

Hvad er geopolitik? Første del: Historie.

LaRouche PAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, Lektion 2, 17. feb. 2018

Der var de fortsatte provokationer i Mellemøsten, provokationer i Asien, Koreakrigen, Vietnamkrigen – dette var geopolitik med det formål at bevare Det britiske Imperium. Og desværre, med mordet på Kennedy, blev USA en partner i det, man kunne kalde et »anglo-amerikansk geopolitisk imperium«.

Og hvad gik politikerne ud på? Frihandel, neoliberal økonomi, nedskæringspolitik. Svækkelse af regeringer, svækkelse af ideen om national suverænitet og etablering af institutioner som den Europæiske Union, der ønsker ikkevalgte bureaukrater til at bestemme politikker for det, der plejede at være nationalstater.

Det så ud, som om alt dette kunne ændre sig i 1989, med den kommunistiske verdens fald, med det østtyske regimes kollaps og Berlinmurens fald. På dette tidspunkt intervenserede LaRouche-organisationen meget direkte, for et alternativ til geopolitik. Lyndon LaRouche var blevet fængslet af George Bush, med assistance fra den daværende vicestatsanklager i Boston, Robert Mueller. Men Helga Zepp-LaRouche anførte kampen for det, vi dengang kaldte den Produktive Trekant Paris-Berlin-Wien, og dernæst, så tidligt som i slutningen af 1990, det, der blev kaldt den »Nye Silkevej« eller den Eurasiske Landbro, som et middel til at bringe nationer sammen og overvinde disse kunstige opdelinger, skabt af Det britiske

Imperium.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Masseskyderier: Et spejl af nationens moralske pessimisme

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 26. feb., 2018 – Hvad var det, præsident Trump lovede, havde til hensigt, blev valgt til at vende omkring? Sammenbruddet af den vindende optimisme, industriel formåen, Amerikas produktive ånd? Lad os holde op med at anstifte krige, sagde han, og i stedet genopbygge vores nation, industri, infrastruktur, økonomi og »sætte fodaftryk i fjerne verdener«. Hans mål, hvad enten han præcist kaldte det dette eller ej, var at afslutte den intensiverende pessimisme i et Amerika, der engang anførte mennesket ud i rummet.

På grund af disse hans hensigter blev præsidenten selv målskive for dem, der vil have et Amerika-altid-i-krig, et Amerika igen i stormagtskonfrontation med Kina og Rusland snarere end i stormagtssamarbejde om fred og økonomisk fremskridt.

For de neokonservative, der steg til vejrs under Bush' og Obamas præsidentskaber, og for ulykkelige millioner af amerikanere, er USA blevet en nation, for hvem »at vinde« blot

betyder at være den bedste til at identificere fjendtlige »regimer«, »stammer« eller folkeslag og slå dem ihjel, sammen med denne eller hin terrorgruppe, som disse krige afføder.

I forløbet med denne identifikation – eller skabelse – af modstandere og med forberedelser til at dræbe dem, tilskriver både neokonservative og liberale etableringer disse »modstandere« deres egen adfærd – »spejlfælden«. Den nylige, forbløffende rapport fra Center for Strategiske og Internationale Studier (CSIS), der erklærede, at Kina er ved at forberede førsteangreb med krydsermissiler mod Washington og mord på amerikanske ledere samtidig med, at de invaderer Taiwan, er typisk for det »nye koldkrigshysteri«. Kinas meget lange historie fremviser ingen sådanne handlinger; USA's seneste 50 år er fuld af dem, og disse handlinger er endda mangedoblet i de seneste 20 år. Kinas *Global Times* gav et korrekt svar på denne CSIS-uhyrlighed ved at give det betegnelsen, »USA skræmt af sit eget spejlbillede«.

Masseskyderier, hvor amerikanerne selv skyder amerikanere, afspejler denne kulturelle og moralske pessimisme.

Amerikanere bør blive skræmt af synet af masseskyderne i spejlet: hvor de ser sig selv som snigskytter og specialstyrker og gør det af med fantasifjender, og altid med selvmord som det ultimative mål. Alle med undtagelse af et enkelt af de 25 værste masseskyderier i Amerikas historie har fundet sted siden 1980. I 1950'erne og 1960'erne – hvor våbenlovene ikke var reformeret, men hvor der var en stærk tiltrækning mod videnskabelig og økonomisk optimisme og en nation, der eksporterede kernekraft og havde rummet i sigte – var der kun seks af disse offentlige skudepisoder på 20 år.

I 1999, da »Columbine-massakren« fandt sted (på trods af et nationalt forbud mod angrebsvåben), skrev stiftende redaktør af *EIR* Lyndon LaRouche, at Littleton, Colorado, havde oplevet »et varsel for vor tid ... Hvordan bærer man sig ad med at korrumpere uskyldige børn til at blive psykotisklignende

mordere? Det hurtige svar på dette spørgsmål er: Umenneskeliggør billedet af mennesket ... Det er ikke en oversimplificering at sige, at, når først dette første skridt, umenneskeliggørelse af billedet af mennesket, er opnået, så har man etableret det aksiomatiske grundlag for at gøre krig og myrderi til en blot og bart barnlig leg ... «

Og hvordan genopretter man nu billedet af mennesket i universet, og af en nation, der hjælper andre nationer i udviklingen af »menneskehedens fælles mål«? »At vinde« vil faktisk sige »win-win«. At forpligte sig over for Bælte & Vej Initiativet for store infrastrukturprojekter i samarbejde med Kina og 60 andre nationer. Genoptag udforskningen af rummet, som i Apollo-projektet, sammen med de andre rumfartsnationer. Få Amerikas økonomi op at stå, før den rammes af endnu et finanskarak, ved at gennemføre Glass-Steagall på Wall Street og skabe kredit til udvikling, ligesom Alexander Hamilton gjorde det.

Men de 50 år, der er gået, siden præsident Kennedy blev myrdet, har været et voksende mareridt for Amerika. At vende tilbage til, hvad det vil sige at være menneskelig – det virkelige emne for LaRouches refleksion fra 1999 over Columbine – er det fundamentale spørgsmål.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump mødes med folkevalgte fra delstater og lokalsamfund, for at diskutere sikkerhed i skolerne. 22. feb., 2018. (Official White House Photo by Shealah Craighead)

Aktivister fra det danske

Schiller Institut intervenerer over for Danmarks forsvarsminister

København, 26. feb., 2018 – Fredag deltog medlemmer af det danske Schiller Institut i en debat med den danske forsvarsminister, Claus Hjort Frederiksen, med Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS) som vært og med deltagelse af omkring 200 gæster. Debatmødet blev streamet online. Anledningen var aftalen i Folketinget om det nye forsvarsbudget, som har givet ministeren muligheder for at skræmme befolkningen i medierne med et budskab, der kan koges ned til »Russerne kommer! Russerne kommer!«

Forsvarsministeren fremlagde Danmarks politik for det, en DIIS-analytiker kaldte »at optrappe for at trappe ned«, som en militær strategi til at tackle Rusland. Hjort Frederiksen sagde, at der ikke var noget forståeligt rationale bag russiske militære aktioner (som f.eks. i Krim) og sagde, at cyberangreb var lige så farlige som konventionel krig, og at NATO's paragraf 5, der kræver fælles respons, også burde gælde for cyberangreb. Han anklagede Rusland for at have intervenseret i de amerikanske valg (og muligvis også i valg i Frankrig og Holland) og for at være skyldig i hacking af det danske handelskonglomerat, Maersk.

Alt imens mødets ordstyrer forsøgte at undgå at invitere de tre Schiller Institut-medlemmer, der var til stede, til at stille spørgsmål, så viste det sig imidlertid, at to af de personer, han inviterede til at tale, var ældre tilhængere af Schiller Instituttet, og så inviterede han endelig Lissie (Brobjerg). Den første af disse to tilhængere sagde, at den danske ambassade i Rusland, samt de danske bevæbnede styrker, begge havde den laveste vurdering af en trussel fra Rusland, og at de befandt sig i den bedste position til at bedømme

dette. Den anden tilhænger refererede til en rapport fra det Danske Forsvarsakademi, som sagde, at russerne ikke var aggressorer, men har været reaktive. Under ministerens svar, hvor han listede rundt som katten om den varme grød, afbrød tilhængereren, der sandsynligvis var den ældste person til stede, med at råbe, »har du læst rapporten?«, til hvilket ministeren måtte svare nej.

Lissie bad ministeren om at kommentere Nunes-rapporten, der viste, at angrebene mod Rusland for angivelig indblanding i de amerikanske valg var baseret på svindelagtig dokumentation og en del af en operation fra kredse i Storbritannien og USA, der går ud på at forhindre et samarbejde mellem USA og Rusland, og opfordrede forsvarsministeren til ikke at gå med i dette spil, men i stedet få Danmark til at indgå i et nyt samarbejde med Rusland og tjene som et forbillede på en ny, Westfalsk Fred og dermed bidrage til at undgå atomkrig. Hertil svarede han: Du nævnte Nunes-rapporten. Det er typiske diskussioner, der altid stiller spørgsmålstegn ved grundlaget og spørger, »hvad er kilderne?« og dit og dat i det håb at få det hele til at fremstå som svindel og plat alt sammen; men jeg går slet ikke ind i den der diskussion. Kendsgerningen er, at dem, vi samarbejder med, er demokratiske lande, der skal stå til ansvar over for deres befolkninger gennem demokratiske valg, og det er dem, vi samarbejder med og stoler på, og det er udgangspunktet for det, og ikke alle mulige mærkelige, andre konstruktioner.«

Bagefter gik Lissie op til Hjort Frederiksen og kommenterede, at hans tidligere bemærkninger om, at russerne var aggressorer, og ikke reagerede til Vestens provokationer, ikke var sande, og hun refererede til Victoria Nuland og kuppet i Ukraine; hertil svarede han, at han ikke ville have noget med den slags at gøre.

Hele mødet kan ses på video her:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qk2K1eliwEw>

Lissies spørgsmål kommer 1:38:14, og Claus Hjort Frederiksen svar starter 1:41:50.

Foto: Claus Hjort Frederiksen (stående) svarer på Lissies spørgsmål.

En afslutning af geopolitik; en afslutning af Det britiske Imperiums bestialske menneskebegreb

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 24. feb., 2018 – Den 24. feb. udgav Demokraterne i Kongressen deres respons til den ødelæggende afsløring, som FBI, Justitsministeriet og deres kriminelle partnere har været udsat for som et resultat af Nunes-memoet og relaterede rapporter – og som i særdeleshed inkluderer *EIR's* dossier, som totalt afslører Storbritanniens Mueller-operation. Det 10 sider lange Demokratiske memo var intet andet end et skamløst forsvar for FBI, Justitsministeriet og den særlige anklager Robert Mueller, baseret på skamløse løgne og sofisteri, der ville have gjort Trasymachos og Kallikles stolte.

Men husk, hvem og hvad det er, som Mueller et al. faktisk forsvarer gennem deres kampagne for at vælte USA's valgte præsident: Det britiske Imperiums gamle, døende paradigme. Dette paradigme er baseret på alle-mod-alle krigsførelse; brutal økonomisk udplyndring af underkastede befolkninger (inklusive den amerikanske befolkning); og, frem for alt, et bestialsk menneskebillede, der er blevet omhyggeligt næret og spredt over hele planeten.

Dette – og ikke en eller anden profileret debat omkring våbenloven – er det spørgsmål, som den nylige massakre på skoleelever i Florida stiller, og de *dusinvis* og atter *dusinvis* af lignende hændelser, der har fundet sted i hele landet i løbet af de seneste år. Som guvernør for Kentucky Matt Bevin understregede i et nyligt videointerview, der cirkuleres bredt på internettet, så er problemet, at hele nutidens amerikanske kultur har hærget vores ungdom. »Vi har en kultur, der er desensibiliseret over for døden, over for værdien af liv, og vi fejrer død gennem vore musikalske tekster, vi fejrer døden gennem videospil, der bogstavelig talt belønner dig med ekstra points for at gå tilbage og gøre det af med folk.«

Selv om Bevin ikke påpegede dem, der er ansvarlige for krisen, og heller ikke foreslog en positiv løsning til den, så opfordrede han til en presserende nødvendig, national debat. I dag understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at Bevins bemærkninger er et meget vigtigt bidrag til denne debat, der også må omfatte de nødvendige, økonomiske politikker, som Lyndon LaRouche unikt har specificeret. Hun satte det kulturelle forfald og lammelsen med hensyn til nødvendige, økonomiske politikker, som gennemsyrrer USA og Europa, op imod Kinas optimistiske fremstød for udvikling – som det reflekteres i deres annoncering i går af investeringer på over \$1,5 billion i »en masse store projekter« inklusive infrastruktur og ny, hightech industrisektorer.

Hvis vi vitterligt skal gøre 2018 til året, hvor geopolitik endelig lægges i graven, sådan, som Zepp-LaRouche har opfordret til, så må dette også være året, hvor Det britiske Imperiums bankerotte finanssystem begraves, sammen med dets bestialske menneskebegreb. Som fr. Zepp-LaRouche understregede mod slutningen af sit webcast den 22. feb.: [1]

»Vi må blot gå tilbage til det højeste, kulturelle niveau i hver nation. I USA ville det selvfølgelig sige Benjamin Franklin, de grundlæggende fædre, John Quincy Adams, Lincoln,

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Kennedy – disse perioder, hvor USA havde en positiv vision af sin rolle. Jeg mener, John Quincy Adams havde f.eks. en tilgang til udenrigspolitik, der ligner meget det, Kina gør i dag. Benjamin Franklin var en absolut entusiastisk elev af Konfutses, og han brugte Konfutses filosofi til at udvikle sit eget moralsystem! Det er denne form for diskussioner, der virkelig ville hjælpe ...

I Tyskland er vi velsignet med en meget rig kultur: Vi har haft mange, mange tænkere, fra Nikolaus von Kues, Kepler og til Leibniz. Vi har haft mange klassiske komponister, fra Bach til Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann og mange andre. Vi har haft fantastiske digtere, som Schiller, Lessing, Heine, Möricke og endnu mange flere. I Italien havde vi den Gyldne Renæssance, i Spanien havde vi den Andalusiske Renæssance. Vi havde Kalifatet i Bagdad – i en bestemt periode under Abbasidedynastiet var Bagdad verdens mest udviklede by! Så var der de forskellige århundreder, hvor Kina var den førende nation med hensyn til videnskab og kultur. Så det, vi må gøre, er, at vi må aktivere det bedste potentiale i hver enkelt nation. For dette er ved at gå tabt ...

