

Benjamin Franklin: Elev og tilhænger af Kina og konfucianisme

4. april, 2017 – I anledning af 300-året for Benjamin Franklins fødsel (1706-1790), udgav professor Dave Wang fra St. Johns Universitet en undersøgelse af Franklins vidtgående studier af kinesisk filosofi og teknologi. I hans indledning lyder det, at »Franklins bestræbelser på at inddrage positive elementer fra kinesisk civilisation i udviklingen med at opbygge en amerikansk civilisation havde stor indflydelse i Franklins bidrag til dannelsen af amerikansk civilisation. Hans livslange korrespondance og diverse efterladte papirer viser, at han var indtaget i og forbløffet over kinesisk kultur. Han udforskede stort set ethvert aspekt af kinesisk civilisation, lige fra det spirituelle til det materielle. Han mente, at Kina var den ældste, og, ud fra lang erfaring, den viseste blandt nationer.«

Her følger nogle citater af Franklin, fra Wangs undersøgelse:

☒ * »Da han [Konfucius] så sit land nedsunket i fordærv, og at ondskab af enhver art triumferede, arbejdede han først hårdt på standspersoner; og, efter at han gennem sin doktrin havde vundet dem for dydens sag, fulgte almenheden ham i stort tal. Metoden har en vidunderlig indflydelse på menneskeheden.«

* »Dette er, hvad Konfucius forelagde for prinserne, for at instruere dem i, hvordan de skulle rette og afpudse først deres egen fornuft, og dernæst fornuften og personligheden hos alle deres undersætter. Men for at skabe en større virkning, efter gradvist at være nedsteget fra hele imperiets vise adfærd og til forstandens fuldkommengørelse, stiger han, med de samme, gradvise trin, atter op fra den oplyste forstand og til hele imperiets lykkelige tilstand.«

Franklins studier af kinesisk teknologi omfattede:

- * silkeindustrien, som han promoverede i Philadelphia efter omhyggelige studier af de kinesiske metoder, inklusive nødvendigheden af omhyggeligt at beskære morbærtræerne, som silkeormene spiser;
- * den praksis at opdele store skibes last i separate kamre gennem skillevægge, der var omhyggeligt tætnede;
- * metoden med at opvarme huse gennem fliser, der blev opvarmet nedefra.

Se også: *Specialartikel af EIR's Mike Billington, ekspert i kinesisk konfuciansk filosofi:*

»*Xi Jinpings Nye Silkevej: En genoplivelse af konfuciansk kultur*«

Dave Wangs artikel: <http://www.resetdoc.org/story/00000000503>

Foto: Kinesisk nytår, Benjamin Franklin og Konfucius.

Valg i Frankrig: Jacques Cheminade, leder af partiet Solidarité & Progrès,

præsenterer sit program for præsidentvalget til arbejdsgivere, landmænd og mange andre

2. april, 2017 – »Gør en ende på tøjlesløs finansspekulation gennem bankopdeling«, »Udsted statskredit til finansiering af realøkonomien«, »Forlad euroen og EU i sin nuværende form« og »Gå med i BRIKS for at udvikle verden«; det er de temaer, som den franske præsidentkandidat Jacques Cheminade hamrede løs på i sine mange interviews i medierne. I sidste uge havde han også lejlighed til personligt at bringe sit budskab til vigtige vælgerbegivenheder.

Den 28. marts var han den første taler på et møde i de Franske Arbejdsgiveres Føderation (MEDEF) i fire minutter, efterfulgt af en diskussion med fire direktører for små og mellemstore foretagender (SMF'er) og tilhørerne, i en hel time. (mere herom nedenfor).

Samme eftermiddag blev han inviteret af Fransk-russisk Dialogsammenslutning for at give en 15 minutter lang præsentation af sin politik, og især af sine synspunkter mht. fransk-russiske relationer. Cheminade bemærkede, at hans politik over for Rusland ville blive de Gaulles politik: entente, detente og samarbejde, såvel som også win-win-samarbejde for at sikre fred i verden. Han krævede en ophævelse af sanktionerne til gengæld for Ruslands ophævelse af modsanktioner, især mod landbrugsvarer.

Den 30. marts deltog Cheminade i en kongres for FNSEA, Frankrigs største fagforening for landmænd, hvor han gav en 10 minutter lang præsentation til de 1.000 delegerede i salen, efterfulgt af spørgsmål og svar fra panelet i henved 30 min.

Cheminade lagde ud med at understrege, at deres profession, landbrug, måtte være meget fremtidsorienteret, eftersom den vil have den store opgave at sikre en tilstrækkelig fødevareforsyning til hele verdens befolkning. Han er overbevist om, at franske landmænd vil være i stand til at bidrage med deres andel til denne indsats, under forudsætning af, at vi bekæmper den finanzielle besættelse med dens politik for spekulation i fødevareprodukter og for at tjene kortfristede profitter, hvilket er uforeneligt med landbrug og dyreavl.

