aircraft carrier for the United States in the South China Sea, to now, collaborate with China on economic cooperation, and also with Russia. The same by

the way, goes for Turkey, which is now shifting and working with Russia, Iran and Syria, to bring peace to the region.

So there is a complete strategic realignment going on, which the Western media and Western politicians have just not got it yet. But this is very, very interesting.

So, then this continued from Vladivostok, immediately afterwards on Sept. 4-5, the G20 Summit in Hangzhou, where China took real leadership in saying the future recovery of the world economy must be based on innovation *and* he made very clear that this innovation must be shared with the developing countries, not to hold up or hinder their development.

So, it's a completely new paradigm, and I'll say something about that in a second.

Then you continue to the ASEAN meeting in Laos, the BRICS meeting in Goa, India in October, the APEC meeting in Lima in November, and it is involving all of these organizations and spreading very fast.

Why is Europe not joining this? Look, Europe is in bad shape. The EU is collapsing, the people in Italy *hate* by now the ECB, they hate Merkel, they have Schäuble, they hold Merkel responsible for the suffering of the population in Italy which is now reaching dimensions like Greece; Greece was

destroyed – one-third of the Greek economy was destroyed by the austerity policy of the Troika. And you know, there's *nothing* left of the idea of unity in Europe. There are borders being built, Schengen is dead; look at the Eastern European countries, they're simply not – the Eastern European and Central European countries are reorienting towards China! The 16+1 this is the Central and East European Countries, they have extensive infrastructure cooperation with China. China is building up the port in Piraeus port in Greece; they're building a fast railway between Budapest and Belgrade, and many other projects.

But the problem with Europe is that at least the European EU bureaucracy and some governments, like the German one, they are still on the old paradigm, the geopolitical paradigm of globalization, of neoliberal policies, and they don't understand that what China has proposed and what is now the basis of a very close and determined strategic partnership between Russia and China they have put on the agenda a different model: To overcome geopolitics by a "win-win" strategy.

Now, most people at least in Europe and in the United States have a very hard time to think that. They cannot imagine that governments are for the common good, because we have not experienced that for such a long time. The common idea of all the think tanks, or most think tanks, is "China must have ulterior motives"; "China is just trying to replace the Anglo-American imperialism, with a Chinese imperialism." But that is not true! I mean, I'm not naïve: I have studied this extensively. I was in China for the first time in 1971, in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. I have seen China, how it was then, I travelled to Beijing, Tientsin, Qingdao, Shanghai, and to the countryside, and so I know what *enormous* transformation China has made in this period.

I went back to China in '96, after 25 years; already then it was breathtaking. But if you look, the Chinese economic model which has transformed 700 million people from

extreme poverty to a decent living standard; and China is now committed to develop the interior region as part of their building of the New Silk Road, to eliminate poverty from China totally by the year 2020, and there are only 4 % left in poverty right now.

Now, China is offering their Chinese economic model to all participating countries in this New Silk Road conception and it is in the interest of Sweden. It would be in the interest of Germany because Germany is still, despite the Green insanity which has deformed many brains, is still a productive country.

The German 'Mittelstand' is still producing, I think, the third largest number of patents in the world. It is their natural interest to find cooperation not only in a bilateral cooperation, but in investments in third countries. It would be in the *best interest* of Germany – if Germany is freaked out about the refugees, which really has meant a complete destabilization of the country, why is Germany not cooperating, with Russia, with China, India, Iran, in the reconstruction of the Middle East? I think, now that the Syrian government has started to rebuild Aleppo, at least building the hospitals, the schools, the Schiller Institute had proposed already in 2012 a comprehensive proposal for the development of the entire Middle East, from

Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the Caucasus to the Gulf States, and it would be in the absolute self-interest because – sure you have to destroy ISIS and the terrorists with military means. But then you have to create conditions where young people in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, have a reason to become doctors, scientists, teachers, so that they have a future, that that way you drive out terrorism forever!

And if all the big neighbors would cooperate: Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, Turkey, Italy, France, Germany, Sweden, you could change this region in no time! And you will hear about that soon from Hussein.

The same for Africa. The only minister in Germany who is reasonable is the Development Minister Gerd Müller, because

he travels all the time to Africa and he says there will be the need for many millions of jobs for the young people of Africa in the next years; if we don't have them to create these jobs, many, many millions of people will flee from hunger and war and epidemics.

So would it not be in the self-interest that all the European nations join hands *with* the Chinese Silk Road initiative, and help to reconstruct and build up the economies of southwest Asia and Africa? I think that that mission would also

really help to overcome the disunity of Europe, because you will not solve that problem by looking at your navel; but you will solve that problem by a joint mission for the greater good of mankind.

So, I think that this is all possible. It can happen this year, it can start this year, because China has committed itself to have two big summits this year – one summit will involve all the heads of state of the Belt and Road Initiative, and it can be the year of consolidation of the new paradigm.

Now there are a couple of elements which are also important for this new paradigm, because we are not just talking about infrastructure, and overcoming poverty. The next phase of the evolution of man is not just to bring infrastructure to all continents on this planet, but to continue that infrastructure into close space around us. This is the first time formulated in this way by the great German-American space scientist and rocket scientist Krafft Ehrlicke, who was the designer of the Saturn V of the Apollo project. He had this beautiful vision that if you look at the evolution over a longer period of time, life developed from the oceans with the help of photosynthesis; then you had the development of ever higher species, species with a higher metabolism, higher energy-flux density in their metabolism.

Eventually man arrived. Man first settled at the oceans and the rivers; then with the help of infrastructure, man developed the interior regions of the continents; and we

are now with the World Land-Bridge picture – go back to the first image – this will be, when it is built, the completion of that phase of the evolution of mankind, by simply bringing infrastructure into all landlocked areas of the world, and you will have – with the help of new methods to create water, with modern technologies, create new, fresh water. For example, if you have peaceful nuclear energy you can desalinate huge amounts of ocean water; through the ionization of moisture in the atmosphere you can create new waters to solve the problem of desertification. Right

now all the deserts are increasing; with these new technologies you can reverse that, make the deserts green, and just make this planet livable for all human beings!

But this is not the end: Mankind is not an Earth-bound species. Mankind is the only species which is capable of creative discovery, and the collaboration of all nations for space exploration and space research is the next phase of our evolution. Now China has a very ambitious space program. They already landed the Yutu rover in 2014. Next year, they will go to the far side of the Moon, and eventually bring back helium-3 from the far side of the Moon, which will be an important fuel for

fusion power economy on Earth. Right now, we are very close to making breakthroughs on fusion power. The Chinese EAST program [Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak] has reached, I think, 50 million degrees for plasma for several seconds. And just a couple of days ago, the stellarator in Greifswald, Germany, reached 100 million degrees for – I've forgotten how many seconds. But it means that in a few years, we can have fusion power! And that will create energy security, raw materials security, on Earth.

So we're looking at a completely new phase of civilization, and the far side of the Moon is very important because will not have the disturbances of cosmic radiation, as you have on the Earth-facing side of the Moon; the Sun and the

Earth – this far side is shielded from a lot of this radiation so it will be possible to put up much better telescopes, you will be able to look into Solar System, into the Galaxy, into other galaxies much, much farther than so far.

And I don't know if any one of you have seen these pictures from the Hubble telescope: If you have not done that, please, go home or next weekend, take the time to look at these pictures from the Hubble telescope. I saw them, and I was completely excited, because now we know that there are – at least – 2 trillion galaxies! Now, I have a good imagination, but I cannot imagine that. It's just too big. And when you see these pictures which have already been taken, you have galaxies which look like the Milky Way; then you have totally different nebulas; you have all formations. And not one galaxy is like the other. Just imagine how big the Universe is?

And we know very, very little! But man is the only species which *can* know! No donkey will ever know about the great galaxies or – no dog will ever be able to breed rabbits to have better breakfast. They all like better breakfast, but they don't know how to do it. Man is capable of overcoming every limitation, and the mind of man is a physical force in the Universe. We're not outside of the Universe, but what our mind invents or discovers, *is* part of the Universe. And that is a very exciting thing.

And there is lots to be found out about what is the origin and essence of life. What governs the laws of the Universe? What is the role of the mind in the Universe? I mean, these are all extremely exciting questions, and they all prove that man is not an Earth-bound species. So there is no need to be a Greenie, because we can bring man's knowledge applied to expand our role in the Universe. Even the ESA is now talking about a "Village on the Moon."

Krafft Ehrlicke at the time had said, that building an industrial center on the Moon as a stepping stone for further travel of space will be important. And you now see the shaping

up of new economic platforms. The first platform, Mr. LaRouche has developed this notion of an economic platform to signify a period of economic development which is governed by certain laws, like for example, the development of the steam engine created a new platform; the development of railway created a new platform; fission is creating a new platform. And that platform is always governed by the most advanced technologies of that time. And you can already see that this infrastructure development of close-by space, the first platform is simply that man is able to reach the orbit! That's not self-evident. If you would have told man in the Middle Ages that you will get on a spaceship and go into orbit, he would have said you're crazy!

Now we can already see we have manned space travel and we can now connect to where the Apollo project stopped after the assassination of Kennedy, 40 years ago; but now China, India, Russia, they all continue that process. India has also been extremely ambitious space project.

And so, the first economic platform will be simply to leave the planet Earth and to go into orbit; the second economic platform of space research will be to have an industrial base on the Moon and to eventually start to produce raw materials from space. Because you will, as this continues, not always transport materials from the Earth for your space travel, but once you have fusion as a propulsion fuel where the speed will become much larger, you will be able to take materials from asteroids, from other planets, for your production and your requirements in space. And then longer space travel between planets as the third platform, which is already visible.

Now, I could – this is very exciting, and once you start to think about it, it shows that mankind is really capable of magnificent achievements, and that we should really overcome geopolitics. Geopolitics is like a little, nasty two-year-old

boy who is not yet educated and who knows nothing better than to kick his brother in the knee. Now that's about the level of geopolitics.

What Xi Jinping always talks about is that we have to form a "community of destiny for the common future of mankind," and that is exactly what the Schiller institute set out in '84, when we said we have to fight for the common aims of mankind. And these common aims of mankind must come first, and no nation should be allowed to have a national interest or the interest of a group of nations, if it violates this higher common aims of mankind. And the areas of working together, a crash program for fusion, space cooperation, and breakthroughs in fundamental science.

All of this however must be combined with a Classical Renaissance, a dialogue of cultures on the highest level, and we have already very successfully at Schiller Institute conferences, practiced that, where we had European Classical music, Bach,

Beethoven, Verdi, Schubert, Schumann; Chinese Classical music, Indian poetry. You have this coming Saturday in New York, a beautiful event on style of civilizations, of cultures, where we will have a Chinese professor talking about literati painting.

You know, in Chinese painting, you have poetry, calligraphy and painting, in one. And for Westerners, it's a complete revelation, because this does not exist in European painting. People get completely excited because they discover that there are beautiful things to discover in other cultures! And once you study and know these other cultures, xenophobia and racism disappears! Because you realize that it's beautiful that there are many cultures, because there are universal principles to be

discovered in music, one musician will immediately understand another musician because it's a universal language. Scientists speak a universal language; they understand each other.