Vi må skille os af med en masse af den nuværende, populistiske kultur. Vi må komme af med denne idé om, at 'penge skaber penge', vi må holde op med at spille vores tid på spekulation, på videospil, eller – folk er virkelig ved at miste deres kreative potentiale! Men man kan genvinde det ved at studere klassisk musik, klassisk poesi, ved at læse filosofierne, Platon, Cusanus, Leibniz, originalværkerne ... jeg mener, det ville være meget let at skabe en ny renæssance for tankegang. Og jeg mener, at den nye, økonomiske verdensorden, den Nye Silkevej, Bælte & Vej Initiativet, sluttelig kun vil kunne lykkes, hvis den ledsages af en renæssance for klassisk kultur ...

Dette er et presserende spørgsmål, hvis vi ikke ønsker at se flere rædselsforestillinger som skoleskyderierne, som jeg mener – selvfølgelig er diskussionen om våbenloven vigtig –

men det er i realiteten vigtigere at give mennesker en indre styrke, fornemmelsen af indre skønhed, så de ikke går i denne retning. Der er mange forstyrrede mennesker, der absolut kunne blive reddet, hvis der var en seriøs indsats for en æstetisk uddannelse eller opdragelse, en opdragelse af deres karakters moralske skønhed, hvilket er grunden til, at man har brug for klassisk kultur og ikke en moderne version af poesi og drama. For *kun*, hvis man har det højeste ideal om mennesket, mennesket som en skøn sjæl, som en skøn karakter, kan uddannelsessystemet vaccinere folk imod sådanne rædselsforestillinger. Og jeg ville virkelig ønske, at folk ville slutte sig til os i denne bestræbelse.«

Foto: Barack Obama modtager Dronning Elizabeth II og Prins Philip, hertug af Edinburgh, før en middag til ære for dronningen i Winfield House i London, 25. maj, 2011. (Official White House Photo)

[1] Læs hele webcastet her (dansk):
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23890>

**Næste møde: Torsdag, 1. marts
kl. 19,
på vores kontor, Skt. Knuds
Vej 11, kld. t.v.,
1903 Frederiksberg – eller**

**vær med
over Skype / telefon: 53 57
00 51**

**Se seneste politiske
orientering fra 15. feb. her:**

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

**EIR: Man det britiske kup i
jorden: Muelers
anklageskrifter
mod russiske sociale
medietrolde platter det
amerikanske folk**

Som vi gentagne gange har vist, så er den strategiske sammenhæng for kuppet mod Trump en fuldt optrappet bestræbelse på at bevare den anglo-amerikanske orden imod det, der opfattes som Kinas fremvoksende magt, som nu er allieret med Rusland. Kina har kontinuerligt og konsekvent inviteret USA til at gå med i dets Bælte & Vej Initiativ, det største infrastrukturprojekt, man nogen sinde har påtaget sig i

historien. Præsident Trumps fornuftige fremgangsmåde over for både Rusland og Kina ses som en eksistentiel trussel mod det fortsatte anglo-amerikanske partnerskab, der har domineret verden, siden Franklin D. Roosevelts død.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

Vært Matthew Ogden: I takt med, at Muellers anklageskrift mod 13 såkaldte russiske 'trolde' fortsat dominerer overskrifterne hen over weekenden, er amerikanerne i stigende grad begyndt at fatte det iboende hykleri i hele denne Russiagate-narrativ. Fra tidligere CIA-direktør James Woolsey, der af Laura Ingraham på Fox News bliver spurgt, om USA nogen sinde har blandet sig i et andet lands valg – til hvilken han måtte rømme sig og hoste og sige, »Jamen, det har vi sandsynligvis, og vil sandsynligvis fortsætte med«; og til en række blogindlæg i denne uge på tidligere forsvarsefterretningsofficer Pat Langs webseite, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. Man ser her [Fig. 1] titlen på et af de seneste indlæg: »Robert Muellers Amerika – En farce pakket ind i

hykleri«. Dette blev postet den 20. feb., og her er et kort uddrag af hans blogindlæg, hvor han siger:

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

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

»Denne sag er således meget langt fra at være en 'slam dunk' for Mueller-teamet. Skulle det nogen sinde komme for retten, er der signifikante huller og sårbarheder i anklageskriftet, som en kompetent forsvarsadvokat kunne splitte ad. Niks. Det her handler ikke om at straffe folk, der overtræder loven. Dette er et politisk teater, der er designet til at nære memet for at promovere antirussisk hysteri.« Tacitus understreger, at enhver objektiv efterforskning af angivelig »indblanding« fra IRA kun ville kunne konkludere, at »IRA's aktiviteter er på grænsen til irrelevante og uden indvirkning«. Ingen stor afsløring her: Rusland har gennemført efterretningsoperationer i USA i 80 år. Men USA har gennemført lignende operationer »i og imod Rusland / USSR og har været involveret i hemmelige indblandinger i valg i hele verden. Dét er det hykleriske. Vi

har et hysterisk anfald over latterlige internet-narrestreger, udført af en lille gruppe russere, der var dårligt finansieret og genererede liden aktivitet samtidig med, at vi ignorerer vores egen historie, hvor vi rent faktisk har væltet andre lovligt valgte regeringer. Der har vi det. Farce og hykleri.«

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.)

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

Henvisninger i den engelske tekst:

Nyt Paradigme undervisningsserie, Indtegning, program:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23703>

Helga Zepp-LaRouches introduktion 10. feb. (dansk):
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23855>

Harley Schlanger, lektion 2 17. feb., video, (engelsk):
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xy87_gzTTTU

“The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States”,
<https://larouchepac.com/20180220/mueller-dossier-revisited-how-british-and-obama-diddled-united-states>

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: This is a case which will never go to trial, because these are people living in Russia. It's an old case, it was already discussed in 2014, and since there is no extradition treaty between the United States and Russia, the

trial will never take place; and therefore Mueller does not have to provide any evidence for any of his accusations. So it's a very convenient way to keep beating the drums in an anti-Russian hysteria and it's a big, big "nothing-burger" as people have been pointing out. But it is actually a fraud against the population, because if you keep building this kind of enemy image, such as against Russia and China – and people should understand, this has nothing to do with Russian hacking, or Russian collusion; as a matter of fact, there were several people, but one of them was a leading member of the Russian Duma who said that there are 102 very well documented cases for the United States meddling in the internal affairs of other countries, and it's fairly well known how many coups and regime-change operations. So obviously, at minimum, you could say is that both sides are doing it, but the United States has a very long record of having tried to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries in multiple ways. So, this should be understood as pre-war propaganda, and people easily fall for things which are in the mainstream media, and rather, they should think twice. What Russia is doing and what China is doing, is they are building a completely different model of international relationships, explicitly modeled on noninterference, and respect for the social system of the other country. And therefore, this propaganda is just a terribly

dangerous scenario of lies which actually is serving as a preparation for war, and that is what people really must get straight.

OGDEN: So the stakes are very high, and in the same broadcast yesterday, Helga LaRouche made the point that there are ongoing investigations coming out of the House Intelligence Committee under Devin Nunes, and also the Senate Intelligence Committee under Chuck Grassley, into the role of Christopher Steele as a central figure in this entire Russiagate narrative.

As she said, this leads directly to the role of British intelligence. So, here's a second clip from yesterday's broadcast.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

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

leadership of Nunes and Grassley, they are still pointing absolutely to the coup-plotters who were involved with the British in this coup.

In the recent developments, [House Intelligence Chair] Congressman Nunes has sent out 10 or 11 other letters to officials of the existing or former government, where they have

to answer very pointed question – when did you know first about

the Steele dossier? Did you discuss it with anybody else? Did Obama know it? When did he know it? And these individuals have

to answers these questions by March 2nd, so it's not a long-term

investigation, but it's something extremely hot. And it's not yet decided how this coup will go: If the Congress has the courage to go after those Obama intelligence officials who colluded with Great Britain, but if they do, a lot of people could not only lose their position, but actually end up in jail,

as some judges are now already demanding.

OGDEN: So, as Helga said, this investigation continues and it continues to escalate. This is the question of the role of the British and their fellow-travellers in the American intelligence community in actually meddling in the US electoral

process. Chairman Devin Nunes is scheduled to appear at the CPAC

[Conservative Political Action Conference] conference today; he's

scheduled to be the closing speaker. We'll see what he has to say there, but as Helga mentioned, Nunes has continued to march

forward with Phase Two of his investigation into this entire Christopher Steele matter. He issued a series of questions; this

is letter that was just published yesterday which was sent to the FBI and officials within the State Department. The letter is asking for questions regarding information contained in the Steele dossier, which was funded by the DNC [Democratic National Committee] and the Clinton campaign, and used in a FISA [Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act] application targetting Carter Page. He notified them, as Helga mentioned, that if their responses are not received by March 2nd, which is a week from today, then subpoenas will be issued. He said, "If you do not provide timely answers on a voluntary basis, the Committee will initiate compulsory process."

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

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

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

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

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

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

"10. Did you discuss the information contained in the Steele dossier with any reporters or other representatives of the media?

If so, who and when?"

So clearly it is very significant that this investigation is going all the way to the top, with Obama himself being implicated. Now recall that Chairman Grassley of the Senate

Intelligence Committee, has also been asking questions about what Obama knew and when did he know it. Take the example of the very bizarre email that was sent by Susan Rice to herself on Inauguration Day at 12:15pm on the day that President Trump was inaugurated; literally right before she walked out of the doors of the White House for the last time to attend this inauguration. The email describes a January 5, 2017 Oval Office meeting between President Obama, former FBI James Comey, former Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, as well as Vice President Joe Biden and Rice herself. The email that Susan Rice sent to herself obviously has been publicized by Chairman Grassley, and in this letter [Fig. 4] that you're looking at, he published the relevant excerpt from this email. Again, this is Susan Rice, addressed to Susan Rice; 12:15pm, January 20, 2017. This is what she says: "On January 5, following a briefing by IC leadership on Russian hacking during the 2016 Presidential election, President Obama had a brief follow-on conversation with FBI Director Jim Comey and Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates in the Oval Office. [She mentions that Biden and herself were also present.] "President Obama began the conversation by stressing his continued commitment to ensuring that every aspect of this issue is handled by the Intelligence and law enforcement communities 'by the book'. The President stressed that he is not asking

about, initiating or instructing anything from a law enforcement perspective. He reiterated that our law enforcement team needs

to proceed as it normally would by the book.

“From a national security perspective, however, President Obama said he wants to be sure that, as we engage with the incoming team, we are mindful to ascertain if there is any reason

that we cannot share information fully as it relates to Russia.”

“The President asked Comey to inform him if anything changes in the next few weeks that should affect how we share classified

information with the incoming team. Comey said he would.”

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

“It strikes us as odd that, among your activities in the final moments on the final day of the Obama administration, you

would feel the need to send yourself such an unusual email purporting to document a conversation involving President Obama

and his interactions with the FBI regarding the Trump/Russia investigation. In addition, despite your claim that President Obama repeatedly told Mr. Comey to proceed ‘by the book,’ substantial questions have arisen about whether officials at the

FBI, as well as at the Justice Department and the State Department, actually did proceed ‘by the book.’...

“4. Did anyone instruct, request, suggest, or imply that you should send yourself the aforementioned Inauguration Day email memorializing President Obama’s meeting with Mr. Comey about the

Trump/Russia investigation? If so, who and why?

“12. Did President Obama have any other meetings with Mr.

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

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

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

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

"[I]n that investigation, we've unearthed things that are very concerning. We know that there are un-maskings that occurred and probably were leaked to the media". [W] hat we found was

happening is, in the last administration, they were unmasking hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of American's names. They were unmasking people for what I would say, for lack of a better definition, were for political purposes". [N]ames were unmasked.

And those names ended up in the newspaper.

"[I]t's like political dirt to create a narrative and a spin with the mainstream media". [T]here were unmaskings that we unearthed, then there are the FISA abuse that we've discovered.

[T]his is where the FBI and the Justice Department – because they're involved in this FISA Abuse, because they're the ones who

" go before the secret court to get the warrants, they're all involved, they're all implicated in this".

"It really boils down to this. You had a campaign. The Hillary Campaign and the Democratic Party went out and paid for

dirt". Then they used that dirt and funneled it into the FBI. The FBI then used that dirt to get a warrant on a US citizen who

was part of the other campaign". [T]o do that, it's wrong.

"... As it relates to Department of Justice and the FBI, if they need to be put on trial, we will put them on trial. The reason that Congress exists is to oversee these agencies that we

created. DOJ and FBI are not above the law. Congress created them, we oversee them, and we fund them. And if they're committing abuse for a secret court, getting warrants on American

citizens, you're darn right that we're going to put them on trial.

"I think people are just starting to learn now what really happened. Because as we peel more and more of this back, I think

more and more Americans get educated. And I think that they're

gonna demand that changes are made.”

Remember that this entire line of investigation is exactly what was suggested in the original LaRouche PAC special report.

Obviously, this special report on Mueller was published now over

six months ago. But this continues to be very timely and very relevant. An update to that report will be forthcoming, but we

have a preview now available on the website of what will be contained in that updated dossier. That preview is available under the title “The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British

and Obama Diddled the United States”. There you can see a screen

shot [Fig. 5] from that updated preview. This is obviously available in full on the LaRouche PAC website, and we would encourage you to read it in its fullest extent. It’s a fairly long update. But what I’d like to do is just read you from the

beginning of how this report is set up, a little bit of a retrospective on the effect that this Mueller dossier has had over its six-month circulation; but also the context in which you

have to understand always the big strategic picture behind the events that are now unfolding on a day-to-day basis. So, this is

what this updated report has to say:

“On September 29, 2017, LaRouchePAC published the original version of the dossier ‘Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will do His Job If You Let Him’. To date, that dossier, now being circulated nation-wide by LaRouchePAC, represents the most thorough and the most accurate assessment as

to the character of Robert Mueller, as well as the utterly fraudulent nature of the ongoing treasonous effort to bring down

the Trump Presidency.

“This present report is an update to that dossier, with the emphasis on the dramatic significance of two documents which were

released in the first days of February. The first is the House Intelligence document known as the ‘Nunes Memo’, and the second

is the – by far more substantive – un-redacted document authored by Senators Grassley and Graham.

“We shall examine the importance of these two documents in depth, as well as significant other developments which flow from

the impact of their release. Before doing so, however, it is of

critical importance that a matter of primary overriding concern

be re-stated here, at the beginning of this update.