Ved MEDEF-begivenheden blev Jacques Cheminade varmt modtaget af mødelederen, der foreslog at introducere kandidaten med en forbindelse mellem tre tal. For det første, €100 mia. om året, hvilket er, hvad Cheminade ville investere i realøkonomien til byggeri af infrastruktur for »mennesker og natur«. For det andet, €90 mia. om måneden, hvilket er det beløb, som Den europæiske Centralbank udsteder for at redde bankerne (bailout), og som udelukkende er lån, der ikke går til realøkonomien. Og for det tredje, noget mere personligt, 800.000 år, for Cheminade har i sin samling af præhistoriske genstande det første udviklingstrin til en økse fra den palæolitiske æra (den ældste stenalder).

Cheminade indledte sin præsentation med at sige: »Der er et ord, der næsten aldrig er blevet hørt i denne kampagne; et andet ord er blevet nævnt, men fordrejet. Det første ord er 'industri'. Frankrig er blevet så afindustrialiseret, at industri i dag kun repræsenterer 12,5 % af vores BNP. Samtidig er befolkningens købekraft stagneret.«

»Det andet ord, der er blevet fordrejet, er 'arbejdskraft'. Fortalen til vores Forfatning ... stadfæster, at alle har ret til at have et job. Men i dag anses arbejdskraft for at være en omkostning, eller en tilpasningsvariabel, og ikke som motor for morgendagens økonomi.

Det spørgsmål, der så ofte stilles i denne kampagne, er, 'hvor

meget koster det?' og igen, 'hvor meget koster det?' og det, vi hører, er, 'Der er ingen penge, vi har ingen penge' – når det virkelige spørgsmål, vi burde høre, er, 'hvordan gør det fremtiden bedre, og hvad vil det koste, hvis vi ikke gør det?' I, der er samlet her, er indehavere af foretagender, dvs., I er fremtidsorienterede, og I ansætter arbejdere, hvis kvalifikationer og færdigheder I må udvikle ved at forbinde dem med jeres ydeevne ...«

»Desværre«, fortsatte han, »er finanskapitalen blevet globaliseret, afreguleret og rovgrisk, og er det modsatte af en arbejdsgiver, der skaber og udvikler noget for fremtiden.« Han forklarede, at han ikke handler ud fra en tankegang om national nedbringelse af omkostningerne, hvilket ville være selvmord, men ud fra en tankegang om at genskabe fædrelandenes Europa, for store projekter og for social retfærdighed, for forhandlinger med BRIKS-landene, den nye, win-win, økonomiske verdensorden, i et system, der beskrives som inkluderende uden at ekskludere USA, og for at have den samme slags relationer med Kina. »Mit synspunkt er, at de store projekter kan fremme menneskehedens fælles mål: rummet, de store oceaner (den blå økonomi) og Afrikas udvikling ...«

»Jeg er her for at diskutere med jer denne mulighed, som må gribes, for det, vi må gøre for morgendagens Frankrig, og ikke spilde jeres og min tid med at kritisere et system og dets velkendte defekter og farer.«

Det første spørgsmål kom fra direktøren for et nystartet computerfirma, som spurgte, hvad Cheminade ville tilføje Den europæiske Union, eller fjerne fra den, for at gøre den levedygtig.

EU, svarede han, er et falsk Europa, der ledes af en falskmøntner ved navn Mario Draghi. €90 mia. om måneden ['kvantitativ lempelse'; 'pengetrykning'], der ikke er i berøring med realøkonomien, er skandaløst. Alt imens vi ikke kan af-globalisere verdensøkonomien, så kan vi af-

finansialisere den, sagde han (altså, afslutte den finansielle besættelse af lande og økonomier, -red.)

På flere tidspunkter under diskussionen vendte han tilbage til behovet for store projekter og for, at Europa går med i Kinas Bælt & Vej-initiativ. Han blev også spurgt om behovet for lærlingeprogrammer i Frankrig for at hjælpe især unge mennesker til at finde jobs i de små og mellemstore virksomheder.

Til spørgsmålet, der blev rejst om gælden og den økonomiske vækst, svarede Cheminade, at gælden aldrig vil blive tilbagebetalt, ikke kun den græske gæld, men også Frankrigs, og han insisterede på behovet for en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling.

Det franske parti, der repræsenterer LaRouche-bevægelsens politik, og som Jacques Cheminade er formand for, hedder Solidarité & Progrès. Cheminades præsidentkampagne kan følges her:

[http://www.cheminade2017.fr/Soutenez-l-impression-des-livres-d-e-campagne](http://www.cheminade2017.fr/Soutenez-l'impression-des-livres-d-e-campagne)

Rettelse: Det nævnes her i Cheminades kampagne, at han fordømmer ECB's Mario Draghis 90 mia. euro store 'pengetrykning' (QE) om måneden. Faktisk trykker Draghi for 80 mia. euro om måneden, en ud af en lang liste af finansielle forbrydelser.