And so the future of civilization will be a dialogue between Plato, Schiller, Confucius, Tagore, and many other

great poets, scientists of the past. So, if you give every child access to these things, which is also in reach, I can see that we will have a new era, a new civilization of mankind. And I would invite all of you to not just look at it, but be part of it. [applause]

Helga Zepp-LaRouche løfter tilhørere til sublime højder, på Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i Stockholm. Uddrag på dansk af Helgas tale

12. jan., 2017 – Sublimt er det eneste, passende ord til at beskrive Helga Zepp-LaRouches intense og smukke præsentation og den atmosfære, hun skabte hos tilhørerne, med 60 deltagere (lokalet var helt fyldt) på Schiller Instituttets/EIR's seminar, der blev afholdt i Stockholm den 11. januar, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Helga Zepp-LaRouches optræden var ikke annonceret på forhånd, og hun skabte en stor succes for hele anledningen med arrangementet. Hendes tale bevægede tilhørerne til at adressere den grundlæggende, epistemologiske – erkendelsesteoretiske – dybere mening med Den Nye Silkevej, og meningen med menneskehedens udvikling i universet. Denne dybere mening rørte endda de tilstedeværende diplomater. En ambassadør fra et betydningsfuldt, asiatisk land indledte

under diskussionsperioden en diskussion om netop nødvendigheden af at adressere disse bredere kulturelle og menneskelige implikationer.

Alt i alt var sytten diplomater til stede, heriblandt syv ambassadører! (Dette har intet fortilfælde i LaRouche-bevægelsens historie i Sverige.) Fire europæiske lande var repræsenteret, ni lande fra Asien og fire lande fra Afrika. En kinesisk reporter kom til sit andet seminar, talte med Helga og tog billeder. Blandt de øvrige deltagere var kontakter fra forskellige svenske sammenslutninger, der arbejder for venskab med Rusland, Ukraine, Syrien, Yemen, Somalia, området omkring Det baltiske Hav (Østersøen) og en anden gruppe, der arbejder for at forlade EU, så vel som også tre kontakter fra erhvervslivet og mangeårige aktivister i den svenske LaRouche-bevægelse.

Formanden for Schiller Instituttet i Sverige, Hussein Askary, præsiderede seminaret og bød deltagerne velkommen. Dernæst holdt Helga Zepp-LaRouche hovedtalen, der havde en håbefuldt vision for verden. Hun gav en vurdering af de aftrædende neokonservatives og etablerede mediers igangværende kamp for at afvise berettigelsen af valget af Donald Trump. Hun påpegede den brede reaktion på den af de neoliberale anstiftede katastrofe, som værende det reelle grundlag for valget af Trump, så vel som også andre lignende reaktioner i hele verden, og sagde, at det er dér, man skal lede efter grunden til, at Trump blev valgt, og ikke i nogen computerhacking. Eftersom tilhørerne for det meste bestod af nye folk, fremlagde hun Schiller Instituttets historie, der samtidig er historien om politikken med Den Nye Silkevej. Hun beskrev processen med, at økonomien udvikler sig fra en platform til en anden og påpegede den kinesiske politik for at satse på den næste, økonomiske platform gennem en Månebaseret industriel udvikling, for menneskehedens videre udvikling som en art, der ikke er bundet til planeten Jord. Kinesernes motivering for deres globale politik kom frem under

diskussionsperioden, i sammenhæng med Afrika. Helga understregede her, på basis af sin baggrund med mangeårige studier af Kinas historie og konfuciansk tankegang, at hendes konklusion er, at Kina virkelig forfølger en »win-win«-politik baseret på det konfucianske begreb om at tilstræbe visdom og harmoni. Hun understregede nødvendigheden af en klassisk renæssance for, at det Nye Paradigme kan blive en succes, og at dette ikke er et punkt, vi kan overlade til Donald Trump.

Efter Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale gav Hussein Askary en kort gennemgang af perspektivet for Sydvestasien og Afrika. Dernæst holdt man en pause, hvor man nød kaffe og wienerbrød, der var doneret af en kontakt. Mange af deltagerne brugte lejligheden til at få taget deres foto sammen med Helga, og til at samtale med hende. To ambassadører, én fra Sydøstasien og én fra Sydvestasien, opsøgte Helga for at give udtryk for deres dybeste påskønnelse af hendes præsentation og skønheden i hendes tankegang.

Denne begivenhed var et sandt gennembrud for vores organisering i Sverige, med en kvalitet og intensitet, der vil bevæge vores politiske arbejde i dette land ind i nye dimensioner.

Uddrag af Helga Zepp LaRouches tale ved Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i Stockholm, 11. januar, 2017

Lad mig begynde med valget af Trump. Jeg har aldrig, i hele mit politiske liv, der er temmelig langt, flere årtier – jeg har aldrig i hele mit politiske liv set et sådant hysteri på vegne af de neokonservative, på vegne af etableret politikere, på vegne af de liberale medier, som med hensyn til Trump. Det skal indrømmes, at Trump ikke opfylder Baron von Knigges regler for god opførsel – han var en tysker, der i det 18. århundrede udviklede reglerne for god, diplomatisk

opførsel. Men årsagen til [fremkomsten af] Trump er, at han simpelt hen lovede en afslutning af det politiske paradigme, der lå til grund for otte år med George W. Bush og otte år med Barack Obama, og som var en direkte fortsættelse af Bush-Cheney-politikken.

Og det var en god ting, for det var helt tydeligt, hvis Hillary Clinton havde vundet valget i USA, at alle de politikker, hun forfulgte, inklusive en flyveforbudszone over Syrien og en ekstremt krigerisk politik over for Rusland og Kina, ville have betydet, at vi ville have været på en direkte kurs til Tredje Verdenskrig. Hvis I har nogen tvivl om dette spørgsmål, vil jeg med glæde besvare jeres spørgsmål under spørgsmål & svar perioden.

Så den kendsgerning, at Hillary ikke vandt valget, var ekstremt vigtigt for bevarelse af verdensfreden. Jeg mener, at, af alle de løfter, Trump hidtil har afgivet, så er den kendsgerning, at han sagde – og gennem udnævnelsen af disse forskellige medlemmer af kabinettet, hvis de alle sammen kommer igennem nomineringsprocessen i Senatet – at han vil normalisere relationerne mellem USA og Rusland, efter min mening *det vigtigste skridt*. For, hvis relationen mellem USA og Rusland er ordentlig og baseret på tillid og samarbejde, så mener jeg, der er et grundlag for at løse alle andre problemer i verden. Hvis denne relation er som modstandere, så er verdensfreden i ekstrem fare.

Så efter min mening er der grund til at tro på, at dette vil ske. Den russiske reaktion har været meget moderat, men optimistisk omkring, at dette kan ske. Ser man på udnævnelserne, så er der flere kabinet-medlemmer og andre personer på andre høje poster, der også går ind for at forbedre relationen med Rusland, såsom Tillerson, der angiveligt skal være udenrigsminister; general Flynn, der er en konservativ militærmand, men også går ind for normalisering med Rusland, og mange andre, så jeg mener, det er et godt tegn.

Hvis man ser på reaktionen fra den neokonservatives/neoliberales side på begge sider af Atlanten, på dette valg af Trump, så kan det kun beskrives som *fuldstændig* hysterisk. *Washington Post* har en artikel i dag, »Hvordan man fjerner Trump fra embedet«, og kalder ham en løgner, og enhver nedsættende ting, man kan forestille sig, fuldstændig utroligt; reaktionen i Tyskland var – [forsvarsminister Ursula] von der Leyen sagde morgenen efter valget, at hun var »dybt chokeret«, dette var »forfærdeligt«, dette var en katastrofe, og sådan bliver det ved. Så de er endnu ikke kommet sig.

Og så er der naturligvis rapporterne fra de forskellige amerikanske efterretningstjenester, Clapper, Brennan, Comey fra FBI, og de offentliggjorde alle sammen den kendsgerning, at det var russisk hacking af e-mails fra DNC og Podesta, der skulle have stjålet valget, fordi de angiveligt skulle have ændret amerikanernes mening til at stemme på Trump.

Jeg mener, at dette er latterligt. Ikke alene har mange cyber-eksperter i Europa, og også i USA, allerede sagt, at alle tegnene tyder på, at der ikke var nogen hacking, men at et insider-læk, der røbede denne information, er mere sandsynligt, og der findes absolut *ingen* beviser på, at det skulle være russisk hacking. Det, der selvfølgelig bliver mørklagt med denne historie, er, hvad handlede »hackingen« om? Det var »hacking« af e-mails, der beviste, at Hillary Clinton manipulerede valget imod Bernie Sanders! Det taler man ikke længere om; men hvis der var nogen tænkning, ville jeg sige, hør her – og der er mange mennesker, der indser, f.eks. en meget betydningsfuld fransk efterretningsmand, Eric Danécé, der er en tænketank-person på højeste niveau i Frankrig, og som sagde: Det er helt klart, hvorfor de udgav denne historie, for de neokonservative måtte forvente den store udrensning, og mange af dem ville miste deres position, og det er grunden til, at de alle blev enige om denne historie og ændrede narrativen.

Den virkelige narrativ er, at det var det neoliberale globaliseringssystemets uretfærdighed, der simpelt hen krænkede flertallet af befolkningens interesser, især i »rustbæltet«. I valgkampen var Hillary Clinton så arrogant, at hun ikke engang tog til Ohio eller nogle af de andre stater, der tidligere var industrialiserede. Man må indse, at dér – at USA, i modsætning til, hvad man for det meste rapporterer i de vestlige medier i Europa, befinder sig i en tilstand af økonomisk kollaps. De har for første gang [nogensinde] en faldende forventet levealder; der er én indikator, der viser, om det går et samfund godt eller skidt, og det er, at den forventede levealder stiger eller falder. I USA falder den for både mænd og kvinder. I den 16 år lange periode med Bush-Cheney og Obama, som man kan tage som en samlet pakke, er selvmordsraten firdoblet i alle aldersgrupper; årsagerne er alkoholisme, narkoafhængighed, håbløshed, depression pga. arbejdsløshed. Der er omkring 94 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der ikke engang er talt med i statistikken, fordi de har opgivet ethvert håb om nogensinde igen at finde et job. Hvis man for nylig har rejst i USA, så er USA virkelig i en forfærdelig forfatning; infrastrukturen er i en forfærdelig tilstand, og folk er simpelt hen ikke glade.

Så valget, og narrativen var derfor årsagen til, at Hillary blev stemt ude, fordi hun blev opfattet som den direkte fortsættelse af disse 16 år, og forsøget på at ændre denne narrativ ved at sige, at det var »russisk hacking«, er temmelig åbenlys.

Men nu er der 10 eller 9 dage tilbage, til den nye præsident indsættes. Og det er ikke en periode for afslapning, for igen, Obamas gamle team forsøger på en måde, der ikke har fortilfælde, at skabe omstændigheder for den tiltrædende præsident Trump for at tvinge ham til at fortsætte Obamas kurs. For kun et par dage siden begyndte de f.eks. en deployering af amerikanske tropper og NATO-tropper, der skal deployeres ved den russiske grænse i De baltiske Lande, i

Polen og Rumænien, via den tyske by Bremerhaven, hvor 6.000 tropper landede med tungt militærudstyr; f.eks. amerikanske Abrams tanks, Paladin artilleri, Bradley kampvogne, 2.800 stk. militært isenkram, 50 Black Hawk helikoptere, som involverer 1.800 stk. personel; 400 tropper, der skal tilknyttes de 24 Apache-helikoptere.

Denne deployering skal selvfølgelig være en provokation mod Rusland, og det er meningen, at det skal gøre det meget vanskeligt for Trump at begynde at forbedre relationerne.

Et andet område, hvor man kan se dette forsøg på at tvinge Trump, er med spørgsmålet om THAAD-missilerne i Korea, hvor Nordkorea nu har hævdet, at de kan lancere deres ICBM'er overalt, til enhver tid; og iflg. kinesiske eksperter er USA alene ansvarlig for, at Nordkorea opfører sig på denne måde.