“The British Origin of the Coup

“Nothing of any truth about the current assault on President Trump can be understood, unless one addresses the question of *why* all of this is occurring, along with the subsumed question of “*cui bono?*” This requires transcending the world of partisan

politics and inside-the-beltway gossip, and the necessity for examining the *strategic* setting and implications surrounding the coup plot.

“Everything that is now transpiring must be viewed within that truthful strategic context. During the eight years of the Obama Presidency, and the prior Administration of George W. Bush,

a profound shift in U.S. strategic policy took place. Obama, working closely with – and often under the direction of – the British, committed the United States to enforcing a global policy

of Anglo-American hegemonism, what is sometimes referred to as

a
'uni-polar world'. This took the form of escalating provocations against Russia, and more recently the targeting of China. Currently, this imperial Anglo-American faction is determined to thwart China's gigantic Belt and Road Initiative infrastructure development of Eurasia, Africa, Southwest Asia (the Middle East), and nations in Central and South America. This largest infrastructure development project in human history now involves more than 68 countries.

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

"Unable to break from imperial axioms and join China's offer of win-win cooperation, let alone offer a viable alternative model which promotes the general welfare, Barack Obama and the British adopted a strategy of geopolitical containment and provocation, a New Cold War policy. It began with the Anglo-American coup in Ukraine in 2014, pushing NATO right up to Russia's borders, and involves hostile encirclement strategies against both Russia and China, employing color revolutions, economic sanctions, overt economic, cyber, and information warfare, provocative military maneuvers, development of new

nuclear and other warfare capacities, and military support of insurgents and terrorists in states friendly and/or trading with

Russia or China, such as Iran and Syria. All of this, of course,

threatens the extinction of the human race.”

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

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

“As we detailed in our original Mueller dossier, ‘Russiagate,’ – which has roiled our nation since Summer 2016, has driven most members of Congress into a McCarthyite insanity

so severe that you can literally picture them braying at the Moon

at night, and has critically undermined Donald Trump’s Presidency

– has absolutely nothing to do with any hostile action by Russia

against the United States. Its origins are to be found in the desperation of the British and American establishments, among individuals and interests who are frantic to re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama Administration.”

I would strongly encourage you to read the entirety of this report, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website now.

It’s

crucial, but let me just pick up on that picture, which was just

laid out in that prefatory section. As is very apparent from developments in the recent week and a half, these frantic attempts to impose the re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama administration, which the Hillary Clinton administration clearly would have continued full-bore; this attempt to re-

impose

that track is now in full swing. One only has to look at the escalations that have occurred in Ukraine, the escalations which

have occurred in Syria, the calls for a response to that, and absolutely the very heated rhetoric and hysterical speeches which

were delivered at the so-called Munich Security Conference which

just occurred this week. We saw just raid anti-Russia, anti-China speeches, one after another after another, attacking

the One Belt, One Road policy as an imperialistic scheme; trying

to identify a full spectrum intelligence operation that's being

allegedly run by the Chinese against every nation in the West, and so forth and so on.

In contrast to that, the spokesperson from China at the Munich Security Conference, very calmly and very undefensively laid out the picture of what the New Paradigm of win-win relations that China is offering to the world really entails. That was originally elaborated by Xi Jinping at his speech at the

United Nations General Assembly several years ago, but it involves non-confrontation, non-meddling in foreign countries' affairs, an understanding of differences in approach and differences in political and cultural systems. But overall, not

an attempt to impose one nation or one system's view of the world

on other nations in a sort of unipolar or hegemonic way; but a way to say, "Let's take our differences and use them to our collective advantage. Let's put together a system of shared, mutual benefit under a vision of common destiny for mankind."

Which is the way the Chinese have put it. But this is characterized as a win-win approach, as opposed to the Cold

War

mentality of winner take all, zero-sum game type of geopolitics.

So, Helga LaRouche in her broadcast yesterday strongly encouraged people to actually read the text of the speeches from

the Munich Security Conference, both the anti-China, anti-Russia

war-mongering speeches so you can see for yourself just how rabid

and hysterical this prewar propaganda actually is. But also, go

and read that speech from the representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, and you can see how the Chinese are responding.

This is the time where we desperately need a New Paradigm of international relations; and it comes under the form of that win-win relationship. The way that you can see that playing out

on the ground, not from 300,000 feet with rhetoric; but really look at the reality on the ground, in places such as Africa, Central and South America, countries in Eurasia. These countries

are already benefitting from the infrastructure, the modern technology and the infrastructure which is being brought to those

countries by China and the One Belt, One Road initiative.

It's

high time that the United States and other countries in Western

Europe come to the table and say what China is doing is very good. This is for the benefit of these countries, and instead of

trying to shut this down and beat the drums of war, we should finally reciprocate what China is doing. We should come to the

table with intentions of good will, and we should join

together

and as a community of nations, build this future which will be for the common benefit of all.

So, the LaRouche PAC class series, which we've been promoting now for several weeks, and is already ongoing, could not be more timely and more urgent. This is titled, "The End of

Geopolitics; What Is the New Paradigm?" You can register, if you

haven't already, at discover.larouchepac.com or at the link that

you see here on the screen – <http://lpac.co/np2018>. Again, there are public classes which have been available on YouTube; two so far. The first inaugural speech by Helga Zepp-LaRouche,

and then the second follow-up by Harley Schlanger last Saturday;

which was "What Is Geopolitics? Part I, the History". That was

very informative and very in-depth. But there are also aspects

of this class series that you cannot access unless you are a registered participant; such as the discussion period which will

occur tomorrow, which will only be open to those who are registered for this class series. So, we strongly encourage you,

if you haven't yet, to register. Also, to encourage other people

that you know to register for this class series at that link that's on the screen and to become active participants in this entire series.

The time has come. We must take very seriously what's at stake here in this current unfolding battle over the soul of the

United States and the soul of the US Presidency. The ugly nature

of this operation and this apparatus continues to come to light,
but we have to continue – as the LaRouche PAC dossier does very well – to put it into its proper strategic context and to understand *cui bono?* and what is the strategic context for this unprecedented assault on the US democratic system and the US Presidency that we now see ongoing.
So, thank you very much for joining me here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do.

Den Nye Silkevej inspirerer de amerikanere, der har held til at finde ud af noget om det

22. feb., 2018 – Aktivisten Andrew Dobbs fra Austin, Texas, har bidraget med en inspirerende, entusiastisk og grundigt researchet og velinformeret undersøgelse af Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ til online publikationen *War is Boring* i dag.

»For mindst 60 lande, der spænder over det meste af verden, er initiativet en enorm mulighed for vækst og udvikling af deres økonomier under en ny, global orden – en orden, der ikke har de samme bånd tilknyttet, som det amerikanskledede system, der i dag er ved magten.

Hvis initiativet skrider frem iht. planen – og hvis der er en ting, som Folkerepublikken Kina har vist evner for, så er det gennemførelse af veludviklede planer – vil det få verdenshistoriske konsekvenser for amerikansk magt.

Alle bomber og støvler på jorden, som vi har lanceret i det seneste århundrede, til trods, så er Kina tæt ved at besejre verden uden at affyre et eneste skud, og det ville du intet ane om, hvis du blot følger med i amerikansk presse.

I de kinesiske medier var Bælte & Vej Initiativet på den anden side det mest omtalte emne i nyhederne sidste år. Dette reflekterer planens historiske betydning. Hvis den bliver fuldført, vil den sandsynligvis repræsentere det største projekt i fredstid nogensinde og skønnes at ville koste mellem \$4 billion og \$8 billion.

Projektet ville genoplive oldtidens Silkevej og forbinde Kina, Centralasien, Mellemøsten, Afrika og Europa med veje, jernbaner, pipelines, kommunikationsnetværk, elektriske net og anden infrastruktur over land, samt en maritim vej, der ville forbinde havne fra det Sydkinesiske Hav, det Indiske Hav, det Arabiske Hav, den Persiske Golf og Middelhavet.

Alt i alt ville det forbinde det meste af verdens befolkning i et eneste, økonomisk netværk, og det ville integrere lidt under halvdelen af verdens BNP. Når det er færdigt, kunne den blotte proces med at bygge det meget vel betyde, at det ville bringe det meste af verdens økonomiske output sammen.«

Tro det eller ej, men Dobbs har en masse andet at sige, der både er sandt og desværre også næsten ukendt i USA, inklusive hans egen undersøgelse af Bælte & Vej som en videreførelse af de seneste 40 års kinesiske politik. Værd at læse. <https://warisboring.com/50317-2/>

Foto: Vægmaleri fra det centrale Kina. Foto David Axe.

Baltica Jernbanerute vedtaget; forbinder de tre baltiske stater

22. feb., 2018 – Den 14. feb. godkendte Estlands Ministerium for Offentlig Administration planen for Rail Baltica (RB) højhastigheds-jernbanelinjen, som vil fuldføre den endelige rute og det foreløbige design for hele jernbanen i de tre baltiske stater, rapporterede *International Railway Journal* den 16. feb.

Rail Baltica-projektet omfatter byggeriet af 870 km elektrisk normalsporsjernbane, der forbinder de tre baltiske hovedstæder Tallinn, Estland; Riga, Letland og Vilnius, Litauen, med en forbindelse til det europæiske normalsporsnetværk i Polen. Jernbanen designes til at operere med 240 km/t for passagertog og 120 km/t for fragttog, og vil udgøre en del af EU's Nordsøen/Baltikum TEN-T-korridor (Transeuropæiske Transportnetværk).

Fr. Baiba Rubesa, adm. dir. og forkvinde for RB Rail, sagde til *International Railway Journal*, at »Vi har nu færdiggjort planlægningsstadiet for Rail Baltica. Næste skridt er at fokusere på det konsoliderede foreløbige tekniske design og detaljerede tekniske design for Rail Baltica infrastrukturen i alle tre lande.«

Billede: Rail Baltica vækstkorridor, som en del af Nordsøen/Baltikum-korridoren.

'Tacitus' sønderriver Muellers anklageskrift mod russere som en 'Farce pakket ind i hykleri'

21. feb., 2018 – I et udlæg i dag på den militære efterretningsekspert Pat Langs »Sic Semper Tyrannis«-blog, sønderriver den hyppige bidragyder Publius Tacitus den særlige anklager Robert Muellers anklageskrift fra 16. feb. mod 13 russiske individer og 3 selskaber, som værre end inkompetent.

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

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

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

Foto: Den særlige anklager Robert Mueller fortsætter sin Russiagate-heksejagt, 'en farce pakket ind i hykleri', med ordene fra Publius Tacitus.

Rusland fordømmer nazistiske angreb mod dets faciliteter i Kiev;

kræver handling

21. feb., 2018 – I en erklæring i stærke vendinger fra 19. feb., fordømmer Ruslands Udenrigsministerium de nynazistiske angreb, der fandt sted 17.-18. feb., mod kontorerne i Kiev tilhørende det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur, det Føderale Kontor for Statssamfundet af Uafhængige Stater og mod afdelingerne for to russiske banker, Sherbank og Alfa-Bank. Disse angreb inkluderede vandalisme af bygningerne, knuste ruder og afbrænding af det russiske flag. Udenrigsministeriet indkaldte Ukraines chargé d'affaires i Moskva for at indgive en formel protest, sendte en formel protest til Ukraines Udenrigsministerium og udstedte en pressemeddelelse til medierne om angrebene.

Det, der finder sted i Kiev, er et af de »ekstremt farlige tendenser, der udfolder sig i Ukraine i dag, og som truer international stabilitet og sikkerhed«, advarede Moskvas Udenrigsministerium. Værre, fortsatte det, så responderer Ukraines »udenlandske protektorer« utilstrækkeligt, eller slet ikke, hvilket giver anledning til stor bekymring. »Det er en skam, at Europa og USA tydeligvis ikke har lært de tragiske lektioner fra det forgangne århundrede.« Det erklærede også, at angrebet på det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur fandt sted, mens kvinder og børn var i færd med at indøve et drama inde i bygningen.

Dette, sagde Udenrigsministeriet, er »endnu et eksempel på aggressiv nynazistisk nationalisme, der vokser i styrke i Ukraine. Det nyder tydeligvis dette lands officielle regerings beskyttelse og støtte«. Det er heller intet tilfælde, fortsatte det, at angrebet fandt sted umiddelbart efter den ukrainske præsident Petro Poroshenkos »offensive tale« på München Sikkerhedskonferencen, »som flød over med anti-russiske angreb og indeholdt en direkte opfordring til at 'bekæmpe det russiske flag' i hele verden«. Desuden viser Ukraines stemme på FN's Generalforsamling imod resolutionen

for at bekæmpe glorificeringen af nazisme og nynazisme »blot, på hvis side, det nuværende Kiev-regime står«, fremfører ministeriets erklæring.

TASS rapporterede, at medlemmer af Organisationen for Sikkerhed og Samarbejde i Europas Særlige Overvågningsmission var vidne til Kiev-angrebene og rapporterede dem til OSCE's hovedkvarter. Pyotr Tolstoy, chef for Statsdumaens delegation til vintersessionen af OSCE Parlamentariske Forsamling, sagde til TASS, »vi forventer, at OSCE's Parlamentariske Forsamling responderer til denne situation, eftersom dets formål er at beskytte folks rettigheder, friheder og sikkerhed«.

Foto: Aktivister og tilhængere af ukrainske nationalistpartier og bevægelser afbrænder det russiske flag, som var taget fra det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kulturs kontorer, under en protest i Kiev, 17. feb., 2018.

Spørgsmål til EU's Mogherini om forfølgelse i Ukraine af Natalia Vitrenkos PSPU-parti

22. feb., 2018 – Den 20. feb. blev en parlamentarisk forespørgsel indgivet til EU's høje repræsentant for udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitik, Federica Mogherini, af medlem af EU-parlamentet Marco Zanni (Uafhængig, Italien) med hensyn til forfølgelsen af Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti:

»Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti (PSPU) blev etableret i 1996 og har siden da opereret i overholdelse af Ukraines love

og Forfatning.

På sine tre seneste kongresser har PSPU ændret sine vedtægter, sit program og sine lederskabsorganer, for at overholde nye regler 'Om politiske partier i Ukraine' og 'Om fordømmelse af kommunistiske og nationalsocialistiske (nazistiske) totalitære regimer og forbud mod propaganda for deres symboler'.