Foto: Ved et FNSEA-møde i Brest præsenterer Cheminade sin vision for fremtidens landbrug.

Daisuke Kotegawa i Rusland: Trumps valgsejr markerer et globalt skifte fra finansinteresser til produktion, med tilhørende produktiv beskæftigelse

3. april, 2017 – Daisuke Kotegawa, tidligere regeringsmedlem i Japans Finansministerium og Japans repræsentant i IMF, sagde i sidste uge ved Moskva Økonomiske Forum, at Trumps valgsejr signalerer, at »verdensøkonomien er i færd med at transformeres fra finansiel kapitalisme og tilbage til en vareproduktionsorienteret økonomi«, hvilket vil »blive klarere, hvis adskillelsen af investeringsbankvirksomhed og kommerciel bankvirksomhed, som er foreslået af Trump«, bliver gennemført.

Kotegawa forklarede, at, som regeringsmedlem i Finansministeriet i 1997-98, havde han tilbagekaldt Credit Suisses banklicens for deres praksis med at drage japanske forsikringsselskaber ind i derivatsvindler, der drev dem bankerot, og tilføjede, at han ville have gjort det samme med AIG, men de havde ingen banklicens (han antydede, at, havde man gjort det, kunne AIG's rolle i katastrofen i USA i 2008 muligvis have været undgået).

Med hensyn til Ruslands nuværende, interne økonomiske problemer, sagde han, at de »forfærdelige politikker, som prof. Jeffrey Sachs og hans team var fortaler for, samt folkene fra Goldman Sachs, ødelagde det russiske folks tillid til banksystemet i 1998« gennem »chokterapiens« politik, som stjal deres bankindskud. At genoprette tilliden til bankerne

er afgørende for at genoprette kredit, sagde han.

Han påpegede også forfaldet i USA's infrastruktur, men tilføjede, at Trump adresserer dette direkte. Han støtter Trumps krav om regeringsstøtte til fremvoksende, små foretagender; for en stor stimulering til infrastruktur; og for at bringe fred til Mellemøsten og for den enorme genopbygning, der behøves dér, som vil være fordelagtig for både amerikanske og russiske foretagender.

Under et 30 minutter langt interview på RT den 23. marts på showet 'Worlds Apart' med Oksana Boyko, gennemgik Kotegawa disse samme spørgsmål og tilføjede, at han mente, at Trumps prioriteringer var, for det første, at afslutte frihandelsaftalerne, dernæst en stor stimulus, dernæst fjernelse af reguleringer over for små banker og foretagender, og så vil han være i stand til at gå videre med Glass-Steagall, hvor han går op imod storbankerne. Han forklarede, at, siden den japanske bankkrise i 1990'erne, hvor flere banker blev lukket og bankierer blev fængslet, har bankierne været »meget forsigtige«, og at, på trods af anklager om at have været årsag til et »tabt årti« i Japan, så reddede afvisningen af fuldt ud at gå med i derivatfiaskoen deres banksystem, alt imens USA og Europa derimod »aldrig er kommet sig« over krisen i 2008.

På et spørgsmål fra Boyko om, hvorfor de vestlige nationer aldrig greb til handling for at fængsle og lægge bankerne i tømmer, svarede Kotegawa med et smil: »Demokrati fungerer bedre i Asien.«

I betragtning af afsløringerne i dag om Susan Rice i den farvede revolution imod Trump, er det værd at bemærke, at Kotegawa nævner Susan Rice (USA's ambassadør til FN under Obama, fra 2009, -red.) som den person, der lagde enormt pres på Abe i 2014 for at gå med i sanktionsregimet mod Rusland og ikke besøge Putin i 2016. Abe afviste klogeligt dette »råd«.

(Daisuke Kotegawa sagde i januar 2017 ja til at blive medlem at Schiller Institutets internationale rådgivningsråd. Kotegawa har deltaget med foredrag på flere Schiller Institut-konferencer.)

Putin fordømmer »endeløs og grundløs« kampagne imod Rusland; advarer om, at det kunne føre til ny Cuba-missilkrise

31. mrs., 2017 – Anklagerne om, at den russiske regering og Donald Trump på en eller anden måde konspirerede for at stjæle den amerikanske præsidentpost fra Hillary Clinton, er »endeløse og grundløse«, sagde den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin i går til pressen, efter at han havde deltaget i et møde langt mod nord, i byen Arkhangelsk, om »Det Arktiske Område – et territorium for dialog«.

Putin beskrev de nuværende relationer mellem Washington og Moskva som »på nulpunktet«, og han gik dernæst ind i bagvaskeskampagnen.