Sydkorea med den fratrædende præsident Park Geun-hye, der muligvis snart bliver afsat ved en rigsretssag, måske inden for få dage eller uger; hun gik med til at få en specialbrigade med en 1.000-2.000 mand stor specialenhed, der i tilfælde af krig angiveligt skal eliminere Pyongyang-kommandoen, inkl. Kim Jong-un; og dette forværrer situationen, for i betragtning af sådanne tings historie, kan man ikke vide, hvornår øjeblikket til sådanne handlinger kommer.

For det tredje ses det af deployeringen af det amerikanske hangarskib *USS Carl Vinson* til Asien, i nærheden af Kina. Dette hangarskib er et atomdrevet skib af Nimitz-klassen, og det vil ankomme præcis den 20. januar, den dag, Trump overtager embedet. *Global Times*, den officielle kinesiske avis, sagde, at denne deployering har til hensigt at ødelægge potentielle forhandlinger med Kina og andre lande i området; det skal selvfølgelig også slå en sur tone an i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer.

Der er andre bestræbelser på at ændre og bestemme narrativen i perioden efter Obama. Ash Carter, USA's forsvarsminister, har

netop holdt en pressekonference, hvor han sagde, at det kun var USA, der bekæmpede ISIS i Syrien. Der skal en solid portion frækhed til at sige dette, for alle i hele verden ved, at, uden præsident Putins beslutning om at intervenere militært i Syrien, med start i september 2015, og med enorm støtte fra russiske luftstyrker til de syriske troppers kamp, ville denne militære situation i Syrien aldrig have udviklet sig. Og det var tværtimod USA's meget tvivlsomme opførsel, hvor de støttede diverse terroristgrupper, der forlængede denne proces og forsinkede den.

Men også som et forsøg på at tvinge narrativen var selvfølgelig John Kerry, der for en uge eller så siden holdt en tale, hvor han sagde, at det var det Britiske Parlament, der skulle have forhindret den amerikanske militærintervention i Syrien. Alle disse mennesker må tro, at hele verden har en meget kort hukommelse, for jeg husker ganske tydeligt, at det var general Michael Flynn, der i sin egenskab af leder af DIA [Defense Intelligence Agency] offentligt udtalte, at det var Obama-administrationens plan at opbygge et kalifat i området med det formål at få et regimeskifte imod Assad, og han blev dernæst fyret af [DNI] Clapper. Og der ligger en vis ironi i det faktum, at her sidste fredag mødtes Trump med Clapper, Brennan og Comey i Trump Tower, hvor disse tre herrer ville imponere Trump med deres historie om den russiske hacking; den anden person, der var sammen med Trump, var general Flynn, der nu sidder i førersædet [til at blive national sikkerhedsrådgiver]. Så man kan forvente, at sandheden ikke bliver undertrykt i al evighed. Det var faktisk kort før den amerikanske militære intervention i 2013, den amerikanske militære aktion var planlagt til at skulle finde sted om søndagen; det havde vi fra velunderrettede kilder i Washington, og i sidste øjeblik tog formanden for generalstabscheferne, general Martin Dempsey, hen til Obama og sagde, »De bør ikke starte en krig, når De ikke ved, hvordan den vil ende. Og hvis De ikke spørger Kongressen, bliver De stillet for, eller risikerer at blive stillet for en rigsret.«

Kun pga. dette spurgte Obama den amerikanske Kongres, og Kongressen stemte nej, og den amerikanske intervention blev forhindret.

Så det forholdt sig altså helt anderledes. Og dette forsøg på at fikse narrativen vil ikke lykkes.

Jeg kan ikke sige, hvordan denne Trump-administration vil blive. Jeg nævnte vist det ene punkt, jeg er sikker på: Jeg tror, vi sandsynligvis først i februar eller endda hen i marts får at se, hvem, der faktisk vil være i hans regering, hvem, der vil blive godkendt af Senatet. Men der er andre interessante elementer: Trump havde f.eks. i sin valgkampagne lovet at investere \$1 billion i fornyelse af infrastrukturen i USA. Det er virkelig godt, som jeg sagde, for USA har et presserende behov for at blive udbedret. Det vil imidlertid kun virke, hvis et andet af Trumps løfter, som han lovede i oktober i North Carolina, om, at han ville indføre det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov, bliver ført ud i livet, for det transatlantiske finanssystem er stadig på randen af bankerot. Vi kunne få en gentagelse af det finansielle sammenbrud i 2007-08, hvad øjeblik, det skal være; og *kun*, hvis vi får en Glass/Steagall-lov i Franklin D. Roosevelts tradition, det, som Roosevelt gjorde i 1933 ved at opdele bankerne, ved at fjerne det kriminelle element i banksystemet, og dernæst erstatte det med en [statslig] kreditpolitik i Alexander Hamiltons tradition, kan man råde bod på denne situation. I modsat fald kan man ikke finansiere \$1 billion til infrastruktur.

Helgas tale kan ses her:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdl0Hxg_Ubc

Engelsk udskrift af hele talen kan læses her:

Xi Jinping i Schweiz og Davos

14. jan., 2017 – Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping vil besøge Schweiz 15.-18. januar og vil – for første gang nogensinde for en kinesisk leder – deltage i Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum. Den kinesiske præsident vil begynde sit besøg den 15. jan. med bilaterale forhandlinger, som vil forsætte den 16. jan.; dernæst deltager han i Davos som taler, og den 17. jan. vil han besøge FN's kontorer i Genève.

I et interview til Xinhua understregede den schweiziske ambassadør til Kina, Jean-Jacques de Dardel, at fokus for schweizisk-kinesiske relationer ligger på samarbejde og innovation. Allerede under den schweiziske præsident Johann Schneider-Ammanns besøg i Beijing i april sidste år, indgik de to sider en aftale om et Innovativt Strategisk Partnerskab. Dette er den første aftale nogensinde af denne art, som Kina har indgået med et andet land.

»Kina ønsker mere innovation, og Schweiz er en mester i innovation. I denne henseende er det fornuftigt at koncentrere os om innovation for at fylde de bilaterale relationer med liv«, sagde de Dardel. Både den schweiziske strategi »Industri 4.0« og den kinesiske »Made in China 2025« forfølger de samme mål, dvs., at forbedre produktion, fjerne det unødvendige og styrke den teknologiske drivkraft for vedvarende udvikling, sagde han.

Schweiz har besluttet at anerkende Kinas status inden for markedsøkonomi. »Vi er overbevist om, at inklusion er bedre end eksklusion«, sagde de Dardel.

Kina har forpligtet sig til multi-lateralisme og er parat til at spille en langt større rolle i beslutninger omkring verdensøkonomisk politik, sagde ambassadøren. Han gav eksempler på dette, inkl. den succesrige organisering af G20, konceptet for og implementeringen af Silkevejsinitiativet og

landets indsats for at skabe Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB).

Schweiz var det første, vestlige land, der officielt anerkendte Kina i 1950; det var det første land, der indgik en frihandelsaftale med Kina i 2007, og det har også anerkendt Kinas fulde status i WTO. Det schweiziske elevatorfirma Schindler var det første, vestlige foretagende, der indgik et joint venture-selskab med et kinesisk selskab allerede i 1970'erne. Schweiz og Kina har fortsat 20 samarbejdsformater, fra industrielle til andre omkring juridiske spørgsmål og spørgsmål om menneskerettigheder. Den schweiziske ambassade i Beijings chargé d'affaires, Alain Gaschen, kaldte Xi Jinpings besøg for »et vigtigt skridt fremad i udviklingen af bilaterale relationer«, i et eksklusivt interview med CCTV.

Som han har for vane, når han besøger et andet land, skrev Xi Jinping en kronik om fredagen i Neue Züricher Zeitung forud for sin ankomst. Han skrev: Den kendte schweiziske digter og Nobelhædrede Carl Spitteler sagde engang, at der ikke findes større lykke end at have venner, der deler det samme synspunkt og den samme skæbne, som én selv.« Han gennemgik også historien om de to landes særlige relation, som refereret i ambassadør Dardels interview med Xinhua

Foto: Præsident Xi Jinping i Kina.

**NATO-vicegeneralsekretær
Gottemoeller:**

Vi stoppede russisk invasion af Baltiske Stater (!)

14. jan., 2017 – NATO-vicegeneralsekretær Rose Gottemoeller, en tidligere højtplaceret embedsmand i præsident Obamas Udenrigsministerium, var i Litauen til en sikkerhedskonference den 12.-13. jan. Mens hun var der, gav hun et interview til *Baltic Times*, hvor hun faktisk hævdede, at NATO's troppedeployeringer til de Baltiske Stater og Polen havde forhindrede en russisk invasion af disse lande. »Der var ingen planer om, at amerikansk militær skulle komme tilbage til Europa, før Ruslands truende opførsel over for de Baltiske Stater, over for NATO-alliancen generelt, og før den oprustning, der har fundet sted, som jeg refererede til for et øjeblik siden, såvel som også deres annektering af Krim«, sagde hun, med reference til ankomsten af en amerikansk, pansret brigade til Polen i denne uge. »Det, NATO-alliancen gør, understreger vi altid, er i proportion og afmålt og defensivt, og det er virkelig sådan, NATO går frem på en meget, også bevidst måde, hvor vi ikke haster ind i noget.«

Som sædvanligt for NATO's vedkommende, så begyndte historien omkring marts måned, 2014, da Rusland angiveligt skulle være rykket ind i Krim (fakta er, at de aldrig havde forladt Krim, da de opretholdt flådebasen i Sevastopol), og de (NATO) udelukker således NATO's ekspansion af historien, kontroversen over missilforsvaret, den voldelige afsættelse, støttet af Vesten, at den demokratisk valgte regering i Ukraine og mange andre tegn på NATO's aggression over for Rusland over en periode på mere end 20 år. Ved at udelukke denne del af historien, kan NATO komme med det argument, at det »responderer« til russisk »aggression«, når kendsgerningen er, at de russiske forholdsregler faktisk er responser til den trussel, det ser komme fra NATO.

Foto: NATO-vicegeneralsekretær Rose Gottemoeller, i Litauen.

Kina og Rusland advarer Seoul og Washington om deployering af THAAD

13. jan., 2017 – I kølvandet på et møde i går i den Sjette Russisk-kinesiske konsultation om sikkerheden i Sydøstasien, advarede Rusland og Kina om, at de har til hensigt at tage »modforholdsregler« som respons til den foreslåede deployering af Terminal High Altitude Defense System (THAAD) i Sydkorea.

Disse modforholdsregler er designet til at beskytte Kinas og Ruslands interesser og den strategiske balance i området, som de anser for truet af THAAD-deployeringen. Begge nationer har, gennem deres Udenrigsministerier, opfordret USA og Sydkorea til at adressere disse sikkerhedsspørgsmål og standse den planlagte deployering. Ifølge TASS advarede Ruslands Udenrigsministerium om, at, ved at forfølge THAAD-deployeringen, vil Washington og Seoul »forhøje spændingerne og styrke våbenkapløbet i området, såvel som også udvide militære øvelser« og »skade den regionale stabilitet og sikkerhed«. I betragtning af det »høje konfliktpotentiale« og den »komplekse og følsomme« situation på Halvøen, understregede Ministeriet, er det afgørende at søge »fælles bestræbelser, der har til formål at finde en meningsfuld strategi, der ville vise vejen ud af det nuværende dødvande og være med til at afgøre spørgsmålet om atomvåben og andre problemer, som Korea-halvøen konfronteres med.«

Xinhua understregede, at de to nationer insisterede på målet med at »fjerne atomvåben fra Korea-halvøen for at sikre fred og stabilitet«.

