

Overvind staten i staten for at sikre det nye paradigme. LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 31. marts, 2017; Leder

Aftenens udsendelse falder i to dele. Første del handler om det, der kaldes Trumpgate; eller ideen om, at Vladimir Putin ikke alene satte Trump ved magten, men rent faktisk styrer Trump-administrationen og bestemmer politikken. Vi havde tidligere på dagen et interview med pensionerede CIA-analytiker Ray McGovern, som har arbejdet for CIA i mange årtier og er en af medstifterne af VIPS (Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity). Lad os starte med det første klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern:

Jason Ross: Godaften. Med mig i studiet i dag er chef for EIR's Washington-afdeling, Bill Jones.

Aftenens udsendelse falder i to dele. Første del handler om det, der kaldes Trumpgate; eller ideen om, at Vladimir Putin ikke alene satte Trump ved magten, men rent faktisk styrer Trump-administrationen og bestemmer politikken. Vi havde tidligere på dagen et interview med pensionerede CIA-analytiker Ray McGovern, som har arbejdet for CIA i mange årtier og er en af medstifterne af VIPS (Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity). Lad os starte med det første klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern:

Udskrift af webcast, engelsk:

DEFEAT THE DEEP STATE TO ENSURE THE NEW PARADIGM!

JASON ROSS: Hello. It is March 31, 2017; and you're

joining us for the weekly Friday LaRouche PAC webcast. My name is Jason Ross, and I'm joined in the studio today by {EIR}'s Washington DC Bureau Chief Bill Jones. We're going to have two main parts to the discussion tonight. The first aspect we're going to be dealing with is what's called Trumpgate; or the idea that Vladimir Putin not only put Trump in power, but is actually running the Trump administration and setting policy. To discuss that with us, we had an interview earlier today with retired CIA analyst Ray McGovern; who worked in the CIA for multiple decades and is one of the co-founders of VIPS (Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity). So, let's go ahead and get the first clip from the interview with Ray McGovern.

ROSS : First off, setting the stage, ever since Trump was elected, and especially since his inauguration, there has been a growing chorus of claims about Vladimir Putin putting Trump in office by directing the election; and of even directing Trump's policy. That, in effect, Vladimir Putin is running the United States government. So, first off, is this true?

RAY MCGOVERN: Well, if it is, then I don't know anything about Russia or the Soviet Union. I was counting up the years that I've been immersed in Russian studies; it goes back 59 years when I decided to major in Russian, got my graduate degree in Russian. Taught Russian; was the head of the Soviet foreign

policy branch at the CIA; briefed Presidents on Gorbachev. I like to think I learned something about how Russian leaders look at the world. When I heard this meme going around that Vladimir Putin clearly preferred Donald Trump, my notion was, well, here's Vladimir Putin sitting with his advisors, and he's saying "That Trump fellow; he's not only unpredictable, but he's proud of it. He brags about it, and he lashes out strongly at every slight; whether it's real or imagined. This is just the guy I want to have his finger on the nuclear codes across the ocean." It boggles the mind that Vladimir Putin would have had any preference for Donald Trump. That's aside from the fact that everyone – and that would include Vladimir Putin, unless he's clairvoyant – knew that Hillary was going to win.

So, just to pursue this thing very briefly, if the major premise is that Vladimir Putin and the terrible Russians wanted Trump to win; then you have a syllogism. Therefore, they tried to help him; therefore, they did all kinds of But if you don't accept that major premise, the whole syllogism falls apart; and I don't accept that major premise. Putin said it himself: "I don't have a preference." And I didn't have any preference; I happened to be in Germany during the election, in Berlin. It was exciting, because the German anchors didn't know what to say, to make of it; and my German friends were saying "We have a German expression here; the choice between Trump and Hillary Clinton

is

eine wahl zwischen Pest und Cholera." That means it's a choice

between plague and cholera. I said, "You know, I kind of agree."

That's why I not only voted for Jill Stein; but was proud to – on the environment, on all the major issues, she had it right. The others did not. That's the way I looked at it. I kind of think that's the way Putin looked at it; and when he said "I don't have any preference," he probably meant he didn't have any preference. So, that syllogism falls down.

Now, just pursue that one little bit here. Everyone expected Hillary to win; everyone. We're talking Summer; we're talking Fall as Trump disgraced himself in one manner or another.