Justitsministeriet har modtaget den krævede dokumentation, men har afvist ændringerne og nægtet at kommentere og forklare, hvordan beslutningerne, der blev vedtaget på de tre kongresser, skulle være i modstrid med de nye ukrainske love.

I juli 2017 henvendte PSPU sig til Distriktsadministrationsdomstolen for byen Kiev, for at klage over Justitsministeriets beslutning.

I betragtning af, at PSPU-aktivitet, inklusive deltagelse i valg, de facto er blevet stoppet siden 2015, og i forventning om en domstolsafgørelse,

Beder vi [Høje repræsentant] VP (vicepræsident) / AR om at finde ud af:

- om de kender til spørgsmålet, inklusive gennem EU-delegationen i Ukraine og EU's konsulterende mission;
- om de ikke mener, at udviklingerne repræsenterer en alvorlig overtrædelse af friheden til meninger og politiske ytringer, eftersom PSPU er et af hovedoppositionspartierne.«

Foto: Dr. Natalia Vitrenko, leder af Ukraines Progressive Socialistparti, her et screengrab fra hendes video, der blev udlagt 1. november, 2016. Den blev filmet uden for hendes kontorer, der blev besat af sikkerhedsstyrker, og det ses tydeligt, at Natalia Vitrenko er bange. Interviewet kan ses på russisk her <https://youtu.be/luE8frGHjgY>.

Forsvarerne af det 'Gamle Paradigme' angriber Kina på München Sikkerhedskonference. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 22. feb., 2018

Så man skal forstå dette som førkrigs-propaganda, og folk falder let for ting, som er i de gængse medier, hvor de hellere skulle tænke sig om to gange. Det, som Rusland og Kina gør, er, at de er i færd med at opbygge en helt anden model for internationale relationer, der er specifikt modelleret efter ikkeindblanding og respekt for det andets lands anderledes samfundssystem. Derfor er denne propaganda simpelt hen et forfærdelig farligt scenarie med løgne, der faktisk tjener som en forberedelse til krig, og det er, hvad folk virkelig må forstå.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Ukraine fremprovokerer fascistisk krig i Europa

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 21. feb., 2018 – Husk på, at det netværk, der nu står bag Russiagate-kupforsøget mod præsident Donald Trump – det præcis samme netværk – gennemførte også kuppet imod den valgte regering i Ukraine i 2014 og satte en fascistisk regering ved magten, der var håndplukket af viceudenrigsminister Victoria Nuland, Obamas repræsentant for regimeskifteoperationen. Den britiske MI6-agent Christopher Steele, der var ophavsmand til det uvederhæftige dossier bag Russiagate, og som er blevet brugt af Obamas efterretningschefer og Hillary Clinton-kampagnen til at lancere et kupforsøg mod Trump, er den samme britiske efterretningsagent, der gav Obama-administrationen over 100 rapporter om Ukraine og orkestrerede Obamas støtte til de voldelige neonazistiske bander på Maidan, som bragte regeringen til fald.

Nu bekender denne »demokratiske« farvede revolution endnu stærkere kulør. De samme neonazistiske bander fra Maidan kører nu klassiske brunskjorte-angreb i Kiev og smadrer vinduer og vandaliserer ejendomme tilhørende kontorer og banker med russiske forbindelser, mens politiet ser på. I mellemtiden forbereder præsident Petro Poroshenko nationen til en fuldt optrappet krig imod russiske »aggressorer«. Det Russiske Udenrigsministerium udstedte mandag officielle advarsler imod de »ekstremt farlige tendenser, der i dag udfolder sig i Ukraine, og som truer stabilitet og sikkerhed«, og erklærede: »Det er en skam, at Europa og USA tydeligvis ikke har lært de tragiske lektier fra det forgangne århundrede.«

EIR advarede dengang i 2014, da den farvede revolution fandt sted i Ukraine, om, at resultatet ville blive, at fascisme i Europa atter voksede frem, og, i *EIR's* rapport fra 24. feb., 2017, »Obama og Soros: Nazister i Ukraine i 2014 – i USA i

2017?«

(se

http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/eirv44n08-20170224/04-21_4408.pdf), og det samme resultat ville komme i USA, hvis processen ikke blev afvendt.

Nu bliver kupforsøget mod Trump fra disse operatører offentligt afsløret af en håndfuld modige medlemmer af Kongressen, som en britiskanstiftet operation. Som *EIR* har dokumenteret, så går briternes hensigt ud på at redde Imperiet ved at underminere Trumps erklærede mål med at etablere venligtsindede relationer med Rusland og Kina. Det korrumperede efterretningsteam under Obama – Clapper, Brennan, Comey, Mueller – er blevet afsløret som kriminelle operatører mod nationens forfatningsmæssige regering. Senest har den dommer, der havde tilsyn med general Michael Flynns tilståelse for at lyve for FBI – Mueller-efterforskningens »store fangst« – krævet, at Mueller overgiver beviser for frikendelse til Flynns advokater, og som var blevet tilbageholdt, ulovligt, af Mueller, og som viser, at de folk, der interviewede Flynn, havde konkluderet, at han ikke havde løjet eller begået nogen anden forbrydelse under sit møde med den russiske ambassadør, men Mueller havde afvist disse kendsgerninger for at kunne stramme grebet om præsidenten. Der er nogle, der råder Flynn til at trække sin tilståelse tilbage, en tilståelse, der blev fremtvunget af Mueller ved at true ham med bankerot gennem juridiske omkostninger og ved at true med at retsforfølge hans søn.

Ikke alene er Russiagate ved at disintegrere, men alternativet til de fascistiske trusler i Europa og USA, i form af samarbejde med Kina og Rusland om den Ny Silkevej for »fred gennem udvikling«, vokser fortsat og inspirerer nationer og folkeslag i alle dele af verden. Valget bliver i stigende grad skrappt: global krig i atomvåbenalderen, eller et nyt paradigme, baseret på menneskehedens fælles mål. Tiden er inde for alle folk at gå sammen med LaRouche for at etablere dette Nye Paradigme, og en ny renæssance. Der er intet, der

forhindrer mennesker i at skabe en sådan ny fremtid, men det må gøres, før Imperiet, som de døende dinosaurer, de ligner, fremprovokerer en krig hellere, end de mister deres imperiemagt.

*Foto: Sammenstød i Kyiv, Ukraine, Begivenheder fra 18. februar, 2014.
(https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/User:Mstyslav_Chernov)*

Kina til Vesten: I stedet for at være misundelig på Bælte & Vej – Så gå med!

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 20. feb., 2018 – En artikel i dagens udgave af den kinesiske avis *Global Times* kommer med den nyttige gentagelse af det, der har været den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings konstante budskab til Vesten: Gå sammen med os i Bælte & Vej Initiativet, og alle parter vil vinde!

Global Times' kronik afviser de endeløse bagvaskelser af Kina for dets rolle i at hjælpe Afrika med at udvikle sig gennem Bælte & Vej Initiativet, som værende »næret af misundelse«. Og artiklen foreslår, at »tiden måske er inde til, at de vestlige lande øger indsatsen« og går med i udviklingen af Afrika – og implicit, i hele verden.

I betragtning af denne indlysende kendsgerning – at alle parter står til at drage fordel af et Nyt Paradigme for samarbejde og fælles udviklingsinitiativer – så klør kvalificerede iagttagere i Kina og andre Bælte & Vej-lande sig

i hovedet i vantro over det systemiske, selvmorderiske vanvid, der synes at feje hen over Vesten. Denne, det Gamle Paradigmes manglende evne til at konfrontere virkeligheden, blev udstillet i fuld technicolor på den nylige München Sikkerhedskonference; i de endeløse bagvaskelser imod Rusland og Kina og truslerne om at »begrænse« dem; i de fortsatte krigsprovokationer omkring Syrien og Koreahalvøen; i Tysklands manglende evne til at frembringe en ny, levedygtig regering, og frem for alt, i det britiskførte Russiagate-cirkus, der fortsætter med at dominere de vestlige medier.

Journalisten Finian Cunningham, der skriver i RT om München Sikkerhedskonferencen, indfangede kernen i det: »At denne overfladiske og spinkle sag [de 13 anklageskrifter for indblanding i valget] af amerikanske politikere bliver holdt frem som en 'krigshandling' fra Rusland mod USA, er latterligt. Vanvid har i sandhed overtaget den gængse, amerikanske debat.« Cunningham fortsatte, at »mange alternative, rationelle iagttagere i USA og Europa kan se, at Russiagate-narrativen er ved at kollapse som følge af manglende beviser.«

Det er korrekt. Det står klart, at den britiske Mueller-operation er i opløsning, og at den stadig kæmper for at komme sig over den afsløring, som LaRouche-bevægelsen stod i spidsen for med sit Mueller-dossier. Kongresmedlem Devin Nunes, der ikke venter på, at Mueller et al. skal tage initiativet på ny, har netop åbnet en ny flanke: han har udstedt et brev til et dusin eller flere unavngivne, nuværende og tidligere folkevalgte, som instruerer dem til at besvare 10 højst ubehagelige og kompromitterende spørgsmål om, hvornår de kendte til Steele-dossieret, hvem, de cirkulerede det til, og så videre – i modsat fald vil de blive indstævnet til at gøre det.

Men, nyttige, som disse træfninger er, så er de ikke tilstrækkelige. De gør det ikke ud for en vinderstrategi for fuldt og helt at gøre en ende på geopolitik i 2018 og i stedet

skabe et Nyt Paradigme, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gentagne gange har erklæret, må ske. Denne strategi fordrer, at vi vinder en krig om ideer, som modvægt til selve den hypotese, der ligger under den geopolitiske nulsumsspils-verdensanskuelse, med samt dens bestialske menneskebegreb. Det er disse ideer, der har ført os til flere verdenskrige og til den nuværende trussel om en ny, denne gang endegyldig, verdenskrig.

Lyndon LaRouche adresserede denne underliggende, mest fundamentale af alle kampe i sin banebrydende artikel fra juli 1994, »Hvordan Bertrand Russell blev en ond mand«[1], som han skrev for Schiller Instituttets *Fidelio*-magasin blot få måneder efter sin løsladelse fra fængsel, efter fem års indespærring for hænderne af det samme britiske Mueller-apparat, der nu er rettet mod at få ram på præsident Trump. LaRouche skrev:

»Storbritanniens Lord Bertrand Russell har, uden for enhver tvivl, været den mest onde, offentlige person i det nu udrindende [20.] århundrede ... Der er intet væsentligt hos Russell, som ikke er en gentagelse af det, der blev skrevet af [Lord Shelburnes lakaj] grundlæggeren af britisk udenrigs-efterretningstjeneste, Jeremy Bentham, for nu mere end to hundrede år siden ...

[Dette er] den britiske, filosofiske radikalisme fra Shelburnes lakajer, og fra Huxley-familien og senere fra Russell. Bertrand Russell var, mens han levede, en raceret venetiansk køter af denne Shelburne-type ... Forstå dette, og du forstår, hvem Russell er. Forstå Russell på denne måde, og du vil begynde at forstå de seneste 600 års europæiske historie, og verdenshistorie. Så begynder du at forstå de vigtige træk af det nu udrindende, nuværende århundrede.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouche påpegede i dag: »Med denne galskab med Muellergate og Russiagate, med dæmoniseringen af Rusland og Kina, er dette kursen mod Tredje Verdenskrig. Den eneste måde at stoppe det på er gennem et Nyt Paradigme i den måde,

mennesker tænker på. Og det er, hvad vi bør diskutere med dem. Vi har løsningen med Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, som er en bydende hastesag, fordi det næste finanskrak kunne indtræffe, hvornår, det skal være. Og vi må optrappe debatten for, at USA skal gå med i Bælte & Vej Initiativet, ikke kun for at genopbygge infrastrukturen i USA, men for at gøre det, som *Global Times* i dag sagde: Gøre fælles sag med Kina i Afrika, for at bygge dette kontinent.«

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump deltager i et erhvervsarrangement med præsident Xi Jinping i Folkets Store Hal, 9. nov., 2017, i Beijing, Folkerepublikken Kina. (*Official White House Photo by Shealah Craighead*)

[1]

https://www.schillerinstitute.org/fid_91-96/943a_russell_lhl.html

NYHEDSORIENTERING FEBRUAR 2018: Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika

Glæd dig til en optimistisk og konstruktiv løsning på det forfærdelige fattigdoms- og underudviklingsproblem, som denne verdensdel er så hårdt ramt af, og, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche så ofte har nævnt, den eneste humane og retfærdige løsning på det umenneskelige flygtningeproblem, der nu også har ramt Europa.

Vi introducerer her Schiller Instituttets nye, danske specialrapport, "Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og

Afrika; en vision for en økonomisk renæssance”, som er en grundig indføring i den 246 sider lange, engelske rapport, af rapportens forfattere, Hussein Askary og Jason Ross.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Meddelelse:

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche i
Internationalt webcast,
torsdag 22. feb. kl. 18 dansk
tid:**

**Forsvarerne af det »Gamle
Paradigme«
angriber Kina på München
Sikkerhedskonference**

newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com

Samtidig med, at momentum bag Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ vokser, med flere og flere projekter, der annonceres hver uge, og med flere og flere nationer, der tilslutter sig, samledes de, der ønsker at forsvare det gamle, kollapsende paradigme, i Bayern til den årlige München Sikkerhedskonference. Med et par enkelte, bemærkelsesværdige undtagelser var budskabet fra de vestlige »eliter« et budskab om ren geopolitik, gående ud på, at de må arbejde sammen for at modgå Bælte & Vej Initiativet,

for at forhindre Kina i at splitte Vesten og overtage USA's rolle som verdens dominerende magt. Det var en gentagelse af den foregående uges tomme retorik, da amerikanske efterretningsfolk sagde til Senatets Efterretningskomite, at Rusland og Kina udgør en større trussel mod USA end terrorisme.

Som modvægt til denne provokerende retorik i München blev en erklæring fra Fu Ying, forkvinde for Kinas Nationale Folkekongres' Udenrigspolitiske Komite, cirkuleret i en særudgave af *German Times*. Fu Ying skrev, at »Kina ikke har nogen hensigt om at eksportere sit politiske system eller sin ideologi«. Hendes erklæring slutter, »Den amerikanskledede vestlige verden har forsøgt at 'vestliggøre' hele planeten ved at eksportere sine egne værdier og modeller. Disse forsøg har ikke alene mislykkedes med at adressere gamle problemer, men har også skabt nye.