»Vi ser, hvad det er, der foregår. De forhindrer den nye [amerikanske] præsident i at opfylde sine kampagneløfter om mange spørgsmål: sundhedssystemet, andre spørgsmål, internationale relationer, bånd til Rusland. Vi venter på, at situationen skal normalisere sig og blive mere stabil. Og vi bryder ikke ind på nogen som helst måde.« Dernæst gentog han: »Hør, hvad jeg siger: Nej.«

Putin advarede om denne provokerende kampagnes ekstreme farlighed. »Dette anti-russiske kort bliver spillet til fordel for nogle interne, amerikanske kræfters interesser, og det har til hensigt at styrke og konsolidere deres positioner. Jeg mener ikke, det tjener det store flertal af det amerikanske folks interesser at bringe de amerikansk-russiske relationer til en tilstand af absurditet, for at tjene intern politik. Ønsker vi fuldstændigt at kappe de diplomatiske relationer? Ønsker vi at bringe situationen dertil, hvor de var i 1960'erne under Cuba- [missil] krisen? Hvor ønsker folk, der opfører sig så uansvarligt, at bringe os alle, inklusive det amerikanske folk, hen?«

Putin afviste ligeledes den idé, at Arktis kunne blive et konfliktområde med USA.

»Rusland ser intet potentiiale for konflikter i det Arktiske Område ... [Vi] vil ikke enten være i krig eller i konkurrence med USA. Jo hurtigere, vi etablerer samarbejde i den militære sfære, desto bedre.«

Nedenstående er et kort klip fra Forummet, hhv. hele diskussionen mellem præsidenterne fra Rusland, Finland og Island.

<http://www.knowyourleak.com/Presidents-Of-Russia-Iceland-Finland-Discuss-Arctic-Cooperation-In-Arkhangelsk-1085718.html>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Vvz9_veeUM

Hvis Trump og Xi genlancerer

det Amerikanske System, bliver Londons finansimperium knust

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 3. april, 2017 – Hvorfor har Londonavisen Financial Times lanceret så fjendtlig en provokation i sit 'interview' af præsident Trump – hvor de insisterer, at det centrale spørgsmål under hans topmøde med Kinas præsident bliver krigstrusler mod Nordkorea?

Hvilke muligheder i dette topmøde er det, City of London så rasende ønsker at afspore?

Dette topmøde 6.-7. april i Mar-a-Lago har potentialet til at genantænde gnisten til netop det 'Amerikanske System', som motor for økonomisk fremskridt i USA, som Trump så lidenskabeligt har påkaldt i sine seneste taler. Med fokus på handel har præsident Trump brug for den substans og form for investering i genoplivelsen af varefremstilling, landbrug og produktiv beskæftigelse i Amerika – og de billioner i infrastrukturinvesteringer, han har sagt, må foretages. Dette kan præsident Xi tilbyde, og mange eksperter i Kina mener, han vil tilbyde det, hvis topmødet ikke bliver saboteret.

Kina og de andre BRIKS-nationer har brug for, at de store magter USA og Tyskland samarbejder med Bælt & Vej-initiativet (»Nye Silkevej«) med store infrastrukturprojekter og landbroer. Og de har frem for alt brug for at bringe denne »win-win« økonomiske genopbygning ind i de sydvestasiatiske og afrikanske områder, der er ødelagt af de endeløse krige, påført dem af Tony Blair, George W. Bush og Barack Obama. Sammen med Ruslands præsident Putin har de brug for hjælp til at udrydde terrorisme og stabilisere Sydvestasien.

Dette er den førende, økonomiske dynamik i dag. Præsident Xi vil sandsynligvis give præsident Trump en personlig invitation

til at deltage i det internationale Forum for Bælt & Vej-initiativet i Beijing, den 14.-15. maj. Hvis topmødet på Mar-a-Lago bliver en succes, vil et nyt paradigme for økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt, og for fred blandt nationer, tage et spring fremad.

Som den kinesisk-amerikanske leder George Koo i dag påpeger i *Asia Times*, så bygger Kinas førende jernbaneproducent allerede i dag nye broer i Amerika, under budgettet og foran tidsplanen, og de køber amerikansk. De har vundet priser for deres byggeri af en bro i New York City ved navn Alexander Hamilton – grundlæggeren af det »Amerikanske System«, som Trump ønsker at genoplive.

London forfølger naturligvis sine egne handelsfordele med Kinas hastigt voksende økonomi; men *Financial Times* gjorde det klart, at London ønsker at se det amerikansk-kinesiske topmøde gå ned i flammerne af krig over Nordkorea, handelskrig, eller begge dele. Det var ligeledes britisk efterretning, der var ophavsmænd til den eskalerende kampagne à la McCarthy-isme, for at skandalisere og ødelægge Trump-administrationen over en hvilken som helst kontakt med Putins Rusland.