He could never win, right? And nobody thought that Hillary was

such a flawed candidate that nobody trusted her; that she might

lose. So, you hear what I'm saying? "Well, it looks like Hillary is going to win. Looks pretty sure she's going to win.

So, why not hack into her mechanism there in the Democratic National Committee? If I get caught, well she may be angry with

me, but what's to lose?" I don't think so. Putin is a very cautious fellow. If he thought Hillary was going to win, like the rest of us did, the last thing he would want to do is hack into their DNC apparatus and be caught; because he would likely

be caught. And have an additional grievance for Hillary to advertise against him. So, it falls down on logic alone.

Now, luckily, you mentioned Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. We are the beneficiary of a membership

whose expertise in intelligence matters just won't quit. This includes four former high officials in the National Security Agency – retired; one of whom devised all of these collection systems that NSA is still using. His name is Bill Binney. He and I are very close. He writes for us; and he helps me write things. What he has said from the outset – and this is five months ago – is that this could not be a hack; it had to be a leak. And for your listeners or your viewers, a hack goes over the network.

ROSS: You're speaking of the DNC?

MCGOVERN: Yeah, I'm talking about the Russians – thanks for interrupting; the Russians are accused, of course, of hacking into the Democratic National Committee emails and they're also accused of surfacing the Podesta emails. Bill says, "Look, I know this network; I created pretty much the bones of it. And, I'm free to talk about it. Why? Here are the slides that Ed Snowden brought out; here are the trace points, the trace mechanism. And there are hundreds in the network. So, everything that goes across the network, Ray, and I know this is hard for you to believe, and you're looking at me real strange, but {everything}. You know where it starts and you know where it ends up; everything." So, if this was a hack, NSA would know about it. NSA does not know about it. As a matter of fact, the CIA and the FBI said "We have high confidence that the Russians did this." The NSA, which is the only real agency that has the

capability to trace this, said "We only have moderate confidence." In the Army, we called that the SWAG factor – it's a Scientific Wild-Assed Guess. So, NSA doesn't have the information. If they had the information, I'm pretty sure they would release it; because this is not rocket science. Everybody knows how these things work, particularly since Ed Snowden revealed the whole kit and caboodle.

ROSS [live]: This is part of the interview; the entirety of which will be available on the website coming soon. It was an hour-long discussion with Ray McGovern. Just to follow up on that, or continue, the British origin of the attacks on Trump were seen in the dossier that was compiled by former MI-6 operative Christopher Steele; who put together the large dossier of supposedly compromising material on Donald Trump that was first published in its entirety on Buzzfeed, but which had been spoken of in anonymous sort of way by press outlets before that. The incredible assault on Trump here, this doesn't represent a Democrat versus Republican type of conflict; what this represents is whether we're going to have the elected government. Donald Trump is the elected President of the United States; he was elected. He won the election; he was elected. Whether we're going to have an elected government run the United States, or whether the Deep State – the intelligence agencies in the United States and in Britain, very significantly – are going to have their way in determining what our policy will be. Specifically in seeing the Trump openness in resetting the relationship

with

Russia, with an openness towards China and with an increasing adoption of the American System outlook, this is not the type of policy orientation that this Deep State apparatus; hence, the attacks.

Ray McGovern and Bill Binney co-authored an article three days ago, called "The Surveillance State Behind Russia-gate".

I just wanted to read a very short part of this. They write:

"Although many details are still hazy because of secrecy and further befogged by politics it appears House Intelligence Committee Chairman Devin Nunes was informed last week about invasive electronic surveillance of senior U.S. government officials and, in turn, passed that information onto President Trump.

"This news presents Trump with an unwelcome but unavoidable choice: Confront those who have kept him in the dark about such rogue activities or live fearfully in their shadow.

"What President Trump decides will largely determine the freedom of action he enjoys as president on many key security and other issues. But even more so," write Ray McGovern and Bill Binney, "his choice may decide whether there is a future for this constitutional republic."