Kinas diplomatiske mål i den nye æra inkluderer at fremme skabelsen af en ny type af internationale relationer, hvor der gives en mere fremtrædende plads til varig fred, universel sikkerhed og fælles fremgang og en opfordring til at bygge et fællesskab for en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden. Dette er ikke alene vore forventninger til verdens fremtid, men også en nødvendighed for vores nationale udvikling.«

Madame Fus kommentarer sætter fokus på den fundamentale forskel mellem de vestlige finansinteressers nulsumsspil, og så den win-win-filosofi, der underbygger Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Hvad kan vi gøre for at bringe de vestlige regeringer til at gå med i det Nye Paradigme? Dette og mere vil Helga Zepp-LaRouche adressere i denne uges webcast.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Hvad er det Nye Paradigme? LaRouche PAC's Nyt Paradigme Undervisningsserie 2018; pdf og video

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Dagens emne er det Nye Paradigme for menneskelig civilisation. Jeg har ofte fremført, at, hvis man ser på tilstanden i især den vestlige verden i dag, dvs. USA, tilstanden i Europa, den tyske regering, der er selvdestruktiv mens den forsøger at bygge en ny regering; vi har tydeligvis en situation, hvor verden er i voldsom uorden. Jeg har fremført den pointe, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme, der er lige så forskelligt i forhold til de nuværende antagelser og aksiomer, som de moderne tider var forskellige i forhold til middelalderen. Hvor alle middelalderens antagelser med skolastik, Aristoteles, overtro og lignende rod blev erstattet af et helt andet billede af mennesket og et nyt begreb om samfundet.

Dette er nødvendigt for at sikre den menneskelige arts evne til at overleve på lang sigt. Og spørgsmålet er, om vi kan give os selv et system for at styre os selv, der garanterer, at den menneskelige art vil eksistere i kommende århundreder eller endda årtusinder? Min mand, Lyndon LaRouche, helligede hele sit livsværk til dette spørgsmål, med andre ord, til at spore de aspekter af det nuværende system, som var forkerte, og hvordan de skulle erstattes med et bedre, mere fuldendt system. Hvis man ser på de nuværende, såkaldte liberale demokratier i Vesten, så benægter de, at man kan have et sådant nødvendigt billede af mennesket, og nødvendigt [kan ikke høres]. For det er selve liberalismens natur, at alt er tilladt, alt er gyldigt; men virkeligheden er, at dette

vestlige liberale demokrati ikke er den eneste situation i verden. En del, et aspekt af dette Nye Paradigme er allerede ved at vokse frem. Det er ved at vokse frem i form af den Nye Silkevej, der for ca. 4,5 år siden blev sat på dagsordenen af Kina. Den såkaldte Ny Silkevejsånd, altså ideen om, at man kan samarbejde på win-win-basis til alles gensidige fordel; denne idé har allerede mange lande – faktisk hele kontinenter – taget til sig. Den Nye Silkevejsånd stormer allerede frem i store dele af Asien, endda visse dele af Europa, Afrika og Latinamerika.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Amerikas fremtid ligger på den Nye Silkevej sammen med Kina

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 19. feb., 2018 – Søndagens gennemgribende anklage mod FBI fra dommer i New York og tidligere anklager Jeanine Pirro var tiltrængt, og fuldstændig korrekt i sin udstrækning. Amerika har ikke brug for, og bør ikke have, et sådant Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Siden sin skabelse under den anglofile Teddy Roosevelt i 1908, på britisk initiativ, har FBI's rolle været at narre amerikanerne med hensyn til, hvem, der var deres modstandere og fjender, og ikke bekæmpelse af kriminalitet.

Bureauets første job var at rulle i tjære og fjer, »russiske

og østeuropæiske røde«; dernæst at arrestere, dømme i eksil eller dræbe amerikanske ledere, der i 1915 ikke mente, USA skulle gå i krig mod Tyskland. Så var det igen de østeuropæiske »røde«, og dossiers, der skulle afpresse præsidenterne Franklin Roosevelt og John F. Kennedy imod afspænding over for Rusland; overvågning og arrestationer og mord for at ødelægge Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen. Og dernæst den »moderne æra« i tiden efter J. Edgar Hoover, med at gøre seriemordere til FBI-informanter og beskyttede vidner, inklusive beskyttelse af de saudiske medskyldige i angrebene 11. september, før og efter gerningen.

FBI har ikke ændret sig i et århundrede, helt frem til Robert Muellers og James Comeys roller i neo-McCarthy-, »had Rusland, had Kina«-kampagnen, der er rettet mod præsident Trump. Også i denne kampagne har FBI været et villigt instrument for britisk efterretning, som det nu er blevet gennemgribende afsløret af det berygtede tilfælde med »Steele-dossieret«.

Men verden, og USA, har dramatisk ændret sig. Der er nu en anden nation, der repræsenterer videnskabeligt fremskridt og teknologisk optimisme in action, hæver levestandarden og fjerner fattigdom hjemme og ude. Denne nation er Kina med sit nu næsten verdensdækkende Bælte & Vej Initiativ med store projekter for videnskab og infrastruktur.

Og USA, der stadig er i besiddelse af evnerne til at gå sammen med, og endda overgå, Kina i dette, er i stedet blevet gennemhullet af pessimisme og fremmedfjendskhed, med frygt for videnskab, med afhængighed af giftstoffer og selvmord, med lønninger og forventet levealder, der er i fælles nedgang. Og med massedråbsmænd, selvmorderiske pessimister, der raser for at dræbe folk i deres umiddelbare omkreds.

Wall Streets finansielle kollapse og afindustrialiseringen af landet har været den første årsag; men ideen om, at USA konstant må være under forberedelse til krig med andre atommagter, har spredt pessimismen.

Nu står ikke alene Amerika, men også de europæiske nationer over for et valg, om de skal gå med i det nye paradigme for initiativet for storslået, globalt infrastrukturbyggeri og udryddelse af fattigdom, som Kina har indledt, eller i stedet konfrontere Kina og Rusland og true med at fremprovokere en verdenskrig. De fleste asiatiske lande, de østeuropæiske nationer, de afrikanske nationer har allerede valgt Bælte & Vej Initiativet; latinamerikanske lande forsøger også at gå med, mens amerikanske militære ledere truer dem imod det.

Dette er ikke bare »få ram på Trump«, fordi han går ind for stormagtssamarbejde. Amerikanere får fortalt, at deres overlevelse afhænger af at bekæmpe Rusland og at stoppe Kinas fremskridt.

Valget mellem disse to paradigmer er selvfølgelig, hvis de folk, der træffer det, er store nok til at tænke og handle for sig selv. At tænke, dvs., som de tænkte, da de var på vej til Månen og præsidenten havde bedt dem om at spørge, hvad de kunne gøre for deres land, og for verden.

Foto: Præsidenterne Donald J. Trump og Xi Jinping applauderer og takker de optrædende på en kulturel forestilling i Folkets Store Hal, 9. nov., 2017, efter en statsmiddag for dem, i Beijing, Kina. (White House Photo by Andrea Hanks)

**Seneste fupnummer fra
Mueller,
trængt op i en krog:**

Opgylpet Nothingburger

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 17. feb., 2018 – Sidste fredag så vi det seneste udslag af spil for galleriet fra den særlige anklager Robert Muellers side, med dennes annoncering af, at der var indgivet anklageskrifter mod 13 russiske borgere og tre enheder, inklusive Internet Research Agency, for angivelig »indblanding« i de amerikanske valg i 2016.

Men hele denne episode, der har domineret overskrifterne i de fleste vestlige medier, er en eneste, stor, genopgyldt Nothingburger, som man siger i folkeligt sprogbrug.

For det første, så blev hele denne angivelige sag bredt dækket i medierne for år tilbage. Der er intet nyt i anklagerne, som i sig selv er skrevet og formuleret som en pressemeddelelse snarere end et juridisk dokument. Vi anbefaler vore læsere at læse artiklen i det kommende *EIR*-nummer, »Robert Mueller II Indicates Some Russian Social Media Trolls: Indictment Scams the American People«, af Barbara Boyd, forfatter af LaRouche PAC's nu berømte **Mueller-dossier**.

For det andet, så befinder de anklagede personer sig i Rusland, der ikke har nogen udvisningsaftale med USA, og de vil derfor aldrig blive retsforfulgt i USA. Dette er meget belejligt for hr. Mueller, eftersom han ikke behøver fremlægge nogen kendsgerning for at styrke sin sag – eftersom det er mere end sandsynligt, at han ikke har nogen sag.

For det tredje, og det vigtigste, så er hele dette cirkus beregnet på at skulle fjerne opmærksomheden fra den kendsgerning, at det er Mueller, hans FBI- og DOJ-medsammensvorne, samt Obamas Hvide Hus (i.e., Obamaregeringens folk) der alle agerer under marchordrer og overvågning fra britisk efterretning, der er blevet taget på fersk gerning i et statskupforsøg imod USA's valgte præsident, Donald Trump, på vegne af en fremmed magt. Deres kriminelle team, såsom »pit

bull« Andy Weissmann, bliver yderligere afsløret med hver dag, der går. Og den amerikanske befolkning er i stigende grad oprørte over det faktum, at FBI har haft for travlt med at iscenesætte et kup til at følge op på ledetråde, som de var i besiddelse af, for at stoppe skolemassakrer såsom den, der netop fandt sted i Florida.

Den russiske regering er klar over, hvordan landet ligger i Washington, D.C. Udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov sagde til Euronews den 16. feb., at »Demokraterne kan ikke forlige sig med nederlaget [i 2016], som fuldstændigt tog dem på sengen, og nu går de af deres vej for at forpøse tilværelsen for præsident Trump ... eftersom han er en leder, der kommer fra uden for systemet ... og som mere end en gang har bekræftet sin oprigtige hensigt« om at have respektfulde og produktive relationer med Rusland. Lavrov afviste selvfølgelig Muellers seneste anklageskifter imod de 13 russere og bemærkede, at de, der arbejder på hele Russiagate-operationen, »har trængt sig selv op i en krog gennem erklæringer om præcise data om russisk indblanding«, der ikke eksisterer.

Mueller og briterne er virkelig trængt op i en krog, men de er endnu ikke helt besejret, og som et resultat udgør strategiske provokationer – såsom forsøget på at dele Syrien og direkte militære trusler imod Rusland og Kina – fortsat en meget reel fare.

Denne fortsatte fare understreger den strategiske betydning af den åbning, der er skabt i USA af den nationale debat over præsident Trumps infrastrukturplan, hvor **Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Love«** for økonomisk og videnskabelig udvikling kan placeres i centrum for en diskussion om politikken i hele den bankerotte, transatlantiske sektor.

Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen Webcast, 16. feb., 2018

Gæst Paul Gallagher.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen«. Jeg har inviteret Paul Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for Executive Intelligence Review, på showet i dag, og vi er glade for at du tager dig tid til at komme, Paul. Vi har nu mulighed for at få en meget seriøs og nøgtern diskussion om LaRouches økonomiske program: De »Fire Love«, og lige nu er dørene vidt åbne.

Med udgivelsen af den såkaldte »Udkast til Lovgivning for Genopbygning af Amerikas Infrastruktur« – Dette er programmet fra Trumps Hvide Hus, som blev sendt over til Kongressen. Det blev udgivet mandag. Alt imens indholdet af denne rapport er, for at sige det mildt, uheldigt – det har Wall Streets fingeraftryk over det hele, alene det, at dette forslag er kommet frem; men det er rent ud sagt en total taber, der har galvaniseret diskussionen nationalt, og det er virkelig begyndt at katalysere kongresmedlemmer på begge sider midtergangen til at begynde at tænke over spørgsmålet på en meget mere seriøs måde: Hvordan finansierer man infrastruktur? Hvis vi taler om \$1,5 billion, hvor skal de komme fra?

(Her følger engelsk udskrift):

And this includes, frankly, Trump himself. As President Trump said in the Letter of Transmission, that was sent over as the opening to this legislative proposal, he said: "Our nation's infrastructure is in an unacceptable state of disrepair, which damages our country's competitiveness and our citizens' quality of life. For too long, lawmakers have invested in infrastructure inefficiently, ignored critical needs, and allowed it to deteriorate. As a result, the United States has fallen further and further behind other countries. It is time to give Americans the working, modern infrastructure they deserve... My administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact a law that will enable America's builders to construct the new, modern, and efficient infrastructure throughout our beautiful land."

Now, on Tuesday, President Trump held an open, televised roundtable with different Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, and this was ostensibly to discuss the aluminum, steel industries and trade policy around that, but during that roundtable, which was televised, the discussion of the infrastructure program came up. And I'd like to just play a short clip from that roundtable; this is an exchange between President Trump and Sen. Sherrod Brown [D] from Ohio, and then Senator Blumenthal [D-CT] also gets in on this. And what you hear is that President Trump says, look, I want to have a bipartisan plan. Come back to me with a counterproposal. What we put out was an opening bid, but I really want a bipartisan

plan. I'm ready, willing and able.

So, here's a clip from that roundtable:

[start video]

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I actually think that we can go bipartisan on infrastructure, maybe even more so, than we can on DACA. ... On infrastructure which is the purpose of what we're doing tonight, come back with a proposal. We put in our bid – come back with a proposal. We have a lot of people that are great Republicans that want something to happen. We have to rebuild our country. I said yesterday, we've spent {\$7 trillion} – when

I say "spent," and I mean wasted – not to mention all of the lives, most importantly and everything else – but we've spent \$7

trillion as of about two months ago, in the Middle East – \$7 trillion. And if you want to borrow two dollars to build a road

someplace, including your state, the great state of Ohio, if you

want to build a road, if you want to build a tunnel, or a bridge,

or fix a bridge because so many of them are in bad shape, you can't do it. And yet, we spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East.

Explain that one. [crosstalk]

SEN. SHERROD BROWN: I've love a bipartisan – we have a bipartisan proposal. We can [crosstalk] dollars on it in infrastructure. We're glad to work together on a real infrastructure bill with real dollars, plus what you can leverage

in the communities and private sector.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Do a combination.

SENATOR BROWN: It needs real dollars.

President Trump: I would love to have you get back to us quickly, 'cause we can do this quickly and we have to rebuild our country. We have to rebuild our roads and our bridges and our tunnels, so the faster you get back, the faster we can move. Focus on document this week, if you don't mind, right? But the faster you get back, the faster we move.