Tysk militærekspert: Rusland har ingen planer om at invadere Baltikum, og alle ved det

13. jan., 2017 – Pensionerede tyske oberstløjtnant Jochen Scholz sagde til Sputnik, at der er flere aspekter til USA's deployering af tropper til Polen, som alle udgør en del af et spil, der skal retfærdiggøre USA/NATO's militære opbygning og sabotagen af amerikansk-russiske relationer under den tiltrædende Trump-administration.

»For det første forsøger Obama-administrationen og forsvarsminister Ashton Carter at lægge en snublesten i vejen for den tiltrædende præsident. For det andet skal den tyske og europæiske offentlighed have at vide, hvor farlig, Rusland er, og hvordan Rusland er en trussel mod nabolande såsom de Baltiske Stater. Det tredje punkt er, at sådanne handlinger bruges til at overtale offentligheden til at spendere flere penge på militæret«, fortsatte Scholz.

»Og, afhængig af, hvordan Rusland responderer til denne deployering, vil der måske komme et fjerde argument, der siger, 'der kan I selv se; vi forsvarer blot Baltikum, men russerne har omgående reageret og bygger offensive styrker her'«, sagde Scholz. »De ved udmærket godt, at Rusland ikke har nogen planer om det [at invadere de Baltiske Lande]. Det er en del af spillet. Man opdigter en trussel, der ikke eksisterer, med det formål at retfærdiggøre større militær tilstedeværelse og større forsvarsudgifter.«

Foto: Pensionerede tyske oberstløjtnant Jochen Scholz til

Tidligere NATO-chef advarer om »søvngænger« ind i en konfrontation med Rusland

13. jan., 2017 – I bemærkninger for det britiske Overhus advarede Sir George Robertson, tidligere NATO-generalsekretær (1999-2003), Storbritannien – og Vesten – om, at de muligvis er ved at »gå i søvne ind i en potentiel katastrofe« med konfrontation med Rusland, iflg. avisen *Daily Mail*.

»Vi må være opmærksomme på og handle på de iboende farer i den aktuelle konfrontation mellem Rusland og Vesten«, intonerede han. »Uden den Kolde Krigs snubletråde og advarselsarrangementer er vi i alvorlig fare for at begå en fejl eller fejlregning, med potentielt katastrofale resultater. Vi har en optimisme-krise – vi håber på det bedste, og forsømmer at forberede os på det værste.«

Robertsons bemærkninger blev rapporteret i sammenhæng med udtalelser af det højtplacerede Tory-parlamentsmedlem Crispin Blunt, leder af udenrigsudvalget, og som sagde, at, bortset fra krig, så er relationerne mellem Storbritannien og Rusland »så dårlige, som de kan blive« og tilføjede, at den gensidige »officielle skænderi-konkurrence mellem UK og Rusland ikke er til fordel for nogen af landene eller for videre internationale relationer«.

Foto: Tidligere NATO-generalsekretær Sir George Robertson.

Moskva: Obamas seneste militære deployeringer har til hensigt at komplicere amerikansk-russiske relationer for Trump

13. jan., 2017 – Henved 2700 amerikanske tropper (ud af forventede 3500) ankom i denne uge til Polen for at overtage de Abrams tanks og andet udstyr, der blev losset i Bremerhaven, Tyskland, for en uge siden og dernæst sendt via jernbane til Polen. Der er allerede små grupper af amerikanske specialenhedsstyrker i hver af de Baltiske Stater, og man er ved at lægge grunden til en formation af en amerikanskledet NATO-bataljon i Polen.

Det ses alt sammen i Moskva som en provokation, ikke alene mod selve Rusland, men også mod fremtidige amerikansk-russiske relationer.

»Vi anskuer disse handlinger som endnu et eksempel på provokerende militær aktivitet tæt på Ruslands grænser inden for rammerne af en berygtet linje, der går ud på at inddæmme Rusland«, sagde talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova i går under sin pressebriefing. Hun sagde, at formålet med disse bestræbelser er forsøget fra den afdgående Barack Obama-administrations side på at »komplicere så meget som muligt situationen i de bilaterale relationer og gøre de nye, amerikanske myndigheder til gidsel for dens systematiske og temmelig fjendtlighedsindede politik over for Rusland«. Rusland må tage denne amerikanske

militæropbygning tæt på sine grænser i betragtning i sin egen militære planlægning, bemærkede hun. »Vi håber, at den nye amerikanske regering ikke vil handle i overensstemmelse med denne linje, som er et åbenlyst dødvande, og som fremprovokerer konfrontation mellem vore lande«, sagde hun.

Talsmand for Kreml, Dmitri Peskov, sagde ligefremt til reportere i går, at ankomsten af tropperne i Polen udgør en trussel mod Rusland.

»Ethvert land kan anse en opbygning af udenlandsk militær tilstedeværelse tæt på sine grænser som noget negativt, og vil gøre det. Det er præcis sådan, vi ser det«, sagde han. »Vi fortolker dette som en trussel mod os og som handlinger, der udgør en fare for vore interesser og for vores sikkerhed.« Peskov påpegede, at »et tredjeland er i færd med at opruste sin militære tilstedeværelse tæt på vore grænser i Europa«. »Dette land er ikke engang selv europæisk«, sagde han og tilføjede, at størrelsen af det militære kontingent var ligegyldigt. »Om det er et tusinde eller ti tusinde, det er det samme«, understregede han.

Foto: Talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium Maria Zakharova under en af sine ugentlige briefinger til pressen.

**Kinesiskbygget afrikansk
jernbanelinje, der forbinder
Djibouti og Addis Abeba,**

tages i brug

11. jan., 2017 – En multimilliarddollar, kinesiskbygget jernbaneforbindelse, der forbinder Afrikas Horn med kontinentets udstrakte indlandsområder, blev officielt åbnet den 10. januar og udgør en vigtig milepæl i Kinas spirende indflydelse i området. Den 750 km lange jernbanelinje forbinder havnebyen Djibouti ved Det røde Hav og Addis Abeba, hovedstaden i indlandsstaten Etiopien, Afrikas hurtigst voksende økonomi. Jernbanen forventes at reducere rejsetiden mellem de to byer fra tre dage via veje, og til blot 12 timer med tog. Det anses også bredt for at være begyndelsen til et trans-afrikansk jernbaneprojekt, hvor en 2000 km lang linje vil forbinde Djibouti, beliggende ved mødestedet mellem Det røde Hav og Adengolfen, en port til Suezkanalen og en af verdens travleste skibsruter, tværs over Afrika til Atlanterhavet.

Jernbanen blev for 70 % 's vedkommende finansieret af Kinas Exim Bank og bygget af to store, statsejede selskaber – China Civil Engineering Construction Corp. (CCECC) og China Railway Construction Corp. Det er det seneste symbol på Kinas voksende tilstedeværelse i Afrika, et kontinent, der traditionelt har befundet sig under Vestens koloniale indflydelse. Jernbanelinjen er den første, elektrificerede jernbane, bygget med standardmål, på kontinentet, bygget med kinesiske standarder og teknologi.

Under indvielsesceremonien i går morges sagde Yuan Li, præsident for CCECC, at åbningen af den nye jernbane var »en drøm, der gik i opfyldelse« og »endnu et symbol for det kinesisk-afrikanske venskab«.

Amerikanske marinesoldater ankommer til Norge

11. jan., 2017 – Et forstærket kompagni amerikanske marinesoldater lander i Norge i denne uge, i hælene på ankomsten af tanks og andet udstyr til den 3. brigade, 4. infanteridivision, til Bremerhaven, Tyskland, i sidste uge. Marinesoldaterne vil blive i en seks måneders rotation, hvilket gør det muligt for dem at deltage i en langt mere intensiv træning, især i et arktisk miljø, end det ellers ville være muligt. Senere på vinteren vil de deltage i en fælles amerikansk-britisk-norsk øvelse ved navn Joint Viking. De vil også få mulighed for at komme til De baltiske Lande.

Marinesoldaterne vil være baseret på Flyvestation Værnes lige uden for Trondheim i det centrale Norge, hvor de har adgang til at benytte et forud deployeret lager af tanks, lastbiler og andre køretøjer, der er i depot i grotter med aircondition.

Depotet stammer tilbage fra 1982, men dette bliver første gang, udenlandske tropper er blevet udstationeret på norsk jord, siden nazisternes besættelse under Anden Verdenskrig.

Foto: USA har deployeret enorme mængder militært udstyr til Norge, hvor det er i depot i grotter med aircondition. Foto fra februar, 2016.

Det afgørende punkt er, at

**menneskehedens
fælles interesse er dens
fremskridt.**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Webcast,**

13. januar, 2017; Leder

Vores udsendelse i aften falder i tre dele. De tre dele er naturligvis indbyrdes forbundne, men første del er et klip fra et interview, som vores ven og kollega Jason Ross lavede med Ray McGovern, en CIA-veteran, der har været analytiker i 30 år, og som nu er medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.

Udsendelsens anden del er et klip fra en præsentation af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der var et gennembrud i Stockholm, Sverige, i går (11. jan.), for et publikum, der bl.a. bestod af et bredt udsnit af det internationale diplomatiske samfund.

Og det tredje indslag i aften forfølger vores igangværende understregning af en intensivering af forståelsen af Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske opdagelser; og det vil omfatte en gennemgang ved Rachel Brown af en artikel, som hr. LaRouche offentliggjorde for nogen tid siden, med titlen, »In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton« (http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/2017_01-09/2017-02/pdf/32-42_4402.pdf), som hun komplementerer med en gennemgang af noget af materialet fra hr. LaRouches opgradering og fordybelse af ideen om, ikke infrastruktur (i sig selv), men om økonomiske platforme. Disse tre dele vil udgøre vores udsendelse for i aften.

For at indlede vores første del, kan vi referere til et indslag på LaRouchePAC's webside i dag. Titlen er, »The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia« (indholdet er dækket i Tom Gillesbergs indledning til Nyhedsorientering januar, læs: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17270>), og det handler direkte om de efterretninger, som vi vil få klarhed over i aften. At de, som virkelig intervenserer i amerikansk politik, ikke er de russiske efterretningstjenester, men snarere direkte er britisk efterretningstjeneste. Det 35 sider lange – hvad man vel må kalde et falsk dossier – om Trumps angivelige forbindelser med Rusland, og som blev citeret af CNN tidligere på ugen i en nyhedshistorie; og som dernæst blev offentliggjort eller lækket af Buzzfeed. Det afsløres nu, at dette blev forfattet af en fremtrædende, angiveligt pensioneret MI-6-efterretningsmand ved navn Christopher Steele; han blev først hyret af operatører fra det Republikanske Parti, der var modstandere af Trump i primærvalgene, og som dernæst blev hyret af Hillary Clintons kampagne for at udføre politisk kontra-research om Donald Trump. Det skulle bruges, ikke som en efterretningsfil, men til at tilsværte Trump under valget. Så dette er slet ikke en efterretningsrapport, som den blev præsenteret for at være af visse amerikanske medier, der lækkede den; men den var snarere blot en politisk misinformationsfil, der, som vi ser, kommer direkte fra britiske efterretningsoperatører. Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump brugte igen her til morgen twitter til at udfordre dette. Han sagde: »Det viser sig nu, at de falske anklager imod mig blev sammensat af mine politiske modstandere og en mislykket spion, der er bange for at blive sagsøgt. Totalt fabrikerede fakta fra foragtelige politiske operatører, både Demokrater og Republikanere. Falske nyheder. Rusland siger, at der intet findes; det er sandsynligvis udgivet af 'efterretningstjenester', vel vidende, at der intet bevis findes, og aldrig vil findes.«

Det, der står klart, er, at efterretningssamfundet har

erklæret krig mod USA's nyvalgte præsident, der vil blive indsat om under en uge fra i dag. Dette er en situation uden fortilfælde; og briternes rolle er klar, som det ses af denne mand, Christopher Steele. Som jeg sagde, så, på trods af den narrativ, at det skulle være russerne, der kører en eller anden enorm indflydelses-kampagne for at forsøge at intervenere i og influere de amerikanske valg, så begynder det at se ud som om, at den virkelig misdæder her, var briterne.