Very strong words. In the past month, on March 4th, we saw Trump's announcement that he was surveilled by the outgoing Obama administration; he used the word "wiretap" at times, for which

he was attacked for his choice of language. But the statement still stands about surveillance. On March 20th, FBI Director Comey testified that he was investigating the Trump administration; guess he didn't have any time to investigate the Saudis. Just today, Wikileaks came out with a report in which they released the latest section of what they are calling "Vault 7"; which is a collection of material from the CIA – documentation and source code. What this latest release showed was "Project Marble", as the CIA called it; which revealed a program that they had to obfuscate their own creation of cyber weaponry of malware and other types of attacks, and the ability to easily attribute such attacks to other state actors. Including the ability to – while making it look as though an attack came from Russia, also include a seeming cover-up of Russian tracks; so that a security researcher might feel that they had stumbled across a clue by finding Russian language comments in this cyber attack weapon, when really it had been planted from the beginning. This of course raises the question of attribution at all, and in particular about the DNC hacks. The FBI never investigated the DNC computers; and all the complaints about Russian involvement and Russian malware came from CrowdStrike, an independent firm. Which, if it's up against the CIA and a colossal program to be able to obfuscate the actual origin of internet attacks, makes it very unlikely; in addition to, as Ray McGovern said, all signs point to this and the Podesta emails being leaks rather than hacks anyway.

So, let's hear our second clip that we have for the program from Ray McGovern.

MCGOVERN : I think Nunes wants to do the right thing. Whether he'll succeed or not is anybody's guess. All I can say is, he's up against formidable opponents; witness what the ranking member or minority leader of the Senate, Chuck Schumer, has said outright to Rachel Maddow.

ROSS : Yeah. It puts the ranking and ranking.

MCGOVERN: Yeah, you got it!

ROSS: I think this story or picture that you've painted really gives us something that we need to do; because if this is to be fought out only among institutional layers, it's a tough fight. It's something where if people are aware, as we're able to make known to the population more generally that this is a fight; that this isn't about Democrats versus Republicans. This is really much more about Deep State versus the potential of elected government to determine our course. The threats of say, blackmail via the FBI or other intelligence agencies, the dossiers that no doubt exist on these elected officials; that stands as a threat if people aren't aware of that being the MO [modus operandi-ed.]. I think people are more familiar with the way the FBI targetted Martin Luther King; urged him on more than one occasion to commit suicide to prevent these kinds of documents from getting out. I think it really means that there's

something for all of us to do in terms of making sure that this is known; making sure that the terms of the fight are known, to make it possible to win this one.

MCGOVERN: Exactly; and those were wiretaps, back in the late '50s, early '60s, those were real wiretaps. You're quite right; that was heinous. Now, I asked Colleen Rowley, who's as I say, the expertise we have available to us at Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity won't quit. Colleen was the counsel of the Minneapolis division of the FBI; she was the one who wrote memos to the Director saying this is how we screwed up on 9/11. She's got guts that won't quit as well. I said, "Colleen, Robert Kennedy – my God! Robert Kennedy, Attorney General, allowing, authorizing the FBI to try to persuade Dr. King to commit suicide? How do you figure that, Colleen?" And she said, "Ray, wiretapping; J Edgar Hoover. Bobby Kennedy would know that J Edgar Hoover has lots of information on all those pretty girls that he and Jack used to invite to the White House pool and all of that stuff." She's imagining this; but the reality is, Robert Kennedy would know that J Edgar Hoover would have lots of material to blackmail not only him, but his big brother.

That's big; and that's why when all this came out in the mid '70s, they created these laws and created these Oversight Committees, which for a while, did their job. Now, they're hopelessly unable, unwilling; they don't want to know this

stuff,

and they don't know it for that matter. The intelligence officials say "They don't want to know this, so why should we tell them?" As for citizens, I would emphasize that this whole

business when Edward Snowden came out with his revelations in June of 2013, what happened? Well, people say, "Well, isn't this

interesting? Everything, they intercept everything! Emails, telephone calls, wow! Luckily, I have nothing to hide." So, we

asked someone from the Stasi – Stasi is the old East German secret service; and if people have seen "Das Lieben Der Anderen"

– "The Lives of Others" – an Academy Award film about East Germany and the Stasi. The Stasi was their KGB. You get a picture of what they did. Wolfgang Schmidt – his real name by the way – a Stasi colonel, is interviewed. One of the Americans

sits down and asks, "Wolfgang, what do you think about people in

America when we say 'We have nothing to hide'?" Schmidt says, "This is incredibly naïve. Everyone has something to hide.