Lyndon LaRouches bevægelse i USA, og Schiller Institutet, har i årtier ført en kampagne for en tilbagevenden til det »Amerikanske Økonomiske System«, og er blevet angrebet og retsforfulgt af den samme »deep state«, bestående af briterne, NATO og USA, der nu jager Trump – i visse tilfælde af denne magts selv samme agenter. Det Amerikanske System er LaRouches Fire Love for at redde nationen: Glass-Steagall, statslig kredit, moderne infrastruktur i stor skala, genoplivelse af rumforskning og fusionsteknologi.

En appel, der promoverer disse Fire Love over for præsident Trump, samler nu tusinder af underskrifter på larouchepac.com sitet.

Xi-Trump-topmødet vil, hvis det bliver en succes, være et

skridt på denne vej.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump vil være vært for Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i Florida, 6. april, 2017.

Den rette tid at leve i, er lige nu

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 2. april, 2017 – Når vore modstanderes scenarie – »russerne gjorde det« – er offer for nådesløs latterliggørelse foran et massivt publikum, er tiden inde til at indse, at kampen om USA's fremtid endnu ikke er afgjort – den er snarere ved at blive afgjort, netop i dette øjeblik. Afgørelsen svinger frem og tilbage over afgrunden.

Den dristige og modige, men samtidig kompetente og klarhjernede vurdering af de aktuelle forhold i verden, lyder, at verdenshistorien står og vipper frem og tilbage i disse aktuelle uger. Vi har nået et punkt, hvor afgørelsen må træffes, og denne afgørelse kunne falde ud til både den ene og anden side.

På modstandernes side finder vi de kræfter og institutioner, der myrdede John Kennedy for over halvtreds år siden. Men ånden i John Kennedys tradition, som var den patriotiske ånd i traditionen efter Franklin Roosevelt og Alexander Hamilton før ham, døde aldrig. Netop, som de, der har verdselig visdom, mindst ventede det, dukkede ånden efter John Kennedy atter op som en eksistentiel trussel mod Det britiske Imperium, i form af præsident Ronald Reagans samarbejde med Lyndon LaRouches »Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ«, 23. marts, 1983. Det britiske Imperium forsøgte at dræbe Reagan; de troede, de kunne holde LaRouche fængslet, til han døde i fængsel. Det mislykkedes.

Jo, det lykkedes dem måske nok at trampe gnisterne ned for en tid, men nu blusser ilden op, højere end før. Nu kan Lyndon LaRouches politiske forslag få succes på kort sigt. Det britiske Imperiums blodige genfærd, og den historiske blindgyde, som hele det oldgamle imperiesystem udgør, kan meget hurtigt blive afskaffet. USA kan gå sammen med Kina og Rusland i det storslæede projekt for den Eurasiske Landbro, som LaRouche-parret var de første til at foreslå. Vi kan videreføre John Kennedys og Krafft Ehrickes opdagelsesrejse ud i Solsystemet, og hinsides dette.

Glem ikke, at jeres børnebørn vil udspørge jer længe og intenst om, hvor I var i 2017, og præcis, hvad I gjorde.

Foto: Præsident Donald Trump ser ud ad det Røde Værelses vindue, på Det Hvide Hus' sydlige søjleterrasse.

Putin fremlægger udviklingsstrategi for det Arktiske Område

31. mrs., 2017 – Ud over at deltage i det internationale møde i Arkhangelsk, Rusland, om »Det Arktiske Område – et territorium for dialog«, holdt den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin et møde samme steds med russiske topregeringsfolk, inklusive premierminister Dmitri Medvedev, forsvarsminister Shoigu og særlige præsidentielle repræsentant for Naturbeskyttelse, Miljø og Transport, Sergei Ivanov, hvor spørgsmålet om »den omfattende udvikling af det Arktiske Område« blev taget op. Som det detaljeret rapporteres på Kremls hjemmeside, fremlagde Putin en omfattende strategi for områdets udvikling på dette møde på regeringsplan.

Putin lagde ud med at bemærke, at »Rusland næsten trak sig tilbage fra området i begyndelsen af 1990'erne«, men bebudede, at det nu vendte tilbage på en storstilet måde. Han sagde, at det Arktiske Område udgør 20 % af Ruslands territorium og har massive »urørte reserver af kulbrintestoffer (eller olie og gas) og mineraler, der er af global betydning«. Han sagde, at disse reserver skønnes at have en værdi på mere end \$30 billioner, og to tredjedele heraf er energiresurser. »Det nuværende udviklingsniveau står ikke i forhold til dette områdes potentiiale«, udtalte Putin; det, der behøves, er »langfristet – lad mig understrege dette ord – strukturtransformation for at forfølge den industrielle udvikling af de nordlige og arktiske have«.