Med denne indledning vil jeg nu gerne vise et klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern. Som sagt har han 30 år som CIA-veterananalytiker bag sig; han var i sin tid ekspert i Rusland eller Sovjetunionen, da han var dér. Han var ansvarlig for at udarbejde nationale efterretningsestimater, og en daglig brief til præsidenten. Efter sin tid i CIA blev han medstifter af en organisation ved navn Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, der nu har omkring 50 medlemmer, pensionerede efterretningseksperter, der for nylig udstedte en erklæring, der satte seriøse spørgsmålstejn ved den narrativ, der blev offentliggjort om russisk indflydelse og russisk hacking. Hele interviewet vil være tilgængeligt fra søndag (15. jan.), på LaRouchePAC websiden og LaRouchePAC YouTube kanalen; og vi har udlagt andre uddrag af dette interview hen over de seneste par dage. Det uddrag, vi bringer her, er begyndelsen af interviewet, der blev udført af Jason Ross, med hr. Ray McGovern.

Jason Ross: Det er den 10. januar, 2017; jeg er Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC. Vi er meget glade for i dag at have Ray McGovern med os i studiet, en veteran, der har været i CIA i årtier, og som i 2003 var medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Mange tak for at være med os i dag, Ray.

Ray McGovern: I er meget velkomne. Jeg er glad for at være her.

Ross: Lad os springe direkte til ét af de store spørgsmål, vi

hører så meget om i medierne i øjeblikket – spørgsmålet om den angivelige russiske hacking af de amerikanske valg. Jeres gruppe, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, udstedte en pressemeddelelse den 12. december, der sagde, at alle beviser pegede på en læk snarere end et hack. Siden da er to rapporter kommet frem; en fra DHS (Department of Homeland Security) og en, der hovedsagligt er forfattet af ODNI, Director of National Intelligence, og som siger, at her er beviset. Vi ved, Rusland gjorde det. Det var tvivlsomt, hvor brugbar denne rapport var. Og for et par dage siden var du så medforfatter af en kronik i *Baltimore Sun* sammen med William Binney, hvor du gentog dit standpunkt; at alle beviser peger på, at dette er en læk snarere end et hack, og under alle omstændigheder er der ikke blevet fremlagt nogen beviser for, at det skulle være et hack. Hvorfor har du dette standpunkt?

McGovern: Først må jeg sige noget om Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Vi oprettede vores organisation, da vi så, at vore kolleger – de kolleger, vi havde arbejdet sammen med – havde ladet sig forlede til at skabe, til at fabrikere efterretninger med det overlagte formål at franarre vore valgte repræsentanter deres forfatningsmæssige, særlige rettigheder til at erklære eller på anden vis bemyndige krig. Det var før Irak; og det kan ikke blive værre.

Bush, Cheney og de andre sagde alle sammen, »Åh, det var en frygtelig fejltagelse.« Det var ikke nogen fejltagelse; det var slet og ret bedrag. Da vi så dette finde sted, dannede vi en lille gruppe – vi var fem til at begynde med – og vi begyndte at gå offentligt. Vi udgav tre memoranda før krigen, hvor vi advarede præsidenten. Vores første memorandum blev udgivet samme dag, som Colin Powell (udenrigsminister 2001 – 2005) holdt sin tale – den 5. februar, 2003 – og vi gav ham et C- for indhold. Og vi advarede præsidenten (George W. Bush), »Efterretningerne bliver manipuleret, og de bør virkelig udvide kredsen af Deres rådgivere«, sagde vi mod slutningen, »til at omfatte andre end dem, der tydeligvis er opsat på at

få en krig, for hvilken vi ikke kan se, der skulle være nogen tvingende grund, og de utilsigtede konsekvenserne af hvilken sandsynligvis vil blive katastrofale.« Den kendsgerning, at vi havde ret, fryder os ikke; der var et par andre personer, der sagde det samme, men der var ingen, der kom igennem til de etablerede medier.

Hvis vi spoler lidt frem, så ser vi, at de daværende NSA-folk ikke alene var rystede over, hvor mange penge, der blev smidt ind i programmer, som de vidste, aldrig ville virke; men de var også oprørte over et billigere program, som de selv havde udarbejdet – som blot kostede \$330 mio. at indføre. Det andet program, som general Hayden støttede, kostede \$3 mia. med et 'b'; så der var ingen sammenligning. Bortset fra, at det ene ikke fungerede; det gjorde dette her. Grunde til, at jeg nævner dette, er, at dette havde masser af beviser for, hvad der ville ske under 11. september; det lå i det. De gik tilbage og så efter; de lukkede dette hovedprogram ned, og da Tom Drake, som stadig var ansat der, gik ind og så efter, så fandt han masser af beviser, der ville have – hvis det var blevet omdelt – forhindret 11. september. Så man var dobbelt oprørt, og Bill Binney havde været teknisk direktør i NSA før han trådte af kort tid efter 11. september. Han tilsluttede sig så os, som så mange andre vidunderlige folk har gjort; og da dette kom på nettet online, dette her med den russiske hacking, så var det mest naturlige for mig at sige, »Hej, Bill. Vi har brug for et memo fra dig; vi har brug for, at du laver et udkast. For du designede de fleste af disse systemer, og du ved, hvad Ed Snowden har afsløret. Disse billeder? De ser virkelig interessante ud for os, men vi har brug for nogen, der kan gennemgå dem for os.« Så sagde han, »Helt i orden«. Så gav han os et udkast, og det, vi typisk gør, er, at vi cirkulerer det blandt de fem, seks eller syv personer, der har særlig interesse i det, eller særlig erfaring; og mellem os fandt vi ud af det rigtige. Vi var én af de første, der kom ud af starthullerne og sagde, »Jo, dette er en spand (lort)! Hvorfor? Af tekniske grunde.« Der var masser af andre grunde,

men nogle folk – til deres ære, mener jeg – de er teknisk orienteret, og de vil vide, »Er dette muligt? Kunne russerne have gjort dette?« Svaret er, »Ja, men NSA ville have vidst besked med det.«

Det er chokerende, Jason, det er chokerende. Men NSA sporer *alle e-mails på denne planet*. Hvis disse går til udlandet, så har de samarbejdende tjenester og regeringer. Ikke blot seks, men de har 13 af dem. Hvis de går igennem USA, så får de dem; hvis de kommer udefra, får de dem alle. Og de kan spore dem; de har disse her små sporingsmekanismer forskellige steder i netværket. Så de ved, hvor hver eneste e-mail kommer fra, og hvor den ender.

Føj hertil den jernovervågning de har af den ecuadorianske ambassade i London, hvor Julian Assange er; og jeg er sikker på, at de overvåger hans kolleger også, uanset, hvor de er. Lad os nu sige, de russiske hack, og de fik det frem til Julian, og til en af hans medarbejdere. »OK, russere er virkelig dårlige mennesker«, siger folk; »Vis os meddelelserne.« »Åh, det kan vi ikke; vi har ikke meddelelserne. Men vi kigger på det.« De fik så præsidenten til, før han tog på ferie på Hawaii, at pålægge sanktioner, baseret på disse flygtige beviser, som de ikke kan vise os. Disse memoer – min første reaktion var at le ad dem, men det er meget sørgeligt at se, hvad efterretningssamfundet er blevet til; meget, meget sørgeligt. For dette er et vigtigt spørgsmål.

Hvad gjorde præsidenten så? Han slog ned på sanktioner; han smed 35 diplomater ud. Alt sammen ud fra hvis udsagn? John Brennans. Hvordan fik så *New York Times* al denne information? John Brennan. Det ved vi, fordi *Wall Street Journal* blev lidt sur over det, og de siger, »Ja, det er John Brennan, der taler med de andre fyre; han taler ikke med *Wall Street Journal*.« Hvad har vi så? Vi har en præsident, der tager en chance på lemfældigt grundlag og forårsager en endnu større fare, mere aggressiv kritik, flere spændinger i vore relationer med

Rusland. På baggrund af hvad? Lad mig sige det sådan; jeg vil måske sige det sådan: Jeg sad og så på nogle YouTube-klip; og jeg faldt over et af Christiane Amanpour, der sendte fra London. Hun er i færd med at interviewe Lukyanov, en af de russiske guruer. Hun siger, »Hr. Lukyanov [imiterer Amanpours stemme] De siger, at der absolut *ingen* beviser er, *ingen*, siger De. Jamen, når der ikke findes beviser, hvorfor har USA's præsident så smidt sanktioner på Rusland?«

Ross: Den er god.

McGovern: Jeg husker, at jeg fik stillet det samme spørgsmål omkring masseødelæggelsesvåben. [Imiterer igen Amanpours stemme] »Hr. McGovern, hvis De siger, at der ikke findes beviser for masseødelæggelsesvåben, hvorfor startede Bush og Cheney så en krig mod Irak?« Tja, svaret er det samme, det samme! Det er virkelig et dårligt flashback, for det, de må gøre, er at komme frem med beviserne. Det er min stærke opfattelse, at det vil de ikke gøre; ikke pga. kilder og metoder, men fordi, der ikke findes nogen.

(Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet):

The Crucial Point Is that Our Common Interest As Mankind Is Man's Progress

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast January 13, 2017

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's January 13, 2017.

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our regular Friday evening webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the

studio today by Megan Beets from the LaRouche PAC Science Team;

and via video by two members of our LaRouche PAC Policy Committee

– Michael Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California; and

Rachel Brown, joining us from Boston, Massachusetts.

We have a three-part show for you today. The three segments

will obviously be interrelated, but they will feature first a clip from a feature interview that our friend and colleague Jason

Ross did with Ray McGovern, a veteran CIA professional analyst for 30 years, and now the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. We have a second segment which features a clip from a breakthrough presentation that Helga Zepp-LaRouche made in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday to an audience comprised of a large cross section of the international

diplomatic community. And then a third segment tonight which pursues our ongoing emphasis on deepening the understanding of Lyndon LaRouche's economic discoveries; and that will include a

review by Rachel Brown of a paper that Mr. LaRouche published a

while ago, called "In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton", complemented by a review of some of the material from

the last few years of Mr. LaRouche's upgrading and deepening of

the idea of not infrastructure, but economic platforms. So, that

will be our three part show from this evening.

To begin our first part, I think that we can refer to an

item that's posted on the LaRouche PAC website today. The title

of that is, "The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain,

Not Russia"; and this goes directly to the intelligence that we're getting clarity on today. That the ones who are in fact interfering in US politics, are not the Russian intelligence services, but rather, directly, British intelligence. The

35-page – I guess you could call it dodgy dossier – on Trump's supposed connections with Russia that was cited by CNN earlier this week in a news story; and then published or leaked by BuzzFeed. This is now being exposed as being authored by a prominent supposedly-retired MI-6 officer, a man named Christopher Steele; who was hired first by Republican Party operatives who were opposing Donald Trump in the primaries, and then was rehired by Hillary Clinton's campaign to do political opposition research on Donald Trump. To be used not as an intelligence brief, but to politically smear Trump in the election. So again, this is not an intelligence report at all, as it was represented by certain US media outlets that leaked it; but rather merely a political disinformation brief, coming directly from, as we see, British intelligence operatives. President-elect Donald Trump took to twitter again this morning to call this out. He said, "It now turns out that the phony allegations against me were put together by my political opponents and a failed spy afraid of being sued. Totally made-up facts by sleaze-bag political operatives, both Democrats and Republicans. Fake news. Russia says nothing exists; probably released by 'intelligence', even knowing there is no proof and never will be."