You

don't get to decide what they get on you. The only way to prevent it from being against you, is to prevent it from being collected in the first place." Beautiful, you know? If they collect it, they can use it. They don't read it all; they don't

listen to it all. But they put it into these little files – they're not files, but they're ...

So, yeah, {all of us}. What Edward Snowden said about "turnkey tyranny." If you have these kinds of private information

about {everyone} including the President and Michael Flynn and all his associates, back in October-November-December; well, you

have the ability, if not to win the election, then to at least to destroy or make these folks seem beholden to the {Russians}, of all places, and disarm the attempts that Trump wants to make, vis-à-vis Russia.

Now, I would have to tell you, that I am against everything Trump stands for, internally. I think he's not only unqualified to be President, but all his instincts are terrible. Okay, so put that on the record. I think I already said I voted for Jill Stein. That said, even a broken clock is right how many times a day?

ROSS: Twice a day.

MCGOVERN: Yeah. He's right about Russia. If he were to say to Vladimir Putin, "Look, I don't think we need to put more troops in the Baltic states or Poland; so why don't I pull out those troops, and you pull out the troops on the other side? It's a deal?" I'm morally certain Putin would say, "It's a deal!" Now, what would that mean? That would mean what Pope Francis, to his credit, called "the blood-drenched arms traders" would lose out, big time. Peace: bad for business. Tension: very good for business. So, there's a lot at stake among very, very powerful people; and if Trump can make this stick – this is not a puny, incidental issue, it's a transcendental one.

I was more afraid that Hillary would bring us to a nuclear

confrontation than Trump. I didn't like Trump on the environment, because I have nine grand-children. Don't Senators and Congressmen have grand-children? Don't they give – So, for me it was a choice between pest and cholera. But, here we have a possibility for a new what the Germans call {ostpolitik} – a new policy, looking to the east. Take my word for it; I've looked at what the Russians have done. I've looked at heyday of the relationship of the United States and Russia, which goes back to October of 2013 when Putin pulled Obama's chestnuts out of the fire by persuading the Syrians to destroy or (have destroyed) all their chemical weapons {on U.S. ships}. Okay? Nobody knows about that but the United States.

But the neo-cons, the people who want to create a {bad} atmosphere in relations between the United States and Russia – they know about it. It only took them six months to mount a coup on Russia's doorstep in Kiev, Ukraine. And that's where all this trouble started: Russians accused of invading Ukraine – not true; of invading Crimea – not true. All that stuff was artificially pumped up. It's just as easily tssuuuu, deflated. And Trump, if he's willing to do that, well, that would be a biggie.

So, being right two times a day is better than never being right.

ROSS [laughing]: Well put.

MCGOVERN: I think.

ROSS: Great! Thanks very much, Ray. Thanks.

MCGOVERN: You're most welcome. Thanks for asking. It's very rare that I get a chance to review what I observe. LaRouche PAC
Friday Webcast, March 31, 2017

ROSS: To fill in one thing on that, regarding Sen. Schumer:
in January, Schumer was on the Rachel Maddow Show, and he said he thought Trump was "really dumb" for taking on the intelligence agencies, because "they've got six ways from Sunday to get back at you." Schumer was saying, "Don't get on the bad side of the intelligence agencies, or they're going to make you pay for it."
A very direct and cowardly and craven admission that there is a power in government besides the elected government. Just a disgusting thing to say.

Let's shift now to our other topic, which is where we {can} go in the United States, once we throw off the yoke of this opposition to collaboration in the world. The promise that we see, for example, in the upcoming meeting taking place April 6-7 next week at Mar-a-Lago with President Xi Jinping of China and President Trump. Bill, what's the import of this meeting happening? Where could we go if this shakes out well?

BILL JONES: It's a very significant meeting. It is a watershed meeting in a variety of ways. First of all, the two major countries in the world – China and the United States – getting together in this way at the highest level, is, of course, something that affects the entire world. But it's important,

especially now, because you have a new administration, with a new policy, with a new direction, trying to revive the U.S. economy, trying to bring back a lot of the economic growth that has been lost over the last few decades. The question for the Chinese, is what is that policy, what effect does it have on us, and how do we fit in? It's going to be a meeting that doesn't lead to any specific what they call "deliverables." You're not going to have communiques saying we're going to do this, we're going to do that, coming out of the meeting.

The Trump administration is still getting itself organized.