SEN. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: I come back to Senator Brown's point, I think there's a opportunity for real bipartisanship here, in these two areas.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I agree, and I'd like you to come back with a suggestion on infrastructure in the plan, and I think that's a bipartisan plan. I really would like to see you come back with a counterproposal on the infrastructure. I think we're going to get that done. I really believe that's – we're going to get a lot of Democrats, we're going to get a lot of Republicans. We're going to get it done. It's something we should do. We have to fix our country: We have to fix our roads and our tunnels and bridges and everything, so, if you can work together on that, and I am ready, willing and able, on infrastructure – that is such a natural for us to get done. And I think we could probably do it. Thank you all very much. [End video]

OGDEN: So as you can see, asking them to come back with a counterproposal, he said, this is our opening bid, but the point is clear: Now is the time for us to mobilize like never before, to put the LaRouche plan on the table. {This} is the

counterproposal.

Let me put on the screen here: first we've got our Campaign To Win the Future. This is obviously the national statement of intent for the elections in 2018. LaRouche PAC is mobilizing a national movement and galvanizing discussion around this program.

And then the content of that campaign can be seen on the next slide, this is "The Four Laws To Save the United States: The Economics Principles Necessary for a Recovery – Why the United States Must Join the New Silk Road" and this contains full elaboration of Lyndon LaRouche's four economic laws.

So, I know that Paul is very short on time, and I would just like to ask you: Please address what the situation is now in Washington. What's coming out of this release of this so-called legislative proposal? And what actually has to be done?

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thanks, Matt. My first reaction, when the White House plan was released – I call it the "White House plan," not the Trump plan, but the White House plan – when it was released, was that closed a certain door of people in elected offices around the country and in Washington, constantly saying "what is the White House going to come up with? what is the White House going to come up with? what are they going to give us in the way of what they can get started towards infrastructure investments? because we desperately need it?" And when it finally came out, and it was very, very, very lacking – as you said, a Wall Street plan – that closed a certain door, and immediately, thus, opened another one. OK, now they have come out with that. Now, we have to come out with something. It's up to the rest of us, particularly

those in elected office, but all of us who are active in fighting
for this: It's up to us now to shape the alternative, because this one just isn't going to work. And it's good to see that that definitely includes the President – that view. He, on another occasion, immediately after the plan was rolled out on Monday, he said that compared to the tax legislation and the military spending increases and so forth, that this infrastructure plan that the White House has put out, was really quite unimportant. A rather surprising thing for him to say. But it indicated, when it was followed the very next day by the comment you just saw, "give me an alternative," and then the very day after that, in another meeting with members of Congress, when, as soon as he was prompted in any way by any of them, he came out very strongly for increasing the Federal gasoline tax by 25 cents a gallon, and applying that through the Highway Trust Fund, to infrastructure investment – not at all something which is part of the White House plan, so-called; and not part of the Republican leadership's plan at all. But when he was asked, he went with that. He hasn't said this publicly, but a number of senators and representatives who were at that second meeting, have reported it publicly in the same way. It's clear that he did say that he was for that increase in the gas tax, and as he said, he would take the political heat for backing it as President, if they would go forward with it. So you've had, in rapid succession, a number of indications that this plan, as poor as it was that came out from the White House, is not in fact the President's plan, and it simply closes

the door on all this waiting, and now says, where are the alternatives?

And that is very definitely what is in the LaRouche Four Laws, is the one alternative to this that will work.

Let me get into this in another way, unless you want to break it up, Matt. And if you have questions, please, interrupt.

But I wanted to read a piece that was written just two days ago by a Chinese scholar John Gong; he's a very prominent professor University of International Business and Economics in

Beijing; and he's a former executive editor of the {Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies}.

OGDEN: We actually have a slide with the title of that article which was written for China Global Television Network (CGTN), "Make America Great Again – With Chinese Money." And I

can read some of the quotes that people can see on the screen, and then maybe you can address what the content is.

This is what he had to say: "Trump is absolutely right that Americas crippled bridges, potholed highways, and crooked railways cannot wait any longer. America needs to be great again.

The only question is, where is the money coming from?" And then

later in the article he said, "I have a great idea. Bank of China

and other major banks from China are now flush with dollar cash

and other dollar-denominated liquid assets, totaling over \$3 trillion, mostly in the form of holdings in U.S. Treasury bills

and bonds. This money can be readily used for Chinese investors

to participate in America's infrastructure boom. By that I mean

Chinese investors can participate in those infrastructure projects as active equity investors, and maybe contractors or suppliers at the same time.

“Call it the Belt and Road. Call it America-belt-America-road. I don’t care, as long as China’s current account trade surplus can be somehow transformed into a capital account stock, in the form of money invested in America as permanent equity shareholders, and more importantly permanent stakeholders of a stable and prosperous Sino-U.S. economic relationship. This could be a win-win mode for both countries.”

[https://news.cgtn.com/news/79596a4d33677a6333566d54/share_p.html]

So that’s Dr. John Gong.

GALLAGHER: Now, that’s very important, in the way it is formulated, in the precision of it. He’s talking about Treasury

holdings, – he’s not the first Chinese official to do this.

In

fact, a year ago, in late January of 2017, Ding Xuedong, the then-chairman of the Chinese Investment Corp., which is one of their two big sovereign wealth funds, made essentially the same

proposal. He said, we have such and such a volume of long-term

U.S. Treasury holdings, they’re not earners, their interest rates

are very low, their return is very low; we would like to trade them for a long-term investment in a U.S. infrastructure bill, as

he put it. And he, at the time, estimated that really, the need

for investment in the United States for new infrastructure, was

{\$8 trillion}, a figure which may seem impossibly large to many, but actually isn't.

[http://www.larouche.com/pr/2017/170116_chinese_invest.html]

Nonetheless, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has written in articles which have been published in the Chinese press, she's frequently interviewed and quoted there, – she has written exactly this proposal in articles which have been published there. I have presented exactly this idea to Chinese officials in Washington.

This is part of LaRouche's Four Laws.

But to start with, the first action implied by his four actions that have to be taken legislatively and from an executive

standpoint, is the restoration of the Glass-Steagall Act and the

breakup of the Wall Street banks and the hiving off of all of the

casino speculative investment vehicles, special purpose vehicles

and all of that, in order to protect and use the commercial banking system for investments.

You cannot get to real, major infrastructure renewal without doing that, and you could see this in the meeting that you played

the clip from. There was at least one representative from Missouri, who brought up the issue, when the discussion was about

trade, and specifically whether there might be tariffs against aluminum imports from China, he brought up the fact that there is

a grave lack of capacity to produce sufficient aluminum for industry in the United States, and where is that lack coming from? The lack of power supplies. So that, this is an infrastructure question, although if you ask the simple

question,

“Is there an apparent sufficient amount of kilowatt-hours per year per capita in the United States?” Yes, there is. But is there sufficient, reliable electrical power supply – constantly

online, reliable, electrical power supply – for an expansion of

industry? The answer would in many cases be, “no.” And that was

what he was bringing up, in particular with respect to more aluminum plants in the United States. You have a grave inability

to produce enough power, particularly since the fiasco of electricity deregulation out on the West Coast 15 years ago:

That

deprived the aluminum industry and shut down a very significant

amount of it.

Now, if there’s going to be that kind of investment in infrastructure across the country, it’s not going to be one, or

two, or three, or four, very famous big projects, like the renovation of the whole Northeast rail corridor of Amtrak, and the bridges and the tunnels in New York and so forth. It’s not

going to be simply those things. It’s going to be, at many, many

levels around the country, the production of enough clean water

supplies, the production of enough electrical power supplies; the

replacement and renovation – mostly replacement – of the river navigation systems, locks and dams, and many of these things.

And for those, the commercial banks have to be ready to lend, because it takes a lot of employment, a lot of contracting, a lot

of local borrowing: The banks have to be ready to lend and if

you allow them to stay the big commercial banks, and the mid-size regional banks – if you allow them to stay in the Wall Street casino, that's where they'll stay. If you say, "no, your business as a commercial bank is lending," then you have a credit channel through the banking system through which national credit can flow, and cooperate in this kind of thing. So it starts with restoring bank separation under Glass-Steagall. We're going to have a group of elected officials from Italy in a couple of months come over and help us organize in Washington on this, because they're fighting for it in Italy at the national and also the local level. Then, the specific second law of LaRouche, a national credit institution, which is able to produce large volumes of productive credit for productive employment of the people, and for increased productivity. And that is where not only the White House plan, but many other plans that have been put forward, are really completely inadequate, where we do have to talk about several trillions of dollars at least of investment, and the way to do that, is exactly the way that was reflected in that comment by Dr. Gong: That is, there is a lot of long-term Treasury debt held out there; three major holders of this long-term Treasury debt, which totals \$7.5-\$8 trillion, are the commercial banks of the United States, again, which hold it in their reserves and all their excess reserves which are very large right now; second, Japan, which holds more than \$1 trillion in primarily long-

term

U.S. Treasury debt; thirdly, China, which actually holds now somewhat more than Japan; about \$1.2 trillion of the same kind of

debt. Those are potential shareholders, equity holders, subscribers of that Treasury debt into a new bank created by Congress for the purpose of generating this kind of credit. That is exactly how we have proposed and circulated and organized that this is the way to form – without a tremendous amount of new borrowing – to form a sufficiently large national

bank for infrastructure; essentially by swapping existing long-term Treasury debt holdings for equity in such a new national bank created by Congress with a guarantee from the Treasury for the payment of the dividends on that equity. And with taxes – this is not free; it's never free, – but with taxes assigned to make sure that those dividends can be paid. That's where the increase in the Federal gasoline tax and potentially the use of other what you would call infrastructure

excise taxes, like the port excise tax and the navigation tax on

the locks and dams, that's where these would come in. Because if

you simply go and raise the gas tax by 25 cents and spend the money for infrastructure projects, it will not produce nearly, nearly enough. But if you use it in this way as leverage to guarantee the equity in a new national bank in exactly the way that we're seeing reflected in that proposal, that article from

Dr. Gong, then it'll work. As I said, he's not the only person,

not only among leading Chinese thinkers about this, but also from

Japan, there's the same kind of positive view of this idea.

Potentially, there you have it – an infrastructure bank.

Then you have to go on and what are you going to use that

credit for? It can't be used simply to repair roads and repair bridges. There are entirely new areas of technological and scientific breakthroughs which will raise productivity in the economy to a far greater extent. One of them that we identify is that a crash program is necessary to develop not only thermonuclear fusion electric energy, but the plasma technologies of infrastructure, which will probably come from such a crash program even before commercial nuclear fusion electricity arrives. We will have plasma technologies being spun off from that crash program, which will address themselves exactly to the production of the kinds of capacities that have died out in deindustrialization in the United States. But they'll do it at a higher level of technology. Those kinds of investments, are one of the Four Laws that LaRouche has called for. Also, a big increase in NASA's capabilities, going back to the Apollo Project level of effort by NASA to really go back to the Moon; industrialize, develop the Moon, develop the raw materials there, including for fusion energy production. And from there, go deeper into the Solar System and ultimately into the galaxy. This is the kind of science driver which leads up-shifts in productivity in industry. And infrastructure is really the way that these up-shifts get introduced to the economy. For example, in a high-speed rail system of cars using magnetic levitation and similar technologies, this is the way it gets introduced. So, that opening from the President is very important. Yesterday you had comments which I think are very significant

from the two leaders of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee – the Republican chairman William Shuster of Pennsylvania, the Democratic ranking member Peter DeFazio – they are normally quite a bit at odds. But in interviews yesterday which were reported today, they were reporting that they are already jointly working on a legislative alternative to exactly what you saw the President asking for there. A legislative alternative again, with real Federal dollars; the language which Senator Brown used – actually it was Senator Wyden was the other Senator – real Federal dollars. An alternative to present which the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is where legislation along these lines will have to start. So, you're seeing that; you're seeing the gas tax being discussed very widely, including by those same two leaders of that committee. You're already seeing an infrastructure bank act in the House – HR547 – of Representative Rosa DeLauro, Democrat from Connecticut, which has the backing of fully half of the Democratic Caucus in the House and is not a national infrastructure bank which would operate in the way that we've described and therefore would not be as large or as capable. But nonetheless, it's legislation which in my view is quite similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which operated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration and did so much to recover the country and then to lead the mobilization for the war and through the war in the 1940s. So that is also something definitely within the purview of

LaRouche's Four Laws.

OGDEN: The idea of national banking is, I think, really the critical idea; and it takes us obviously directly back to Alexander Hamilton. If you look at Hamilton's view on infrastructure, the idea of public infrastructure is very much an American idea, and is a major pillar of the American System. Hamilton's emphasis on the necessity for the rapid upgrading of the national infrastructure, the ports and dredging the harbors and things like this, what was called "internal improvements." But this idea of public infrastructure has an American idea to it. In fact, it was written directly into the Constitution in the form of the General Welfare. There were huge fights, including Hamilton's defense of the Constitutionality of a national bank against Thomas Jefferson around this idea of the General Welfare. I know you have to go, so maybe one more aspect that you can address before you leave, and then I can conclude the remaining portions of the show on my own. But just on this subject of the idea of the public good, the United States used to be the world's gold standard, in great modern infrastructure, public infrastructure. You can see that obviously by what Franklin Roosevelt did during the New Deal. Nations around the world were banging on our door to try to imitate what we accomplished with the Tennessee Valley Authority and so forth and so on. But now, the gold standard is swiftly being set by China and what China has done in an unparalleled way. Create this amazing public infrastructure in a very rapid and swift manner.

Two things I think maybe could be addressed in what we need to now learn from China or relearn in terms of what we used to be committed to, is: 1) the policy approach that has made this possible in China; but also, 2) the philosophy that China is clearly committed to when it comes to this idea of the public good, the common good, or what we call in American Constitutional language, the General Welfare. Maybe you can address that just briefly before you leave, Paul.