What is clear is that the intelligence community has declared war on the President-elect of the United States, who is due to be inaugurated in less than one week from the present moment. This is an unprecedented situation; and the role of the British in this is clear, as can be seen by the role of this character Christopher Steele. As I said, despite the narrative that the Russians were running some huge influence campaign to

try to interfere and influence the American election, it's beginning to look like the real culprit here was the British.

With that said as a matter of introduction, I'd like to play a clip of this interview that we did with Ray McGovern. As I said, he's a 30-year veteran analyst with the CIA; he was a Russia or Soviet Union specialist at the time he was there. He's responsible for preparing national intelligence estimates and the Presidential daily brief. Now, since his time at the CIA, he has become the co-founder of an organization called the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, which now has about 50 members, retired intelligence specialists who recently put out a statement seriously calling into question the narrative being put out about Russian influence and Russian hacking. The full interview will be available beginning on Sunday on the LaRouche PAC website and the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and we have released other excerpts of this interview over the past few days. This excerpt you're about to see is the very beginning of the interview, which was conducted by Jason Ross, with Mr. Ray McGovern.

JASON ROSS: Hi! Thanks for joining us. It's January 10, 2017; I'm Jason Ross here at LaRouche PAC. We are very happy to have in the studio today Ray McGovern, multi-decade veteran of the CIA and the co-founder in 2003 of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Thanks very much for coming today, Ray.

RAY McGOVERN: You're most welcome; I'm glad to be with you.

ROSS: So, let's jump right into one of the big issues that we're hearing about so much in the media today – the issue of purported Russian hacking of the US elections. Now your group, the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity released a press statement on December 12th, saying that all evidence pointed towards a leak rather than a hack. Since then, two reports have come out; one from the DHS and one primarily authored by the ODNI, the Director of National Intelligence, saying here's the proof. We know Russia did it. The report was of questionable usefulness. Then just a few days ago, you co-authored an op-ed in the {Baltimore Sun} with William Binney, where you restated your position; that all evidence points toward this being leak rather than a hack, and in any case, evidence of a hack is not been presented. Why do you take that position?

McGOVERN: Well, I need to tell you something about Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity first. We established ourselves when we saw that our colleagues – the colleagues with whom we had worked – had let themselves be suborned into creating, into fabricating intelligence for the express purpose of deceiving our elected representatives out of their Constitutional prerogatives to declare or otherwise authorize war. That was before Iraq; and that's as bad as it gets.

Bush, Cheney, and the others all said, "Oh, it was a terrible mistake." It was not a mistake; it was out and out

fraud. When we saw that happening, we formed a little group – there were five of us in the beginning – and we started publishing. We published three memoranda before the war, warning the President. Our first one was on the day of Colin Powell's speech – the 5th of February, 2003 – and we gave him a C- for content. And we warned the President, "The intelligence is being manipulated and you really should widen the circle of your advisors," we said at the end, "beyond those who are clearly bent on a war for which we see no compelling reason, and from which, we believe the unintended consequences are likely to be catastrophic." We take no delight in the fact that we happened to be right on that; there were a couple of other people saying that, but nobody got into the mainstream media.

So, if you fast forward now, you see that the NSA people who were in place at the time, not only were appalled at how much money was being thrown at programs that they knew would never work; but were outraged when they found out that a cheaper program that they devised themselves – which only cost \$330 million to emplace. The other one that General Hayden went for, cost \$3 billion with a "b"; so no comparison. Except that one didn't work; this one did. The reason I mention that, is this had plenty of evidence what was going to happen in 9/11; it was in there. They went back and they looked; they closed that main program down, and when Tom Drake, who was still employed there, went in and looked, he found plenty of evidence that would have

– had it been shared – prevented 9/11. So, double outrage here, and Bill Binney had been the technical director at NSA before he left shortly after 9/11. So, he joined us, like so many other wonderful people have; and when this went viral, this business about Russian hacking, it was the most natural thing for me to do to say, "Hey, Bill. We need a memo from you; we need you to do a draft. Because you know, you designed most of these systems, and you know what Ed Snowden has revealed. Those slides? They look really interesting to us, but we need somebody to take us through them." So, he said, "Sure." So, he gave us a draft, and what we typically do is, we circulate it around the five or six or seven people who have special interests in that, or special experience; and we got it right together. We were one of the first ones off the block saying "Yeah, this is a crock! Why? For technical reasons." There were plenty of other reasons, but some people – and I think it's to their credit – they're technically oriented, and they want to know, "Is this possible? Could the Russians have done this?" Well, the answer is "Yes, but NSA would know about it."

Now, it boggles the mind, Jason, it boggles the mind. But NSA traces {all emails on this planet}. If they go abroad, they have cooperating agencies and cooperating governments. Not only six, they have about 13 of them. If they go through the United States, they get them; if they come from outside, they get them

all. And they can trace them; they have these little trace mechanisms at various points in the network. So, they know where

each and every email originates and where it ends up.

Now, add to that the ironclad coverage they have of the

Ecuadoran embassy in London, where Julian Assange is; and I'm sure that they monitor his colleagues as well wherever they happen to be. So, let's say the Russians hack, and they got it

to Julian, they got it to one of his associates. "Well, OK, Russians are really bad people," people say; "Show us the messages." "Oh, we can't; we don't have the messages. But we'll

look at it." Now, they got the President, before he went on vacation to Hawaii, to impose sanctions based on this elusive evidence that they can't show us. These memos – my first reaction was to laugh at them, but this a very sad thing to see

what the intelligence community has become; very, very sad. Because this is an important issue.

So, what did the President do? He slapped on sanctions;

threw out 35 diplomats. All on whose say-so? John Brennan's. Now, how did the {New York Times} get all this information? John

Brennan. We know that because the {Wall Street Journal} was a little ticked off about it, and they said, "Yeah, it's Brennan that's talking to these other guys; he's not talking to the {Wall

Street Journal}." So, what do we have here? We have the President going out on a limb, causing even more danger, more flak, more tensions in our relationship with Russia. On the basis of what? Well, let me just say this; maybe I'll put it this way: I was looking at some YouTube clips; and I happened upon one of Christiane Amanpour, broadcasting from London. She's

interviewing Lukyanov, one of the Russian gurus. She says, "Mr.

Lukyanov, [imitating Amanpour's voice] you say there's {zero} evidence, you say {zero}. Well, if there's zero evidence, why is it that the President of the United States has slapped sanctions on Russia?"

ROSS: That's good.

McGOVERN: I remember being asked that question about weapons of mass destruction. [Again imitating Amanpour's voice]

"Mr. McGovern, if you say there's no evidence of weapons of mass destruction, why did Bush and Cheney start a war on Iraq?" Well, same answer; same answer! It's a really bad flashback, because what they need to do, is come up with the evidence. My strong view is that they're not going to do that; not because of sources and methods, but because there isn't any.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, that's part of a much longer interview, and part of it has already been posted on YouTube under the title "Sources and Methods Versus National Interests"; and you can expect the full interview to be posted and available coming Sunday, the day after tomorrow.

But I would like to just use that to invite the other members of the broadcast here today to just open up a bit of a discussion on this subject.

MICHAEL STEGER: In all of this discussion, apparently some people are not pulling back over so-called "Trump's ties to

Russia." What this whole situation now makes clear, is that the entire attack on the Trump campaign and the President-elect's policy towards Russia, has been the target explicitly of British Intelligence the entire time. The report that was released, this 35-page dodgy dossier, starts in June once Trump consolidates the nomination, essentially, for the Republican Party, and doesn't stop until mid-December of this just past year. And so, it's clear that British Intelligence were the ones pushing this the entire time. It's clear that Christopher Steele was close friends with now-head of MI-6, Alex Younger. The British media are panicking. A former Secretary General of the NATO, a British Lord, came out and said this is a total panic. We could be sleepwalking into a complete catastrophe.

It's clear the British had an explicit intent to manipulate the U.S. elections, to fabricate false intelligence on a major candidate, to drum up a conspiracy – so-called "hacking" by the Russians to disrupt U.S. foreign policy and U.S. interests – against the welfare of the American people. To those who know history, and know Mr. LaRouche's role in the last 40-50 years of American politics, this role of British Intelligence, includes people who represented British outlooks, like Henry Kissinger, a public advocate of British foreign policy against the American outlook; the British hand, not just in an attempt to destroy and manipulate the Presidential election and alter U.S. foreign policy changes, but the direct role of the British in support of the terrorists in Syria, via Saudi Arabia, and other nations;

the
direct role of the British, such as David Cameron, who just
high-tailed it out of Downing Street and the British
Parliament,
because he was directly exposed in a fraudulent-led campaign
against Libya; the false intelligence of Tony Blair on the
Iraq
war, which Ray McGovern was just referring to.

Besides that, you've got then the international drug
trade,
which we documented beginning in the 1970s, with {Dope, Inc.},
and the international drug trade run by Her Majesty, Queen
Elizabeth. Who, by the way, could be on her death-bed; and
that
wouldn't necessarily be a bad thing.

You've got an international drug trade, and
international
war program, international terrorism, and, of course, the
Wall-Street/London nexus of international finance, which has
run
this absolute cult of financial policy for decades, for
centuries, in essence. This is the same institution which was
responsible for the assassination of Alexander Hamilton,
Abraham
Lincoln, William McKinley, the attempted assassination of FDR,
the backing of Hitler. By the way, I think the Russian
Embassy
in London made it clear that it was the Brits, such as the
Cliveden set, who were responsible for backing Hitler. That
they're coming out now and targeting the potential policy
changes
in the United States, one towards Russia, potentially towards
China – to end the threat of nuclear world war.

They're also attempting to disrupt what could be a
very
important – as I think we'll see from Helga Zepp LaRouche's
clip

– relationship between the U.S., China, and Russia, on an economic policy; and, as we know it to be very important that we'll get to later as well, a fundamental change in U.S. financial policy. This British nexus is targeting the Trump campaign and targeting this entire change in U.S. policy. This is British imperial tactics. This is what they do; they are at the source of it. If there's going to be a Congressional investigation of any foreign nations' or foreign agents' involvement to manipulate U.S. democracy, I think first and foremost, it has to be the United Kingdom.

RACHEL BRINKLEY: The fact that on page 15 of these 35 pages, it attacks LaRouche by name, saying that there were Trump factions travelling to meet with Putin factions, as part of this alliance in the summer of 2016. They cite LaRouche directly in this report as having representatives that went to Russia as part of this discussion; which did not happen. As this was authored by the British, this is just the British Empire freaked out about LaRouche's policies taking over, and the potential of a United States/Russia/China alliance, especially the Russia/U.S. cooperation.

I think it is notable that if you have the United States, Russia, and China working together, there's no problem on the planet that can't be solved. That's an unstoppable alliance. I think the British are desperate, and that's what we're seeing.

OGDEN: That's exactly what Helga LaRouche presented at this conference that happened in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday.

This was an extraordinary conference, and I'm going to play a clip of her opening speech to you right now. This was a standing-room-only capacity audience that included 17 diplomats,

a cross-section of the entire planet, including seven ambassadors. She delivers her analysis of what we've really seen

behind this showdown, as we've been discussing, of the British and American intelligence establishment vs. the incoming President-elect. She highlights, towards the end of these excerpted remarks – and again, this is only an excerpt, in bits

and pieces – the whole speech contains a lot more substance in terms of what you just said, Rachel.