Many of the issues, including the issues that are matters of controversy between China and the United States, have not been worked out, because the people are not in place in the departments at this point. Those include the South China Sea, the Korean nuclear question, the trade issue – which is very important, of course, for the Trump administration. These things still have to be worked out. They will be discussed. In fact, they will, probably, have at the top of the agenda, of going through them one by one, to determine this is where we stand, where do you stand? – to try to get an understanding of where the two sides lie on issues that to some extent separate them.

The importance of the meeting, if it is successful – and I think it will be successful; it's happening at a very early stage in the administration. It's not so often that a summit of this nature will be held – what is it? – two-three months from the inauguration of the President. Both sides agreed that they

wanted

to have this. Both of them felt that there was a necessity of getting together at the highest level in order to really get to

know where the two stand, and really getting to know each other

in a very different sense. They've had communication from the get-go. There were two phone calls. There were a number of letters that went back and forth; so they're not strangers to each other. But it's that time of {meeting}, where they can talk

one-on-one, or with people that they decide to have with them at

any particular point. Probably will be a one-on-one meeting with

interpreters at some point. They will get to learn the mind of the other person.

This is extremely important because during the course of the election, as is often the case, many things are said which don't

necessary don't reflect anything on policy. We've had the uncertainties about the Taiwan issue. At one point it was unclear

for the Chinese if the One-China policy was still going to be followed by the Trump administration. And certain things that were tweeted or said in the spur of the moment were taken seriously by Beijing; and so there was a lot of uncertainty and a

certain amount of trepidation. Most of that has been cleared up.

The One-China policy stands fast. This, President Trump has made clear.

More importantly, on the lower level of high-level meetings

between Secretary of State Tillerson and his counterpart,

Foreign

Minister Wang Yi, he did something that no other official has ever done. He reiterated what has been the explicit Chinese position with regard to the China-America relationship. He said,

"No conflict, no confrontation, mutual respect, and win-win cooperation." He's taken a lot of heat for doing that, because that has not been what the United States has said; it's what the Chinese have said and indicated this is what they want. By saying it, Tillerson indicated that the United States was on board these basic policies.

On the basis of that, they are able to have their meeting. I

think it will be a good meeting, because President Trump is a very good host. He has shown that in a lot of the summits that he's had. President Xi is also – although these are two very different personalities – they're both really "people persons."

They know how to talk to people in all categories of life.

President Xi is really unique in one sense among many Chinese leaders, some of whom are much stiffer, because he {does} go to

the people; he {does} know them; he {has} worked amongst them.

President Trump, although he was an industrialist, a very wealthy

man, he could go onto the work sites, he could talk to the people

down there, he could get a feeling for what they were all about.

I think these characteristics will allow them to establish a

rapport, perhaps even a warm relationship, in understanding each

other. That is extremely important because as we move into the

administration, as policy takes place, a lot of these difficult issues, like the issue of trade, will be coming up. President Trump, of course, was very explicit on that in his campaign. He wants to have fair trade; he's not a "free-trader," letting the market decide. He has made references to the American System of Henry Clay. He probably will move to tariffs on certain products, in order to create a basis for industrial production in those areas where the United States has lost jobs to low-wage producers. It's a new element that the Chinese also have to take into consideration.

And, of course, it seems to me that if there is this understanding, and President Trump wants to move forward on maybe being less open in terms of trade on certain products, there is a possibility of giving the Chinese added capabilities, because they may lose some of the market on certain trade, but they can, for instance, have a larger market in terms of investment in infrastructure. President Trump also has committed to \$1 trillion in infrastructure in the United States, to rebuild the roads, rebuild the highways, rebuild the cities, and the infrastructure. \$1 trillion. He is not going to get that from industry; industry is not generally interested in waiting 10 years to get a payback on investment that they make. Unfortunately, the United States no longer has the types of institutions that could finance

this.

That may change; if Trump goes with the American System, maybe he will move in the direction that Lyndon LaRouche has indicated in his four points, by setting up an infrastructure bank or a development bank like the Hamiltonian bank; like the First Bank of the United States, to finance this. But, in that case, you have China also with a lot of capital that they could invest and {would like to invest} in the United States; which could assist President Trump in his attempt to rebuild infrastructure.