I særskilte bemærkninger krævede Putin, at det Russiske Forsvarsministerium og den Føderale Sikkerhedstjeneste gennemførte planer med en »udsigt til at styrke landets forsvarsevner og beskytte vore interesser i det Arktiske Område, samtidig med, at den Nordlige Sejlroute opererer normalt«. Han sagde, at regeringen ville »optrappe færdiggørelsen af en ny version af det statslige program for social og økonomisk udvikling af de Arktiske Områder ... Det betyder skabelsen af moderne infrastruktur, udvinding af resurser og industrielle faciliteter«.

Rusland er åben over for internationalt samarbejde omkring alt dette, men, understregede Putin, »Vore planer for udvikling i dette område er absolut berettigede. Der er næppe noget, der kan ændre vore prioriteringer dér.«

Foto: Vladimir Putin taler for det internationale møde i Arkhangelsk, Rusland, »Det Arktiske Område – et territorium for dialog«.

Washingtons Nationale Symfoniorkester gennemfører sandt diplomati i Rusland

2017, 1. april – Washingtons Nationale Symfoniorkester, der ledes af Christoph Eschenbach, opnåede en betydningsfuld, diplomatisk succes med sin koncert den 29. marts i Moskva, til ære for afdøde Mstislav Rostropovich, den berømte cellist, der havde dirigeret NSO i Washington, rapporterede Anne Midgette i en forsideartikel i *Washington Post* i går.

Midgette, der er *WP*'s musikkritiker, udtalte, at denne første opførelse i Rusland af symfoniorkestret i næsten et kvart århundrede, »viste, at, i en tid, hvor den politiske retorik er ophedet, kan musikken muligvis tilbyde det sande, diplomatiske sprog ... Det var faktisk ikke klart, om folk klappede ad det, de netop havde hørt, eller ad det, som dette besøg repræsenterede«.

Det Nationale Symfoniorkester tog til Rusland for atære sin afdøde musikdirektør, Mstislav Rostropovich, på den årlige festival, som hans datter Olga skabte på det, der ville have været hans 90-års fødselsdag. Rostropovich var leder af det Nationale Symfoniorkester i 17 sæsoner, efter han var blevet sendt i eksil fra USSR for at støtte Alexander Solsjenitsyn.

Midgette skrev: »Russerne bemærker bestemt de symbolske implikationer af, at et amerikansk orkester kommer for at være en russer og bogstavelig talt spiller under et *enormt* banner, dekoreret med et portræt af Rostropovich over konservatoriets scene ... På et andet plan kan man se det Nationale Symfoniorkesters opførelser som et levedygtigt alternativ til politisk diplomati og viser folk fra forskellige samfund, der bringes sammen gennem en fælles kærlighed.«

USA's ambassadør til Rusland, John Tefft, sagde, »Kultur hæver

sig stolt over den larmende politik. Den gør ting, som traditionelt diplomati ikke kan.« Den russiske ambassadør til USA, Sergej Kislyak, sagde, »Turneen er et af de mest strålende elementer i vore aktuelle relationer.«

Ved slutningen af Schuberts »Niende Symfoni«, »byggede klapsalverne op til rytmiske, dundrende klapsalver« for en encore, som, skriver Midgette, skulle udtrykke, »Vi ønsker at kunne lide musik. Vi ønsker at kunne lide hinanden.«

Foto: Mstislav Rostropovich dirigerer.

Det Nationale Symfoniorkester vil give tre koncerter i løbet af den internationale Rostropovich-festival. 29.-30. marts spiller orkestret i Moskvas Tjajkovskij-konservatorie, og den tredje koncert bliver i Skt. Petersborgs Sjostakovitj Filharmoniske Akademi. Orkestret vil især spille Picker, Elgar, Sjostakovitj og Schubert.

Rusland kræver USA til ansvar i saudisk folkemord i Yemen

31. mrs., 2017 – Under sin faste briefing i går anklagede talmand for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova, praktisk talt saudierne for at føre en krig for folkemord imod det yemenitiske folk, men hun lagde det virkelige ansvar for det på USA.

»Jeg bed mærke i en udtalelse fra USA's ambassadør til FN, Nikki Haley, der sagde, at USA er 'verdens moralske samvittighed'«, sagde hun. »Hvis I virkelig er verdens moralske samvittighed, ville I så lukke øjnene for det, der sker med befolkningen i Yemen? Eller er det en ny hybridform

for samvittighed, der ikke sender signaler til hjernen eller andre vitale organer? Det er umuligt ikke at se katastrofen.«

»To års vold, blodsudgydelse, fortvivlelse, hungersnød og ødelæggelse er mere end rigeligt for, at alle sider kan se nødvendigheden af, at det haster med at søge en fredelig afgørelse af konflikten«, fortsatte Zakharova. Det internationale samfunds pligt er at arbejde hen imod et ophør af fjendtlighederne, understregede hun. »Parterne bør vende tilbage til forhandlingsbordet med assistance fra FN's særlige udsending for Yemen, Ismail Ould Cheikh Ahmed, og arbejde for en holdbar våbenstilstand og en politisk afgørelse af konflikten.«

Francis Boyle, professor i international lov ved Illinois Universitet, var endnu mere ligefrem.