The motivation behind ending this confrontational policy

towards Russia and towards China, is that if Russia, China, and

the United States were to join, in a grand alliance, around what

is now a concrete policy initiative coming out of China – the One Belt, One Road, or New Silk Road project – to bring development to the interior of not only Eurasia, but also Africa

and the North and South America landmass, and were to reorganize

our relations around what's now being called the "win-win" paradigm among nations – then everything is possible. She explores a lot of these questions in the {full} speech, which will be available in video form in just a few hours.

In what you're about to hear, she touches on what must be

done, both strategically and economically, to shape the policy of

this incoming new Presidency. I apologize for the quality of the

audio. It was not the best audio recording, but again, in just

a few hours, we will have the full video that will be available. This is just a taste:

HELGA ZEPP LAROUCHE (Audio excerpt): ... Let me start with the Trump election. Now, I have in my whole political life, which is now becoming quite long, several decades – I have never in my whole political life, seen such hysteria on the side of the neo-cons, on the side of the mainstream politicians, on the side of the liberal media, as concerning Trump... But what was caused Trump, is that he simply promised end the political paradigm which was the basis of eight years of George W. Bush and eight years of Barack Obama, which was a direct continuation of the Bush-Cheney policy.

And it was a good thing, because it was very clear that if Hillary Clinton would have won the election in the United States, that all the policies she was pursuing, including an no-fly zone over Syria, and an extremely bellicose policy towards Russia and China, would have meant that we would have been on the direct course to World War III.

The fact that Hillary did not win the election was {extremely} important for the maintenance of world peace. And I think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the fact that he said ... that he will normalize the relationship between the United States and Russia, is, in my view {the most important

step}. Because if the relationship between the United States and Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I think there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world. And if that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world peace is in extreme danger.

So from my standpoint, there is reason to believe that this will happen. The Russian reaction has been very moderate, but optimistic that this may happen. If you look at the appointments, you have several cabinet members and other people in other high posts who are also for improving the relationship with Russia, such as Tillerson who is supposed to become Secretary of State; General Flynn, who is a conservative military man but also for normalization with Russia, and many others, so I think this is a good sign.

Now, if you look at the reaction of the neo-con/neo-liberal faction on both sides of the Atlantic to this election of Trump, you can only describe it as {completely} hysterical. The {Washington Post} today has an article "How to Remove Trump from Office," calling him a liar, just every derogative you can possibly imagine, just on and on unbelievable...

And then naturally, you have the reports by the different U.S. intelligence services, Clapper, Brennan, Comey from the FBI. They all put out the fact that that it was Russian hacking of

the
emails of the DNC and Podesta which would have stolen the
election, because they would have shifted the view of the
Americans to vote for Trump.

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many
cyber
experts, in Europe but also in the United States, already said
that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an
insider
leak giving this information out, which is more and more
likely,
and there's absolutely {zero} proof that it was Russian
hacking.

Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is what
was
the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved
that
Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie
Sanders!
That is not being talked about any more....

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the
neoliberal system of globalization which has violated the
interests of the majority of the people, especially in the
"rust
belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so
arrogant
that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states
which
were formerly industrialized. You have to see that the United
States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western
media
in Europe, is in a state of economic collapse...

[T]here is one indicator which shows if a society is
doing
good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or
shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first
time

for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment.

There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

So the vote, therefore, the narrative, was that the reason why Hillary was voted out because she was being perceived as the direct continuation of these 16 years, and so the attempt to change that narrative by saying it was "Russian hacking" is pretty obvious....

I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about... But there are other interesting elements, for example: Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion into the renewal of the infrastructure in the United States. That is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in North Carolina, that he would implement the 21st Century

Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and {only} if you have a Glass-Steagall law in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure...

OGDEN: Now, Helga continues from there to give a very inspiring overview of the development projects from the last three years that have been sparked by the initiative from China on the One Belt, One Road or the New Silk Road initiative. But she also gives an incredible history of the founding of the Schiller Institute and the role and she and Lyndon LaRouche have played over the last 30-40 years in the fight for a new, just, international economic and strategic order. A fight which is now coming to a certain point of culmination at least internationally; but the urgency of winning this fight here in the United States is something that she continued to emphasize, and it's exactly what she ended with there in that excerpt.

Right now, we must have the most urgent mobilization; there are no excuses for delay from {any} elected representative for an immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall. We have now launched

and are in the midst of a national mobilization; we've talked about this on previous broadcasts. But as you can see on the screen right now, we're circulating a petition which is collecting signatures; it needs to more rapidly accrue signatures. But it's accessible at lpac.co/trumpsotu; and again, this is a petition which originated from some citizen-activists in Ohio, who are associated with the "Our Revolution" movement, people who had been associated with the Bernie Sanders campaign during the primaries. But who have now taken it upon themselves to rally behind the initiative that LaRouche PAC has led; that we must have Glass-Steagall, and we must hold Trump to his word, when he called for a 21st Century Glass-Steagall at that speech in Charlotte, North Carolina. As I said, this has bipartisan support, and there are no excuses for delay. The only way this is going to happen, is if citizens across the United States decide to participate in this LaRouche PAC campaign and sign your name onto this petition: lpac.co/trumpsotu – State of the Union.

Now, we did have a day of action in Washington this week.

The Congress is now officially back in session; they've been sworn in and business is underway. There was participation from

many states up and down the East Coast in person.

Representatives coming in from Virginia, from Maryland, from Pennsylvania, from Connecticut, from New Jersey, from New York.

But there was also a lot of other participation from across

the country in terms of pressure being put on representatives to meet with members of the LaRouche PAC. There was a unique representative from the Manhattan Project, Mr. John Sigerson, who's the director of the Schiller Institute Chorus in New York City; who's been participating in some of the recent choral activities there, including the memorial at the Bayonne, New Jersey 9/11 Teardrop Memorial, where members of the Schiller Institute Chorus were joined by the PDNY Honor Guard and the Honor Guard from Bayonne, New Jersey to honor the tragic loss of the Alexandrov Choral Ensemble from Russia. This is just one example of the kind of power that the music program from the Manhattan Project, from New York City, has been able to play to shape the political dialogue in the United States and also across countries. In this case, the potential for a far-improved relationship between the United States and Russia. So again, this was a day of action in Washington, DC, but the mobilization has to continue. We are in a countdown; it's now a 7-day countdown until the inauguration. Then shortly after that, we will have the State of the Union; and again, this petition is to insist that Trump put a premium on highlighting the necessity for a return to the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act during that State of the Union. This has to be one of the number one agenda items of the first 100 days.

But, let's discuss a little bit more broadly what Helga LaRouche brought up at the end of that discussion; that

Glass-Steagall is only the first step, and there's a much more far-reaching and profound approach to a revolution in the economic policy of the United States that's necessary and which has been framed by Mr. LaRouche.

STEGER: Well Matt, I think it's important to start with how Mr. LaRouche initially responded immediately after the Trump election. His response was that this was global; and I think that really does capture this. The political process that is shaping the United States in contradiction to this British intelligence operation to destroy the United States, is really a global phenomenon; and I'll get to that in a second. But what Mrs. LaRouche then touched on in her speech is something that most Americans are experiencing, but because of that British intelligence operation, because of this mass-lie campaign that the American people have been living under; the official lie, in essence, Orwellian policy that even the Russian Foreign Ministry now refers to, that Americans have been living in since 9/11. This has kept them from identifying what is now physically identified; that the actual quality of life is collapsing at such rates that life expectancy is now beginning to collapse.

We have officially, you might say, entered into a Dark Age; a mini-Dark Age has begun in the United States. Now, this can be reversed. But the level of drug addiction has more than tripled under Obama's Presidency; the level of opiate addiction, the abuse of drugs like marijuana has skyrocketed under an Obama-supported legalization campaign. Which is of course, backed by the same drug cartels which are providing the

financial

backing to the banking institutions. This was Obama's program.

You've seen a massive level of homicides and crime and murder rates escalating in severely impoverished areas, including Obama's so-called "own neighborhood" of the South Side of Chicago. This level of breakdown has never been seen in the history of the United States; and it is only characteristic of societies which are beginning to utterly break down. Long-term

survival is not even a question; what's at immediate risk for an

increasing majority of Americans is short-term survival.

That's

what you see when you have decreasing life expectancy rates, increasing numbers of people are dying faster and faster; largely

from things like alcohol addiction, drug addiction, diseases related to despair, suicide and so on.

That's where Glass-Steagall comes in; and this is what really has to be captured. And why it's not simply Glass-Steagall, but the full Four Laws. I think Megan and Rachel

can say more, because we're currently working on a project to make this clear. But the role of fusion and the space program really captivate the fourth law in what direction our country has

to take to reawaken a sense of optimism, a sense of development

within the American culture. To break out, not just of disrepair

– breaking down of bridges, bad roads – we all know the bad roads and highways, especially on the East Coast. But that's not

what we have to emerge from. Building better roads isn't escaping from the clutches of a Dark Age; something greater has

to capture the real spirit of human identity and creativity.

Now, this is why it's so important to identify this global phenomenon; because the steps of the Four Laws: Glass-Steagall immediately; shut down this Wall Street banking cartel and basically a drug operation. The second is the public credit of a national banking system, which Paul Gallagher elaborated last night; we could say more on. To consolidate, aggregate the US debt that exists, as well as other financial resources towards the most important projects of development for the country; the most advanced levels of infrastructure, or the broader physical platform of industry and production. And of course most importantly, the fusion and space program.

This phenomenon globally is just somewhat breathtaking; and Mrs. LaRouche touches on it directly. The Transaqua project in Africa is something that we've been promoting for decades; this is something which begins to take the sub-Saharan area of Africa from the great lakes near the eastern part of Africa towards West Africa and Nigeria, up into the southern border of the Sahara Desert. It begins to look at how we use major infrastructure projects of water transportation, the refilling of Lake Chad, and the development of this central African area. There's also a major rail line, which is not initiated – it's been inaugurated; it's now running from Ethiopia to the coastline of Djibouti. This rail line is one of the key continental rail passages that

the Schiller Institute and {EIR} have been fighting for, for decades; to begin to integrate the full potential of Africa's people and its resources and its industrial capacities into an integrated economic breakthrough. A real shift in the productivity and lifestyle and scientific potential of Africa. Those things are now unfolding; these are coming from largely Chinese investments, Chinese engineering companies are directly onboard.

The same is true from another project, and I think it's worth just highlighting, because we have gotten reports recently that it's practically shovel-ready. This is Kra Canal. All this contention over the South China Sea that everyone's heard about; and the Americans remain, I'm sure, still somewhat confused. What's the big deal about a couple of islands in the South China Sea? As the President of the Philippines said, we're not going to eliminate humanity over a couple of fishing spots in the South China Sea. The real question is the Kra Canal; this is something explicitly that the British Empire has prevented by diktat, to shut down. Matt, you and others have been involved in video production specifically on this project and the role of the British to shut this down over centuries to eliminate this project. The Chinese have said that they are ready to begin the development of the Kra Canal. The Thai government, with a new king, seems favorable; the military, the prime minister seem favorable. The question of Japan's collaboration is something that goes back to the 1980s; with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche directly

involved in this project. The people we worked with then, in Thailand, are again promoting and advocating for its initial construction today.

So, these projects are transformative. We've gone through more on that; I'm not going to give the layout of these projects.