This came up in a meeting today at CSIS; I raised that type of a trade-off, and the people generally were positive to this notion. If some kind of infrastructure bank or a group or fund in which the Chinese could go and invest, were set up; this would be a possibility for them investing in the United States. There are many difficulties with that, but it may also be something that the Chinese are interested in. In fact, the question of taking much of their capital, which has hitherto been invested in Treasury bills, and putting that into a fund for infrastructural investment has been mooted both privately and in public in the media in China. So, there may be a possibility that the Chinese leader coming here, will also have something to offer; may make a proposal of this nature, which would then set the stage for moving further.

So, I think this is an important meeting, because it

will

really provide the basis for economic development; and the Chinese are in the forefront of this economic development.

Not

simply by having become a major – in fact, the second major – economic power in the world; but through their Belt and Road Initiative, they have then offered this type of development to the other countries of the world – especially in the developing

sector. All countries are invited to this; including the United

States. So, if you have some kind of an agreement in regard to

these issues on infrastructure, trade, the United States can then

become a part of the Silk Road here in the United States itself.

ROSS: Bill, could you tell us more about what lessons we

could learn from China on financing? China has been putting a tremendous amount of money into infrastructure. They have a wonderful high-speed rail network, the most extensive in the world; which is going to be doubled within a decade or so in terms of its extent. You had mentioned something about the opportunity to invest Treasury bonds in something more productive. What can we learn? How are they doing this?

What

can we do here?

JONES: Well, obviously, what the Chinese are doing is what

the United States used to do. You go back to the FDR period, and

you will see that this is what was done. The institutions that

were established to build the TVA, to finance development; to

create the industries at the point in time when we were in the Great Depression, were all here as institutions which promoted the development of private industry. But creating the basis on which that private industry can move in. This is the Hamiltonian system; this is the way the United States was created. We were not based on free trade; we fought against free trade. Hamilton introduced tariffs in order to prevent the British from dumping their products on the US economy; making it impossible for us to produce our own products and ever becoming an industrial nation. That was reinstated at various times in our history when the free trade mania took place, leading to devastation; it was revived at various points. Abraham Lincoln did it; President McKinley did it. Roosevelt in his own way did that; and it's been a very successful model. The Chinese have used that, given their own specific circumstances, with largely state-controlled industries, they nevertheless have used this Hamiltonian or you called it a Listian model; since the influence of Germany on the Chinese economy was very great in the last century. They used this policy in order to develop their industries. They have a free market; they have individual entrepreneurs; they're very successful in computers and other fields. But there is a government which is responsible for the good of the people; for the people's welfare – or as the Chinese call it, the people's livelihood. Therefore, they must make sure that things work so

that these industries operate to the benefit of the people.

We

had that system, too; we have it in our Constitution. The Federal government is responsible for the General Welfare; that

is a broad notion. That means that people cannot be put on the

scrap heap, they can't be out of work a long period of time; there must be measures that are taken to assure them that they can survive and their families can survive. We've gone away from

that system; we've become much more anarchistic in this free market system, and a lot of people have suffered.

When President Trump was elected, to the surprise of the

large majority of the citizenry and of the world, it was simply

by appealing to the changes that were necessary to move away from

that type of system toward one which could secure a livelihood for the American people. The Chinese can serve as a model for that; it's a little bit different, but the principle is the same.

The principle of this Hamiltonian system. We have to begin to reconstitute institutions that can provide credit guarantees to

our industries, to our construction companies; so we can build those roads, highways, nuclear power plants, things like that which we need. We also have got to reinstitute the tried and true separation of speculators from the legitimate commercial bankers; that's called Glass-Steagall, and that was the law between 1933 and 1998. It meant that the speculators, the gamblers, those who want to make quick bucks in a short time, even though there's tremendous risk, they cannot go into the banks and take Grandma's money and use that for the speculation

to the detriment of Grandma if they lose. And the losses, of

course, in the financial system have been extremely great.

So,
that has to be reinstated again. We have to prevent the
Wall
Street culprits, the pirates, from stealing our wealth and the
wealth of people who have invested in their banks. If that is
done, then we cut off the fluff that is the fictitious growth
of
the paper economy, and have the capability of using the funds
that are available to extend a credit system in the United
States
to build and to create greater wealth tomorrow as a result of
this investment today.