»I en nøddeskal, så er saudierne, emiraterne og USA i færd med at påføre houthierne et folkemord«, sagde han, rapporterer Sputnik. Og John Kiriakou, tidligere CIA-analytiker og 'whistleblower', advarede om, at en optrapning af amerikansk militærstøtte til den saudiske krig ikke vil bringe krigen til en hurtig afslutning. »Det kan kun føre til mere ødelæggelse i et land, der allerede er næsten ødelagt«, sagde han til Sputnik. »Det vil øge den menneskelige elendighed blandt yemenitterne, og det vil koste de amerikanske skatteborgere utsalte millioner af dollars.«

Som for at understrege anklagerne om en folkemordskrig, rapporterede *Al Masdar News* her til morgen, at saudierne er i færd med at bombe landbrugsmarker i Yemen. Saudiske krigsfly, rapporterede *Al Masdar*, ramte en gård uden for hovedstaden Sana'a og fulgte dernæst op på det med angreb mod et beboelsesområde i selve hovedstaden.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Institutets stifter, har karakteriseret situationen i Yemen som det værste folkemord på planeten i dag.

Foto: Den saudiske illegale bombning af civile mål, herunder landbrugsmarker og beboelsesområder, fortsætter i det næsten totalt ødelagte Yemen.

**RADIO SCHILLER 3. april,
2017:**

**Vinder Trump eller
efterretningsstjenesterne?
Vil Trump alliere sig med
Kinas opbygningspolitik?**

Politisk briefing ved formand Tom Gillesberg.

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/vinder-trump-eller-efterretningsstjenesterne-vil-trump-alliere-sig-med-kinas-opbygningspolitik

**»Krafft Ehrickes vision for
menneskehedens fremtid«**

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på Schiller Instituttets konference i München, Tyskland, den 25. marts, 2017

Jeg er også sikker på, at, hvis Krafft Ehricke havde været her i dag, eller havde levet i vor tid, så ville han have været utrolig optimistisk med hensyn til, at hans vision, som i hans levetid ofte blev bekæmpet – ikke kun hans livs vision, men fortsættelsen af rumfart i det hele taget mødte utrolig meget opposition og modarbejdelse – at han ville erkende, at vi i dag virkelig har den strategiske konstellation, som bringer realiseringen af hans vision inden for rækkevidde. Det er allerede, i forbindelse med en tale om det kinesiske rumfartsprogram, blevet sagt, at »frøspringet« nu virkelig kommer, for kineserne har en vision om at udvinde helium-3 på Månen bagside til den fremtidige fusionsøkonomi på Jorden. Det bliver endda også diskuteret af ESA, men jeg mener, at Kina på verdensplan uddanner flest forskere og videnskabsfolk inden for rumfart, og derfor er jeg optimistisk over, at denne »leap-frogging«, altså frøspring, vil fortsætte.

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

Repræsentant for det danske Schiller Institut på LaRouchePAC Manhattan- møde:

Hvordan ser I virkningen af dette skifte i USA's politik på resten af verden, der endnu ikke er i det nye paradigme?

... Men i Europa har vi et politisk lederskab, som man kunne sige ligesom sidder fast i en tidslomme. I denne tidslomme går resten af verden fremad, og de sidder fast i denne tidslomme, denne glasklokke, som de bliver ved med at støde hovedet imod. Og derfor spiller vores organisation, Schiller Instituttet og vore allierede organisationer i Europa, en nøglerolle som lederskab for at bringe Europa ind i dette nye paradigme.

Næstformand Michelle Rasmussen havde følgende indlæg og spørgsmål på LaRouche PAC's borgermøde på Manhattan, New York, lørdag, 1. april:

Jeg er Michelle Rasmussen, og jeg arbejder for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og er her på besøg. Jeg vil gerne give et øjebliksbillede af, hvordan tingene ser ud fra Europa, for

det er ligesom folk i Europa står på usikker grund: På den ene side har man, mod øst, det nye paradigme, der anføres af Kina med Rusland og de andre centraleurasiske lande, der er involveret i Bælt & Vej-politikken. Og på den anden side, mod vest, har man potentialet for, at USA rent faktisk ændrer sin politik. Mod øst har vi en konkret transformation. Mod vest ville jeg sige, at der mest er et potentiiale for en transformation, med tale om det Amerikanske System, infrastruktur, Glass-Steagall, med ideen om at få et nyt forhold til Rusland; samt de meget spændendeudsigter med topmødet mellem Xi Jinping og præsident Trump; Trumps NASA-tale, osv.