But there are major development orientations taking place that are gripping mankind. There was an offer today, apparently, in the {Hindu Times} in India from a Chinese journalist, which said "Will Donald Trump Participate in the Silk Road Conference in China?" I think that really is the potential which we've got today.

So, the Glass-Steagall fight, this question of the United States deciding that we're going to build our nation again, we're going to shut down this Wall Street racket and take on this kind of potential; that's really what has to be ignited. And there's no reason Donald Trump should not take that up at the inauguration and the State of the Union.

BRINKLEY: Right! And on this question of the murder policy of Obama, there's an attempt now to cover it up and make him the cute President and Joe Biden getting an award. No, this is flat-out murder, and if this mass movement across the world is properly educated, it won't be stopped.

So, there was discussion recently around infrastructure, as Helga brought up, from Trump. It's still not to the level of LaRouche's conception of infrastructure. For example, here's

what Speaker Paul Ryan said about infrastructure: "In the spring budget, we believe we will be able to address the infrastructure issue." The chairman of the Republican study committee, Mark Walker, says "I don't know that we've settled on \$1 trillion. If it's \$1 trillion in infrastructure, that is something we'd have to say, 'There's a portion of this that we're not comfortable with and come back to the table.'|" And then Sam Graves, the head of the Transportation Subcommittee, says "We just simply can't afford it," adding that "It can't all be done through public-private partnerships as the President-elect is talking about."

They're still looking at this as an issue. LaRouche developed this concept. Helga LaRouche made the point that 2017 should be the year of the rejuvenation or flourishing of LaRouche's ideas. He wrote a paper in 2010 called, "What Your Accountant Never Understood; the Secret Economy". He goes through a universal history of the greater concept of infrastructure. He starts with the question of transoceanic travel; navigation across the oceans. He says, "For example, look back to the approximately hundred-centuries of the Earth's last great glaciation. While some part of the human population had remained mired in the habits of life of some fixed, relatively narrow regions free of glaciation, great transoceanic maritime cultures were also developed. The requirement of a stellar mapping for navigation for the existence of maritime cultures, gave us the stellar notion of the efficient existence of a functional form of an ontologically-actual universe; as echoed by such great residual artifacts as the Great Pyramid

of
Giza, and by the physical science of spherics. Now, into this
so-called Platonic long cycle, into the Pythagorean
predecessors
of Plato."

So, you have the concept of how to travel on an
ocean. How
do you navigate? By the stars. How do you map the stars? On
a
flat plane? No, you find you have to use a spherical map; so
the
beginning of this spherical foundation of a physical science
of
the Universe was discovered. This was applied to navigate the
oceans. He says from there it goes on to the idea of inland
travel, not just oceanic, but inland via internal waterways.
He
says this you saw developed with Charlemagne first. He says,
"Charlemagne's reforms served as a precedent for the
development
and role of the great internal system of rivers and canals,
which
provided the crucial steps toward modern European economy, and
the application of the same reform within our United States.
Those inland waterways prepared the leap toward the
revolutionary
US trans-continental railway systems. First, inside the
United
States; and in turn, the trans-continental rail systems of
Eurasia." So, this was John Quincy Adams uniting the country
with waterways and with the rail systems. He was the first to
fully unite the United States as a single territory. This was
followed by Bismarck in Germany and Mendelejev in Russia.
That
was the next advancement.

Then he says, "Now, the prospect of the combined
effect of

magnetic levitation mass transport systems and rail, which will connect the principal continents of the world, would render most ocean transport of freight technologically obsolete; because the modern successor of ordinary internal rail transport will have rendered much of ocean freight technologically, and therefore economically, obsolete." We are starting to see the beginnings of this with things like the North-South transport corridor from India to Iran to Russia; which cuts off the maritime route by making it 40% shorter. There are also new rail lines developing between China and Europe. The first train of which, for example, just went from Beijing to London, starting January 1, 2017; the first time ever in history. There are 39 various routes now between China and Europe; inland rail following the route of the old Silk Road, but with modern rail. As LaRouche says, if you have high-speed magnetic levitation rail, that would be even a further advancement.

Next, he says, "Changes such as those, illustrate a general principle which will be expressed in certain nearby Solar System locations. Now, we're going to go to the next step, such as our Moon and Mars, when they will have come to be considered later, as within the bounds of our presently still-young, new century's plausible instances of work and habitation. Typical problems to

be overcome for the purpose of human transport and dwelling in nearby solar space, and later beyond, must look to such future developments already foreseeable for later in the present century. We should then recognize that the development of basic economic infrastructure had always been a needed creation of what is required as a habitable development of a synthetic, rather than a presumably natural, environment for the enhancement or even the possibility of human life and practice at some time in the existence of our human species."

So, he's bring up, one, this long-term conception; he says later, three generations – 75 years – should be our orientation for space. We have the questions of habitation and transport as fundamental challenges; and this is the idea of the next phase.

But in general, also this last question of synthetic versus natural; that these various new modes of habitation and travel were based off of new discoveries that created a whole new platform of existence, of habitation, of travel, where mankind could reach through these advances. And those were all creations of the human mind in the likeness of the Creator. Infrastructure is not just making a bridge or something to get from here to there; it's the question of a new advancement, of a new principle that is applied throughout your entire society. So, it's not an add-on to your economic policy as Paul Ryan was saying. "We'll get to that; we'll figure out how to fit it in the budget." It's

the beginning of your notion of economy.

MEGAN BEETS: Yeah Rachel, I think what you just put forward here from Mr. LaRouche's overview and what you were just saying, it's a way of thinking that most Americans have forgotten about.

People have lost touch with the kind of big thinking about long sweeps of human history, and I think that that way of thinking

— the idea that we can consider 50-100-year cycles of human progress in general — flies in the face of the biggest British Empire lie which has dominated for some time. The idea that human growth is bad; human progress is bad; population growth destroys the Earth and it's bad. We have to hold back technological progress; we have to go backwards. Instead of towards nuclear power, we have to go backwards towards solar power, wind power; and reduce our impact and our presence on the

Earth. That lie is exactly what's being threatened with both the

rise of the New Paradigm being led from Eurasia and the potentiality of Mr. LaRouche's ideas; which are really the most

advanced version of the American System ideas of Hamilton, Franklin Roosevelt, and Lincoln, of putting the creative power and really the responsibility of the creative human mind to change nature. To alter nature to better support human life; alter the biosphere to higher levels of productivity, as we do by improving agriculture, for example.

I just think that what you're bringing up here really is the crucial point; that our common interest as mankind is man's progress. That right now dictates that we can't accept

anything

lower than a long-term dedication to the highest forms of technological advance and growth; which is nuclear fusion power

and its companion, a space program. The colonization of the Moon

and eventual colonization of Mars. That would really be a beautiful renaissance expression of the American people working

with the rest of the world towards the uplifting of humanity toward our real, true potential.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, we are going to continue the discussion of the substance – this was, I think, crucial Rachel;

because it's exactly what you're saying. This insight into the

real meaning of something which has become banalized – infrastructure; that's the key to all of economic science. If humanity is going to make the shift into the next phase of our global existence as a species, it's only going to be possible if

we have a flourishing of this kind of philosophical understanding

of the science behind real, true economics. It's a critical ingredient of the ability of humanity to move forward. So, I think we're going to continue this; and there are a lot of interrelated works that Mr. LaRouche authored over the last several years which explore this concept of the real meaning of

infrastructure, the idea of the economic platform, and the role

that Hamiltonian credit should play in facilitating all of that.

So, that said, that's the crucial insight and understanding

that you need to fight with us right now for the necessary

policy

revolution here in the United States. This all revolves around

the initiation of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws.

Michael

went through them, but it's Glass-Steagall, number one. We need

to return to Hamiltonian national banking, number two. We need

an initiation as Franklin Roosevelt did it, of Federal credit using that Hamiltonian national banking system to raise the productive powers of labor of the workforce as a whole. And this

all has to be driven by a dedication to the breakthroughs in science; most especially right fusion and space exploration.

So, there are two things that you need to do before this

program ends tonight. Number one, you need to immediately sign

the petition that's being circulated by LaRouche PAC. Again, the

address is: lpac.co/trumpsotu – all one word – trumpsotu for State of the Union. If you've already signed this, then it's a

great opportunity for you to spread it to your entire network and

help us reach the goal. We've set the goal of 10,000 signatures

on this petition. We are increasing the number of signatures, but it has to increase at a much more rapid rate. It's a perfect

opportunity to help us increase the outreach of the LaRouche Political Action Committee. Then, number two; immediately subscribe, if you haven't already, to the LaRouche PAC daily email list. For two reasons: 1. in the 7-day countdown between

now and the inauguration, you need to have the daily marching

orders and the daily updates. This is a very fast moving situation, as you can see from the intelligence situation that we presented at the beginning of this show. Then after that, in the critical first days of the new Presidency, as things change very rapidly, you need to have the insight that only LaRouche PAC can uniquely provide you. And then, another reason is, as we develop more crucial and unique, exclusive content like what you got a taste of here today, especially this interview with Ray McGovern, the veteran CIA intelligence analyst and the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, you will receive a notice in your email inbox and this is material that you can't afford to miss. You really need to know as soon as we publish it and as soon as we make it available. So again, you can look for the full interview that Jason Ross did with Ray McGovern to be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and our YouTube channel on Sunday, the day after tomorrow. And you can also look forward to the full speech that Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered at this very important, breakthrough diplomatic seminar in Stockholm, Sweden.

So, thank you very much for tuning in tonight. I think this was a successful broadcast, and I'd like to thank Megan, Rachel, and Michael for joining me in the discussion. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com and good night.

Tidligere tyske forbundsdagsmedlem Willy Wimmer om »Krigsetablisementet« imod Trump

12. jan., 2017 – Tidligere medlem af den tyske Forbundsdag, Willy Wimmer, har afsløret en koalition af Demokrater og Republikanere, der nægter at acceptere Donald Trumps valgsejr. Til RT sagde Wimmer: »Når man ser på situationen i Washington, så mener jeg, at de, der tabte valget, ikke er villige til at acceptere den nye præsident, hvis navn er Trump.« Wimmer, der er alvorlig bekymret, siger, at, »det, der foregår i Washington, lyder som starten på en borgerkrig«. [Sådan lyder det virkelig, når man læser *Washington Post*.]

Donald Trumps planer om at opbygge gode relationer med andre lande er et hårdt slag mod krigsetablisementets høges verdensanskuelse blandt Demokrater og Republikanere, såsom senator John McCain.

»Der findes et netværk af modstand imod den præsident, der vil indtræde i embedet den 20. januar, og jeg mener, at, når man ser på virkeligheden i Europa, ønsker folk i alle europæiske lande at eksistere med gode relationer til den Russiske Føderation«, sagde Wimmer. Kampagnen, der har til hensigt at bagvaske Trump, ligner den metode, som de etablerede medier brugte til at dæmonisere Rusland, tilføjede han.

»Der findes ingen fjendtlige følelser [mellem Rusland og Europa], fjendtligheden er organiseret på en meget kunstig måde, og det er samme metode for organisering af fjendtligheder, som vi nu ser imod Trump ... Dette gør det ganske klart, at der findes et netværk af Demokratisk og Republikansk krigsetablisement i Washington, og de er ikke villige til at acceptere stemmeurnerne ... Jeg mener, at alle i Europa ønsker at se en Trump i embedet, som forfølger den politik, han forklarede under kampagnen, og satse på gode relationer med andre, inklusive den Russiske Føderation«, sagde Wimmer.

Foto: Tidligere medlem af den tyske Forbundsrag for CDU, Willy Wimmer, til RT: ... »det, der foregår i Washington, lyder som starten på en borgerkrig«.