ROSS: So, once we get Glass-Steagall passed, once we
trim
off this cancerous speculation and make it possible for credit
to
be going into productive purposes, what do you see as the
potential physical types of cooperation with China? You had
mentioned earlier that if Trump puts up tariffs, China may see
this as acceptable from the context of Chinese businesses
being
able to open up in the United States as well. When you think
about the kinds of physical investments that need to be made
on
things like railroads in particular, something where China has
a
great deal of home-grown expertise at this point, including
the
development of maglev rail; or nuclear plants, which China is
building the most of in the world, most of them are being
built
in China right now. What do you see as the need or the
potential
for physical economic cooperation with China, for us to have a
physical economic recovery here?

JONES: There are a variety of way they could do this. There could be direct investment – look, they made a proposal to build high-speed rail in California going from LA to Las Vegas. They also invested in Las Vegas a lot, too; there's a lot of infrastructure there. However, that didn't go through, because there were concerns whether it's security or whatever concerns; maybe because it was a state-owned enterprise. But those things are going to happen. I think the important thing is, if the rules are lifted, so that China has a greater possibility of direct investment; they could do that. There's also another option; and some people are concerned that if China owns our railroads, where do we stand and what does this mean for the United States? We can get around that through this idea of creating this fund or a national bank. The national bank of Alexander Hamilton, the money was lent from international lenders; it was really the Dutch who were doing this. We owed them the debt, and by creating a debt repayment plan, they were willing to put more money into the United States. The bank could accept money from US people; it could also potentially accept money from foreign investors as well. This would be a way for China – and this has actually been proposed by the head of the China Central Investment Corporation; who said we have all this money in Treasury bills, and we're getting maybe 1% or 2% interest on the Treasury bills. We would be just as happy to invest this in an infrastructure fund, where we might get 2% or 3% – a low interest rate it has to be, because it's long-term; but better than they're doing now. That money would then be readily available for the United States also, if they have the

capabilities; if we have the workers and the materiel and everything to do it ourselves. But they could also contribute as well; they could contribute with their expertise as they have done in Africa, in Asia and Latin America. They know the ropes in terms of high-speed rail; they know the problems involved in it. They know all the technicalities of it because they've built so many of those; but we haven't built any high-speed rail, so we're kind of starting from scratch. They could come to offer their technical assistance, or even offer capital to try and get these things started. There are many ways that this can be resolved, and there are ways that have been indicated clearly by Chinese representatives that they would be happy to do things like this. So, the only thing is, we have to have a situation where the only thing that is done on trade – and nothing draconian should be done, because that would cause a major problem. But whatever is done on trade, there is a quid pro quo; something that China gets to their advantage so that you have a win-win situation as people are saying.

With regard, of course, to the summit, what has been emphasized by the Chinese, of course, is that element of mutual respect; and this is absolutely key, this is why there is a certain amount of trepidation. China is a major country; it is effectively a great power at this point. They are a very proud people, and they have a right to be; as Americans are a proud people. But in the United States, this is not so well understood

because of the attitude toward China and the Chinese which existed during the entirety of the 1800s going into the 1900s with the Chinese Exclusion Act and all these measures that were

taken to keep the Chinese – who built our Transcontinental Railroad – out of the country. People saw them as people who didn't have a culture, who lived at a very low level; and they just did not understand the greatness that was China. We understood that in the beginning in the American Revolution; Benjamin Franklin was the first major Sinophile, the lover of China. He wanted to introduce many of these projects that Confucius – the great Chinese philosopher – had been talking about in terms of creating a leadership. He wanted to implement

that here in the United States; but that was lost. And that is a

big loss, because things may go well at the top level, but there

also has to be this understanding between the peoples.

There's

going to be more exchanges; there are going to be exchanges on the economic side. If these programs go through, you will have

Chinese technicians and engineers coming and helping in the United States; you'll have more Chinese tourists – and there are

many of them coming in today. And hopefully, you'll have more American tourists going to China to learn the culture and the society; to get to know it better. Because as they get to know

it better, they will understand the importance of the nation and

the importance of the relationship that we have with China.

So, much can come out of this summit meeting, and I'm relatively confident that it will be successful; at least to the

extent that the two leaders of the two major nations in the

world

will have a greater understanding of the other's views, of the other's wishes, of the other's motivation. If you have that, then

you have the basis on which these other problems – trade, South

China Sea, the Korean nuclear program – can be more readily resolved.