GALLAGHER: There was, in the 19th Century, the American Whig and then Republican leaders were all very conscious Hamiltonians. They realized that they were attempting to develop the country, and they were doing it – at least a lot of the time – extraordinarily successfully with a commitment to the “internal improvements” what we call infrastructure, but the internal improvements, the national credit provision, the protection of industry; which came from Alexander Hamilton. But his overriding premise was actually none of those particular policies, but rather his stating against the tide of opinion in the 1790s when he was Treasury Secretary and the decade before and after. He definitely took on the tide of opinion that the United States was going to be an agricultural country, a country of yeoman farmers with all of their well-known virtues and so on and so forth. He said that the wealth of a country is found in the inventive qualities of its people, and in the freedom and opportunity that they have to turn their inventive qualities into enterprise. And he really was responsible for the emergence of the first banks of the United States; not only the First Bank of the United States, the first

national bank, but also the first private banks of the United States, of which there were very few at that time. He saw the creation of a national bank as essentially the necessary link or liaison between the actions of the government to assist the economy and the actions of the private banks; that this was the necessary way, in which they should be related. But his principle was that the mind of the individual and the freedom of the individual and opportunity to make that into enterprise, that that was what defined the ability to produce the wealth of a country and that the wealth of a country was produced within it; it was not gained by trading with other countries – fairly, freely or otherwise. It was gained primarily by producing the wealth which the inventiveness of the people and the resources of the country made possible. And that was the function of protection when it was used, but of course, Hamilton favored more what we would call industrial subsidies than he did what we call tariffs. So that, right through Abraham Lincoln, was the creed of the great leaders of the United States in the 19th Century and considerably thereafter. We became the greatest industrial nation on Earth that way. Franklin Roosevelt revived that general outlook, although he did so without the creation of a national bank, really because of what he was working with in Congress. Otherwise, he might have preferred to do that. But he did it through such institutions as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the TVA, which

became
wonders of the world. We have not really improved on that
much
in the 70-80 years since. But that idea, Hamilton's ideas
spread
very rapidly through Friedrich List, who spent a lot of time
in
the United States and was a leading Hamiltonian in the 1820s
and
1830s, and then was in the middle of the unification of
Germany
for the first time in the Customs Union of Germany in the
middle
of the 19th Century. This spread through Bismarck's policies,
who knew that he was a Hamiltonian, later in the 19th Century.
They spread through the Japanese adopting and learning a lot
of
the works of Hamilton; late in the 19th Century inviting
Hamiltonian economists from the United States to come over and
advise them. This kept being repeated in Korea again. China
has
taken this far beyond, because as you said, they're not only
applying those policies, but they're also as they always say
doing them with Chinese characteristics. Particularly now
with
Xi Jinping as the President of China, he has really defined
and
enshrined in their Constitution the principle of what a
country's
leadership is judged for is its ability to strive for the
common
welfare, the common aims of the population; what we call in
the
Constitution, the General Welfare. That has really had a very
distinctive effect on Chinese policy in the country and also
on
the policy of the Belt and Road Initiative which Xi Jinping

launched, but was really already underway before he made the formal speech three and a half years ago. Already the investments by big Chinese commercial banks outside China, in these projects of energy, mining, but also a lot of infrastructure projects. These big investments were already underway in 2011, 2012; then he made the announcement in 2013, which was so very close to the policy of the World Land-Bridge which had been promoted by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche since the later 1980s. And since that time, that has really been recognized in China; they call Helga the Silk Road Lady. This policy of the common welfare is clearly one reflected in the way

that they've eliminated almost entirely down to the last few tens

of millions of people, they've almost entirely eradicated extreme

poverty in China. I just heard the World Bank chairman the day

before yesterday praising that to the skies and saying it's the

one model for the world. He said the World Bank has been trying

to do this for so many decades, to eradicate poverty, without making too much progress. China has done it, and now they are seeking to help do it in Africa and other places. They want to

invest in the Middle East in reconstruction. But this is really

the test that you are acting for the general good, for the common

welfare, which is what our Constitution commits us to.

So, in that sense, they've gone beyond, and in the process, really developed a lot of technological breakthroughs in infrastructure; and that's where you find them. That's where Roosevelt found them. The projects of the 1930s, which many people think of as just creating a lot of work for people, and building a lot of airports and roads and bridges and things

like

that; those projects – especially the hydro-electric projects and especially the Tennessee Valley Authority – were technological breakthroughs at the time. They built dams, navigation systems, hydropower systems technologically in ways which not only hadn't been done, but had been denied that they could be done even right up to that time. John F Kennedy spoke

about this later, that experts were saying that you couldn't build dams that were simultaneously for water management, for navigation, and for hydropower. The TVA did 57 such dams.

So,

they completely transformed an area of the country. These breakthroughs were made in all of this infrastructure building in

such a way, that the productivity of the U.S. economy leaped up in

the 1930s at the fastest rate of the last 150 years. A close second was the 1940s, including the war mobilization.

So that's what China is experiencing now, as they make these kinds of investments; and they're doing it with a very common welfare orientation.

OGDEN: Wonderful! So, thank you very much, Paul. I'm going to let you go before we finish the remainder of our show.

But I think you've made it very clear that we are uniquely positioned to inform and ultimately shape this counterproposal and what must ultimately become the infrastructure and general economic policy of this Presidency. So, I know we have a lot of

work to do. Thank you for joining us, Paul.

GALLAGHER: Thank you. I'm sure you'll talk about the necessity to bring this up from the bottom as well; from the local elected officials, from the state legislatures in particular and apply it to the election campaign. I think

it's

probably true what Chairman Shuster said, which is that work on

this legislation will be going on until the summer. I think that's definitely true. It will become a part of the election campaign, no question. If we can get candidates out there and local elected officials out there who are for the Four Laws, we're going to shape this. So, thanks for the opportunity and having me on, and have a good time.

OGDEN: Thank you, and we'll talk to you again soon. What Paul said is absolutely correct. This is the ultimate principle

or thought behind the campaign to win the future. This is the LaRouche PAC election mobilization in 2018. We've already had a

number of state legislators endorse this campaign. We're really

on the ground in various places, including in West Virginia; doing some very significant meetings with people who are involved

in the China-West Virginia deals. We've also mobilized in a very

big way in the Midwest, which was key to the Trump election victory. We know that these former industrial states really are

the most significant in swinging these elections and creating the

constituency blocs around this idea of the LaRouche Four Economic

Laws and everything that you just heard Paul go through. This is

the urgent necessity as we mobilize around this kind of program.

I think everything that you just heard from Paul, makes it very

clear that we are uniquely well-positioned to shape this

entire

discussion. I think the opportunity is even greater now than it

was previously.

Now, let me just go over a few things that I think will make it very clear to you that there is an opportunity for a moment of

awakening, you could say, among people who have recognized that

everything that we've been committed to for the last several decades up to this point has completely failed. There were two

very informative or entertaining articles over the last week and

a half, which point to exactly this; indicate exactly this opportunity for people to perhaps open their minds and begin a more sober and serious discussion around the true principles of

economics. One of these is an article which appeared in Bloomberg, this was {Bloomberg Business Week} I believe. The title of this article was "What if China Is Exempt from the Laws

of Economics?" This is by a fellow named Michael Schuman, but the subtitle is "Beijing's policymakers seem to be doing a lot of

things right – and that may upend much of basic economic thinking, especially our faith in the power of free markets."

So, here are a couple of excerpts from that article. He says:

"Over my two decades of writing about economics, I've devised a list of simple maxims that I've found generally hold true...

"But recently, my faith in this corpus of collected wisdom has been badly shaken. By China.

"The more I apply my rules of economics to China, the more they seem to go awry. China should be mired in meager growth, even gripped by financial crisis, according to my maxims. But

obviously it's not. In fact, much of what's going on right now in that country runs counter to what we know – or think we know – about economics. Simply, if Beijing's policymakers are right, then a lot of basic economic thinking is wrong – especially our certainty in the power of free markets, our ingrained bias against state intervention, and our ideas about fostering innovation and entrepreneurship.

“On the surface, that probably sounds ridiculous. How could one country possibly defy the laws that have governed economies everywhere else?...”

“Yet as China marches forward, we can no longer dismiss the possibility that it's rewriting the rulebook. Beijing's policymakers are just plain ignoring what most economists would recommend at this point in its development. And, so far, they're getting away with it... .”

“... Perhaps China really is refashioning capitalism.

“Perhaps. I, for one, am still clinging to my maxims... .”

“... Maybe my rules of economics will hold firm after all. But thanks to China, I'm prepared to edit them.”

Now, it's not that China is rewriting the rule book. I think that what you just heard from Paul is that it's the West, it's the United States under the influence of British free market ideology; this free-market school economics. It's the United States and the West which have been playing by the wrong rulebook for decades, if not generations. We've neglected the rulebook that we originally wrote. It was Alexander Hamilton, it was our first Treasury Secretary; that's why it's called the American System of economics. Other countries have applied these

principles of Hamiltonian economics and experienced the same phenomenal growth that we experienced under the influence of Hamiltonian policy. That is exactly what China is experiencing

right now. It's leaving these economists scratching their heads,

but perhaps they merely have to open a few history books.

I think as you can tell from that Bloomberg article, it's

beginning to dawn on people. "Gee! Maybe we've been wrong.

Maybe we've been duped by this British free trade, free market ideology. Perhaps that's why our economies are in shambles right

now."

Here's another article. This is in the {New York Times

Magazine}. It came out earlier this week. This one is very

interesting and goes through a lot of the history you just heard

Paul elaborate on. This is called "The Rise of China and the

Fall of the 'Free Trade' Myth." The subhead is "China's economic

success lays bare an uncomfortable historical truth. No one who

preaches free trade really practices it." So, here's an excerpt

from the article:

"[T]o grasp China's economic achievement, and its

ramifications, it is imperative to ask: Why has a market economy

directed by a Communist state become the world's second-largest?

Or, to rephrase the question: Why shouldn't it have? Why

shouldn't China's rise have happened the way it did, with

state-led economic planning, industrial subsidies and little or

no regard for the rules of 'free trade'?...

"Indeed, economic history reveals that great economic powers

have always become great because of activist states.

Regardless

of the mystical properties claimed for it, the invisible hand of

self-interest depends on the visible and often heavy hand of government. To take only one instance, British gunboats helped impose free trade on 19th-century China – a lesson not lost on the Chinese... The philosophical father of economic protectionism is, in fact, Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the

American financial system, whose pupils included the Germans, the

Japanese and, indirectly, the Chinese.”

After some history, he lays out the case of Germany, and this one is interesting to focus on. He says:

“... Unified in 1871, Germany was scrambling to catch up with industrialized Britain. To do so, it borrowed from recipes

of national development proposed by Hamilton soon after the Americans broke free of their British overlords. In his ‘Report

on the Subject of Manufactures’, submitted to Congress in 1791,

Hamilton used the potent term ‘infant’ industries to argue for economic protectionism.

“... In his view, infant nations needed room to maneuver before they could compete with established industrial powers. The

United States embraced many of Hamilton’s recommendations; the beneficiaries were, first, the textile and iron industries and then steel.

“It was Hamilton’s formula, rather than free trade, that made the United States the world’s fastest-growing economy in the

19th century and into the 1920s. And that formula was embraced by

other nations coming late to international economic competition.

Hamilton's most influential student was a German economist named

Friedrich List, who lived in the United States from 1825 until the 1830s and wrote a book titled {Outlines of American Political

Economy}. On his return to Germany, List attacked the free-market

gospel preached by Britain as sheer opportunism... Applying List's lessons, Germany moved with spectacular speed from an agrarian to an industrial economy.

"... Closely following Germany's example, Japan heavily subsidized its first factories ...

"... South Korea, too, found solutions for its problems in Friedrich List rather than Adam Smith. The country's leader, Park

Chung-hee ... was also deeply familiar with German theories of protectionism. (The economist Robert Wade reported coming across

whole shelves of books by List in Seoul bookstores in the 1970s.)...

"But little did I know that Hamilton (and List) would achieve their greatest influence in post-Mao China. 'The rise of

China resembles that of the United States a century ago,' the Chinese scholar Hu Angang writes. He is not exaggerating."

Now, that's a very interesting article to appear at this moment. I'm not saying that everything the author says in his analysis is entirely accurate, or that all of the conclusions that he draws are necessarily correct. But what he does make clear is that what made America great was the policies of Alexander Hamilton. And what's making China great today are those very same Hamiltonian policies. This realization shows you

that we have a very fertile field for the reception of our so-called Four Laws campaign – Lyndon LaRouche's revival of Hamiltonian policies. The fight which Lyndon LaRouche has led for decades to liberate the United States from this imposed

free
market, free trade hoax; this British ideology. To return us
to
the principles of Alexander Hamilton. What he did
simultaneously
abroad to educate these other nations on the policies of the
American System and Hamiltonian economic policies. That's
where
China got this from; that's where you can credit the great
Chinese economic miracle of the last 15 years. Do not write
out
of the equation the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have
played as spokesmen for this great Hamiltonian tradition, and
urgently with updates and a profound scientific depth that
Lyndon
LaRouche has brought to this discussion. But the time is now,
and the field is very fertile for the reception of this idea
that
the time has come for a Hamiltonian coalition of nations. We
must join hand-in-hand with China to do exactly that; to bring
development to all the nations on the planet using these
American, but universal, economic principles.
Now, let me just play a very short clip from a broadcast
that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had yesterday. Because the biggest
problem that you run into – and I think this is something that
you run into as an organizer or as an activist – is that
people
fail to make the necessary leap in terms of understanding
these
principles because they have an axiomatic problem. There's a
disconnect. The biggest problem that we have when it comes to
economics today is that money is essentially God. Money has
achieved this status in economics where it is everything to
everyone. It's the Genesis of economics; it's the root, it's
the
prime mover; it's the measuring rod, it's the purpose, it's
the

medium. Money is everything. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed exactly this pathology in her webcast yesterday. And she called for a public debate on this. She said, as it begins to dawn on people who have believed that everything that they had believed about economics may perhaps have been wrong, we need to question some of the most basic economic assumptions that we hold dear, and ask ourselves the question, "What is the ultimate purpose of an economy and what is the true source of true economic wealth?" So, here's Helga LaRouche:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators, so that the rich become richer, and the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking. This article by Bloomberg which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to his theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he says that China is doing everything which according to his theory are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says,

he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections.

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

von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market

model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause

of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of

the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological

discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an

increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things.

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

OGDEN: So the time has come. As I said, it's a very fertile field, and this is one of the most important reasons why

we've now launched a new LaRouche PAC class series, which gets directly at these principles; not only of economics, but this is

what drives global policy. What is the purpose of economy?

What

is the true identity of man? And what should be the

collaborative between peoples and between nations, to what end?