Men i Europa har vi et politisk lederskab, som man kunne sige ligesom sidder fast i en tidslomme. I denne tidslomme går resten af verden fremad, og de sidder fast i denne tidslomme, denne glasklokke, som de bliver ved med at støde hovedet imod. Og derfor spiller vores organisation, Schiller Instituttet og vores allierede organisationer i Europa, en nøglerolle som lederskab for at bringe Europa ind i dette nye paradigme. For vi har en lille organisation i nogle af landene, og vores politik har altid været, at vi ikke nødvendigvis forventer, at de europæiske lande vil vise vejen, men at vi måtte så frøene for LaRouche-programmets politik for den dag, hvor USA tager skridt til det. Så måtte vi have sået frøene, så de europæiske lande kunne komme med.

Det er, hvad vi gør. Vi har, f.eks., ganske kort, i Italien haft omkring 12 forskellige lovforslag for Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i løbet af de seneste tre år. Alle partierne, undtagen det førende parti, er for Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, og for blot to uger siden begyndte man omsider at drøfte det i parlamentsudvalget.

I Frankrig har vi en enorm chance i de næste fire uger, med Jacques Cheminades kampagne, der er i færd med at opbygge en national bevægelse. De har kontaktet 30.000 borgmestre for at skaffe 500, der ville støtte Jacques. Han vil få massiv

lejlighed til at komme i medierne. Hans program vil blive uddelt til hver eneste husstand i Frankrig. Dette sker inden for de næste fire uger.

I Tyskland har vi netop haft en vellykket Krafft Ehrickenkonference om udforskning af rummet. I Berlin har vi en valgkampagne.

I Sverige er Glass-Steagall netop blevet diskuteret i det svenske parlament, for en eller to uger siden; forslaget blev nedstemt, men det blev diskuteret. Og vore folk i Sverige lavede en indsats for at forsøge at standse krigen mod Yemen, og vi har Hussein, vores leder i Sverige, der arbejder med den arabiske version af vores Verdenslandbro-rapport.

Og i Danmark, som I hørte for et par uger siden, havde vi et vidunderligt gennembrud med koncerten for en dialog mellem kulturer, hvor folk hang oppe under loftet, så mange mennesker kom; og den vidunderlige udveksling af traditionel musik fra hele verden, inkl. fra Rusland og Kina, og også med europæisk opera og klassisk musik.

I parentes bemærket, så blev Alexander Hamilton født i Vestindien; han blev født på en britisk ø og voksede op på Sankt Croix, som var en dansk ø. Den danske statsminister, der netop har mødt Trump, besøgte i denne uge Jomfruøerne, fordi det er 100 år siden, danskerne solgte Jomfruøerne til USA. Alexander Hamilton voksede op på Skt. Croix [USVI], der dengang var en dansk koloni, og det har en vigtig indflydelse i amerikansk historie, for Alexander Hamilton var ikke fra nogen delstat! Alle de andre kæmpede for deres egen del, vores stat først, vores stat først. Men Alexander Hamilton stod over dette, han opererede ud fra standpunktet om principperne for frihed, og hans bestræbelser på at etablere en centralregering har forbindelse til dette: han var ikke bundet til en bestemt delstat. Det var blot en parentes.

Men, hvordan ser I virkningen af dette skifte i USA's politik

på resten af verden, der endnu ikke er i det nye paradigme?

Diane Sare: Jeg tror, det bliver meget ulige fordelt, for steder synes at have en masse fraktioner, som vi ser det i Tyskland, hvor der er folk, der virkelig gerne vil arbejde sammen med Rusland, især industrifirmaer osv. – og så er der Merkel. Så jeg tror, det bliver et *chok*, hvis vi får USA til at skifte politik, det bliver et virkeligt chok. Og jeg tror, det vil styrke folk, der ved, hvad der er rigtigt. Som ikke ønsker krig, som mener, de bør orientere sig mod Rusland, som ikke har haft mod til at sige det. Jeg tænker – da jeg var i Sverige sidste efterår, talte vi om, at hjernevasken imod Rusland var spektakulær! Man tror, det er slemt her, og det er slemt her, men jeg havde en nær ven, der boede på Gotland, denne ø mellem Sverige og de baltiske lande, og hun var fuldstændig overbevist om, at der er russiske spioner overalt på øen! Og det svenske militær må opruste for at forberede sig på en russisk invasion.

Jeg mener, at et skifte i USA slutteligt kunne give en masse optimisme. Men det bliver interessant; jeg tror, det bliver meget ulige fordelt, og jeg tror, det vil forårsage nogle uventede resultater.

<https://larouchepac.com/20170401/manhattan-town-hall-event-diane-sare>

Michelle start på 46 min.

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 communiqus 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 ways 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 Ehricke. 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 Ehricke; 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 send 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 Ehricke, 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.