ROSS: Thank you very much. On the aspect of moving forward

and China's role in developing new things, I know that China has

made a push on changing the conception of "Made in China" meaning

some cheap junk, to "created in China"; to the fact that there's

a development of an ability to create new products. You brought

up the entrepreneurship in many fields; we see it in the high-speed rail, for example. You definitely see it in the Chinese space program and Chinese efforts towards fusion research.

I wanted to let our viewers know and ask you to say a bit

about a conference that was held last Saturday in Munich, Germany. A conference on March 25th for the 100th anniversary of

the birth of the German space visionary, space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke. I know that Bill, you were fortunate to be able to attend this conference; and the videos of it will be posted on the Schiller Institute site in a somewhat short period of time, I

hope. Could you tell us a bit about it from your firsthand experience?

JONES: This is an attempt to revive an understanding

of a person who really was undoubtedly one of the greatest of the space pioneers who worked in the US space program. He was a part of the German team that came over from Peenemünde. Everybody knows Werner von Braun, but nowadays they don't know Krafft Ehrlicke; which is a shame, because he was one of the most genial of all of those pioneers. He was thinking hundreds of years ahead; he was thinking already in the 1950s of building colonies on the Moon. He actually had correspondence between him and Werner von Braun on how to get to Mars; both of them had written books on how to get to Mars. They had exchanges now and then where Krafft would make suggestions on how you would do it; and von Braun would respond. But he was also a very unusual individual, because he believed that the nature of man is that of a creative being; that man cannot stand still. He must always pursue the search for the new frontiers; this is in the fundamental core of human nature, that they must seek the new and develop the new. Because of this, of course, he came into contact with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche; and they just hit it off from the get-go. They were like souls. The last part of his life, he was working with the Schiller Institute and with the LaRouches to fight the zero-growth movement. When we came into contact with Krafft, during the period of transition from the great heyday of the space program to the low level of the zero-growth, back-to-nature movement, Krafft was conducting a lone fight in order to fight the philosophy that was being foisted upon the American people with the zero-growth movement.

Of course, when he came into contact with the LaRouches, he realized that there was a greater forum on which he could operate; so they became very good friends. He went on tours together with them in order to talk about the space program; to try and revive an interest in space in those days.

The reason we're reviving it is not simply that it's his 100th birthday; he would have been 100 years old this week, if he had lived. He died at a very early stage; he was in his sixties – 1984 – he was still a relatively young man, but he had a serious ailment and he passed away at that time. We felt it was necessary not only to honor him and to raise an understanding in the broader public about his importance. But also given the fact that President Trump has expressed the intention of moving back into space in the message that he sent that he sent last weekend – in fact, the same day as the conference. We were able to put that on the film at the end of that; it had come in in the morning, and the conference went until the afternoon, so we showed that; and people of course were very surprised. They thought this was a conspiracy between us and President Trump; it wasn't that, it was just coincidence. But because this is now the re-orientation of the United States, it has created a new capability of moving in that direction that we lost many years ago. And that therefore the work of Krafft Ehrlicke, which again still remains to be realized, now becomes of practical importance

for moving back into space. So, there was a kind of dual purpose for the conference.

ROSS: Great. I think if we compare the two images that we've been discussing tonight – the attempt to prevent by any means a shift away from the anti-Russia, anti-cooperation policy that had dominated the thinking of the previous administration; we compare that with the potential that we have in cooperating with and working with the New Paradigm created by the LaRouches over the decades, and being spearheaded right now on a policy front by China, we really have a great potential in store for us. These assaults on Trump – Trumpgate – the idea that Vladimir Putin is destroying the United States; this stuff really will not blow over. Given that Trump has attempted to turn the tables on this by calling out the wiretapping, by calling out the surveillance, by taking on these institutions – domestic intelligence agencies and, of course, the British; this means it's possible to actually defeat this control or grip over the government of the United States and make it possible to set our own policy, and a very good policy. And develop a future that we can be proud of. So, we have a great deal of material about this on our website; we've been almost every day continuing with updates to keep you informed about what can be done on this fight against the Deep State here and in Britain. We will continue to

have more on that; and we need your help, we need everybody's help to make sure that we have the potential to be freed up to join the future that could be ours if we take up that chance.

So thank you, Bill, for joining us today.

JONES: Thank you for having me.

ROSS: Thank you for joining us, and we will see you next time.