So, I'll take that as an opportunity before concluding, to remind

our viewers that tomorrow we will have the second class in our 2018 class series. This class will be titled "The End of Geopolitics, Part I: The History of Geopolitics." The guest speaker will be Harley Schlanger. Again, you can register for this entire class series, which is called "The End of Geopolitics. What Is the New Paradigm?" The registration is now

open. If you have not registered for this class series, I strongly encourage you to. The link is available on the screen

– lpac.co/np2018. You can also visit discover.larouchepac.com which will be the central hub of all of the material for this class series. Again, if you're a registered participant, not only do you have the opportunity to participate in the live public forums, such as the inaugural class that was delivered last Saturday by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, but you also have the opportunity for an in-depth engagement around the syllabus, the

required reading materials, the homework assignments, the live feedback from the teachers and from the leaders of the LaRouche

PAC class series, and also some discussion periods which are only

open to registered participants. Registration has continued to

increase. We have a large number of registered participants from

all across the United States and elsewhere around the world, too.

So, we're putting together the educated grouping, the cadre which

will be able to lead this discussion for a new economics, a New

Paradigm. The field is wide open. The door is there, and all we have to do is walk through it. We are in a unique position to inform this discussion today; and it is a very urgent debate which needs to take place as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said. So, thank you for joining me here today. I thank Paul for joining me. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do, and we'll see you next week.

GBTimes interviewer Helga Zepp-LaRouche om Kinas Nye Silkevej og Europa

16. feb., 2018 – GBTimes er et multimedie-nyhedssite med hjemsted i Finland, hvor det blev grundlagt af den kinesiske

iværksætter Zhao Yinong, og som refererer til sig selv som en »bro mellem Kina og resten af verden«. Det udgav den 16. feb. et interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der kan læses her:

<https://gbtimes.com/interview-with-helga-zepp-larouche-on-chinas-new-silk-road-and-europe>

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

2. del:

De neokonservatives voksende hysteri over

Kina er bevis på, at Silkevejsånden er ustoppelig. Helga Zepp- LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 15. feb., 2018.

Introduktion v/ Harley Schlanger:

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

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

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

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

(her følger engelsk udskrift af videoen):

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

Helga, I think what we need to start with this week, is the issue of geopolitics. You've always emphasized, that geopolitics

is an imperial game, it's part of the old paradigm and the greatest threat to mankind. This was on display yesterday in the

U.S. Senate: The Intelligence Committee has the Threat Assessment hearing; Dan Coats, the Director of National Intelligence, said, "Frankly the United States is under attack."

And Marco Rubio said, "China is the biggest threat." He said, "it's aggressively promoting infrastructure as part of its long geopolitical arm."

What's behind this?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think it is very clear that, as it becomes clear that China is becoming sooner or later the

largest

economy in the world, it's already bypassing the United States in

certain respects, – I mean, there is obviously a freakout on the side of those people in the West who are sticking to the conception of an unipolar, the idea of a *Pax Americana*, where, basically the United States is the only remaining superpower. And the fact that a nation which is after all, 1.4 billion people, is eventually becoming stronger, especially if it has the

kind of science and technology oriented policy which China is pursuing, it is clear that some people respond to that with the

idea to contain that country.

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

Now, China has answered to the recent attacks, which are really ranging from Australia, to the United States, to certain

European think tanks, in a very calm way. For example, there was

a response to the formulation that China would be a "competitor"

or a "rival," as Trump said it in his State of the Union address,

where there was a quite reasonable article in *Global Times*, answering to this, and making the point that the United States has to make an historic choice: That it is clear that the rise of

China has caused certain strategic phobias among certain people,

who recognize or help to see that China is offering a different

development model which is especially attractive for developing

countries, and that they are now reacting in this way; but that

obviously, cooperation is the only way for these two largest countries in the world – the United States and China. And if they find a way of cooperation, then they have a bright future.

This is completely crazy to say that everything China does – the Chinese culture, the Chinese system – all of this would be a threat to the West. It is absolutely not the case, and China has offered cooperation, and anything else can only lead to a catastrophe.

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

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Essentially, I think what this Joseph diGenova points out, which I think is quite relevant, that the counter-memo to the Nunes memorandum which was basically coming from Adam Schiff, was kept back by the FBI and the DOJ, diGenova says, because there are certain formulations in it which need

to

be redacted according to these two institutions, and he points out to the fact that the formulation because there is a criminal

investigation going on, is very interesting. And he points to the

fact that all the culprits who were involved in this Russiagate

coup attempt eventually will face criminal prosecution. So that's

one thing.

And also the role of former President Obama is now an issue.

There was a funny email which Susan Rice sent to herself as a kind of memo, reminder, on Jan. 20, 2017, where she reported about a meeting involving Obama, Biden, Comey, herself, in which

this was discussed that the incoming President Trump should not

be told by the secret services, things relating to Russia, because of the suspicion of a collusion with Russia. Now, that's

quite incredible, that the outgoing President would instruct the

intelligence services to withhold information from an incoming President. And this refers to a meeting which apparently took place on Jan. 5th, and then, one day later, the four heads of the

intelligence services went to Trump in the Trump Tower, – this was still in the transition period – and they told him about the

supposed collusion with Russia. And later, when Comey made this

big speech in front the Congress, he said this was his “Edgar Hoover moment.”

This is all now in the public domain, and I think everything we said in the dossier on Mueller, which we published last September, is now proven absolutely to the point by these

congressional investigations. ["Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin; He Will Do His Job If You Let Him!"] So, I think

the battle where the United States will go looks much better for Trump than the people who tried the coup against him.

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

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

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

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

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

state and local governments will not function. And I think that

China has noted that point in commenting that the political system in the United States is making it impossible. Because the

moment Trump said anything about his program, the Democrats completely opposed it. And obviously infrastructure is in the national interest, and therefore, should be a nonpartisan issue.

But the fact that you have this partisan system in the United States and elsewhere in the West, as part of the so-called "democratic" system, this prevents any progress in this respect

and therefore, it's all the more important that a professor from

Beijing University offered to use the large foreign exchange reserves which China has, especially in the form of U.S.

Treasuries and U.S. bonds, to invest those in the infrastructure

in the United States.

This is a proposal which we have made from the very beginning, because obviously, China has the financing, China has

the infrastructure expertise; they have built an enormous amount

of fast train systems, and other infrastructure. So I think that

that would be the only way to make this function. But I think short of that, you need Glass-Steagall, you need a National Bank

in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, and a credit system, and

then the cooperation with the Belt and Road Initiative; and then

it would function.

So that remains the task, basically in the United States, our colleagues are encouraging state legislators and others to

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

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

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes. As a matter of fact, as these attacks against China have escalated, they had a very interesting counterattack on "democracy," saying that "democracy" is the hobby-horse of many people in the West, but in reality, it is not in the common interest, it's basically a weapon to defend the interest of an oligarchy. And also the West are not the only ones who can claim to have a democratic system. And then they say basically that this goes back to Mencius, who already demanded that the government must follow the Mandate of Heaven, and in China it is the highest obligation of the party to follow the Mandate of Heaven, which means following the common good of the people. So, they basically say democracy is being used for regime change, that when they target a country, they demand people should follow "democracy," then they play up through the mainstream media some demonstrators and if everything goes well it leads to regime change and if it doesn't go well, they go

for

a nice color revolution.

So I think these kinds of renewed, sharp responses coming from China reflect the fact that they do not intend at all to be

intimidated, and that they're quite aware of double standard of

the so-called "liberal system" which claims they're liberals, but

then demand global hegemony and controlling the rules on a global

scale, and that this double standard is visible for anybody who

wants to see it.

So there is a new tone of self-confidence and

self-assuredness in the Chinese responses to these accusations.

SCHLANGER: And I would assume the Chinese have to be asking the question, "What's wrong with reducing poverty?" And here we

see this situation where poverty is growing in the West, it has

been growing from the 2001 period on, and yet, Chinese efforts to

alleviate poverty, not just in China, but also in their neighbors

and all around the world as well, is seen as somehow an imperial,

expansionist policy.

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

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yeah. They have right now the most impressive program to alleviate poverty inside China by 2020.

For those people who are interested in that, there is a documentary on CGTN, the Chinese Global Television Network, where

they show how they absolutely map out every spot, every village where you have poverty, they have a file on every family to look at what are the reasons for it, what can be done to overcome it – education, infrastructure, industrialization, relocation of people to better-off areas – and President Xi Jinping is very much hands-on. He travels to these villages – not all of them, but some; he talks to the families; he makes it clear that it is his personal concern that the goal of eliminating poverty by 2020 is reached. And this is very, very impressive. There was another article in the Chinese press, where they say, infrastructure development and poverty alleviation is also an area of competition. And not only is the economic growth of China absolutely incredible and outstanding, but so is the infrastructure building and the poverty alleviation. So the West has to basically suffer to be judged: Who is doing more for their people, is it China, or is the West, with their so-called austerity systems, which in the case of, if you look at Europe, there is now a new study out by the European Center for Economic Research [ZEW], which looked at what was the difference, after the 2008 crisis, in those countries which an anti-cyclical focus on basic research and development, R&D, and they had a massive increase in productivity. The countries that did that were Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Finland. As compared to those countries which were hit by with EU Troika austerity policy – namely, Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland,.

Czech

Republic, Lithuania – which had to make cuts also in the basic research and development, and as a result had a terrible collapse

in productivity.

I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators,

so that the rich become richer, and the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking.

This article by Bloomberg, which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to his

theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he

says that China is doing everything which according to his theory

are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says, he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections.

There will be a lot more corrections, because I think we need a public debate, what are the economic criteria for a functioning economy? And obviously, the works of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and his development of physical economy, going

back to Leibniz, to Friedrich List, to Henry C. Carey, to Wilhelm

von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market

model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause

of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things. We need a discussion about that, because the notion of what is economy, equating that with money, has really become one of the axiomatic assumptions of a failing system. So we need a debate about that.

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

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Oh, I think they're on a very good development: There was just a reiteration in Brazil coming from the Chinese Embassy, that the biooceanic railway, connecting the Pacific and the Atlantic from Brazil to Peru, is still very much on the agenda, that a feasibility study has been made. So this is on a good trajectory, and all the projects agreed upon at the

China-CELAC meeting – the Caribbean and Latin American countries meeting with China; and naturally, also the Africa projects are all progressing very nicely. So I think the World

Land-Bridge is becoming a reality, very quickly, to the benefit

of all countries that participate in it.

SCHLANGER: I'd like to come back, as we wrap this up, to the question of geopolitics. We got a question from a viewer, who wanted to know why you always blame British geopolitical manipulations for World War I and World War II? And they ask the

question, what did they do, and what were they responding to? Why don't you give us the answer to that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: If you look at the British Empire's policy toward the Continent in the 19th century, they clearly were extremely upset about the industrial revolution in Germany, introduced by Bismarck. Bismarck, as I mentioned earlier, was a

free-trade follower in the beginning, working with the Prussian

Junkers. But then he got acquainted with the theories of Henry

C. Carey: He had this friend, Wilhelm von Kardorff who was the

head of the German business association at the time, and they recognized the fundamental difference between what Friedrich List

had called the "American System," and the British system.

So Bismarck changed to a proponent of protectionism, and this led to a very quick industrial revolution in Germany.

Now,

the British, through relatives in the oligarchy, manipulated so

that Bismarck got ousted, which was really a tragedy, because

Bismarck was very smart and he had basically established a peace order on the European Continent, by having many diplomatic treaties with every nation, and especially with Russia, he had the Reinsurance Treaty, which was a very important element to prevent a possible outbreak of war, in case there should be some French-German tensions.

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

Now, what was behind that, also, was the idea of geopolitics as it had been developed by Mackinder, Milner, and later by Haushoffer, which was the crazy idea that whoever controls the Eurasian land-mass is in control of the world, to the disadvantage of the Atlantic rim countries, in that case, United

States and England. So basically, that idea that you have to orchestrate conflict in order to prevent such a development, that

became an issue, naturally, with the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was built essentially in the 1890s; and the plans to build

a Berlin-Baghdad Railway, was regarded by the British at that time, as a fundamental threat to their control of the sea trade.

Now, obviously, today, with the New Silk Road, if you think in terms of geopolitics, you could easily arrive at the same mistaken conclusion, and I think that is the British thinking.

And as we can see now, in the case of Mr. Rubio, or the intelligence heads of the United States, that is their thinking.

But as I had said, many, many times, geopolitics led to essentially all the wars in history. It led to two World Wars,

because the idea with the Second World War, was everybody who had

read *Mein Kampf* and knew the background of Hitler, knew that eventually a war between Russia and Germany would result, and there were backers who wanted Hitler to come to power – [Bank of

England Governor] Montagu Norma, in the United States, the Harriman interests and others – so this was a manipulation where

it was clear it would result in such a war.

It should be clear to everybody who is not completely losing his marbles, that in the age of thermonuclear weapons, you cannot

continue this game, if you do not want to risk the extinction of

civilization! And I think what China has proposed with their “win-win cooperation,” with their offers for China and the United

States to cooperate on the basis of a special relation among major powers, the offer for European countries to cooperate, that

is catapulting humanity to a higher level of cooperation and reason! And I think it is so much in our self-interest – what is the problem with the United States? It’s not that China is rising, the problem is that the United States has moved away from

the policies of the Founding Fathers, of Lincoln, of Franklin D.

Roosevelt, of Kennedy. And the United States, indeed, could become great again, if they go back to these policies, and then

they would not regard China as a threat. It's only when the West is collapsing that there is ferment to see a rising power as a threat. But as the Chinese ambassador to Washington Cui Tiankai, he said – and I think that that is definitely something to think about – that in history, there were 16 cases where one nation would rise and the dominant one up to that point would be faced with such a situation: In twelve cases, there had been war, and in four cases, the rising country had just bypassed the old, dominant one and that would have been the new situation. And the Chinese ambassador said: China does not want the twelve cases where it led to war, but they also don't want the four cases where China would just take over and become the unipolar, dominant country; but that they want to have respect for the sovereignty of each, and that is what all the developing countries that are participating in the Belt and Road Initiative are experiencing. That's why they cooperate, they have benefits from it, and they have, now for the first time, the chance to overcome their underdevelopment and poverty. And I think it would be absolutely dangerous to listen to these people who are now saying everything China represents is a threat. Because if you look at China, it's actually a very well-functioning economic model: The people are happy, the philosophy is for the common good, and it is not a threat. And I want to keep insisting on that, because nothing would be more dangerous than if you get into a complete anti-China hysteria, anti-Russia hysteria, and the only consequence of that could be a

terrible catastrophe for all of us.

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

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, till next week.

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

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

omgiver ham i Det Hvide Hus.

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

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

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

Som præsidenten gentagne gange har erkendt: USA behandler ikke

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

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

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

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

Foto: State of the Union 2018