

Hvorfor briterne bliver ved med at myrde amerikanske præsidenter.

LPAC kortvideo

De nylige trusler mod præsident Trumps liv, der kommer fra mange kendte personer, New York City Public Theatre Company, samt nedskydningen af kongresmedlem Scalise, bør ikke ses som isolerede tilfælde; som forbrydelser, begået af enkeltindivider, der handler af egen vilje. Vi bør snarere af USA's egen historie lære, at der ikke findes nogen 'enlig skytte'. Det er briterne, der myrder vore præsidenter, af en særlig grund.

Lad os se på de af vore præsidenter, der blev myrdet; hvad er mønstret? Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, JFK og, endskønt han ikke var præsident, men er relevant for os i dag, Alexander Hamilton. Hvad fortæller mordet på disse præsidenter os om vor nations unikke rolle i historien? Hvis man ser på deres handlinger, så anvendte de, eller havde tydeligvis til hensigt at anvende, det Amerikanske Økonomiske System, for at fremme vor nation, og de kæmpede udtrykkeligt mod Det britiske Imperiums gennemførelse af 'frihandel' i USA. Disse præsidenter vidste, til forskel fra de fleste amerikanere i dag, at Det britiske Imperium er vores fjende, og de vidste, at det var deres job at beskytte vore borgere mod den elendighed, vi ville stå overfor, hvis britisk imperie-frihandel blev praktiseret. Og, hvad der var allervigtigst, så indså de, at britisk frihandel ville kvæle vores mest dyrebare resurse; det amerikanske folks kreative gnist i en naturlig hældning mod at bidrage med vore evner hen imod en positiv og varig virkning på vore efterlevende. Det Amerikanske System

opmuntrer udtrykkeligt denne gnist og bruger den til udvikling af gennembrud inden for varefremstilling, landbrug, videnskab og kultur.

I dag henviser præsident Trump udtrykkeligt til Det Amerikanske Økonomiske System som sin politiske programerklæring. Bortset fra Lyndon LaRouche og hans bevægelse, så er der ingen i det 20. århundrede, der har identificeret det Amerikanske Økonomiske System som værende dét princip i vores historie, der fuldstændig adskiller os fra Det britiske Imperium. Trumps plan om at genoplive den produktivitet, vi har mistet i de seneste 50 år, siden mordet på JFK, og hans beredvillighed til at samarbejde med Kina og Rusland om skabelsen af en ny, økonomisk orden, vækker rædsel i briterne. Trumps præsidentskab udgør en trussel mod selve Det britiske Imperiums eksistens. De ved, der ikke er plads til deres Imperium i en ny, international, økonomisk orden på denne planet, og de vil ikke dø uden kamp.

Lær om Lyndon LaRouches fremsættelse af det Amerikanske System, kendt som de Fire Love til USA's omgående redning, gennem viste videolink, ([dansk tekst her](#)) og gå med i LaRouche PAC (Schiller Instituttet, DK!) for at skabe en ny æra for menneskeheden, *uden* Det britiske Imperium.

Offentliggjort den 24. jun. 2017.

USA tilslutter sig Bælte & Vej – Ideer flytter verden!

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 23. juni, 2017 – Fire begivenheder i løbet af de seneste par dage har vist, at USA nu responderer til det krav, Lyndon og Helga LaRouche fremsatte for tre år

siden: USA tilslutter sig den Nye Silkevej.

* Den 22. juni mødtes Kinas udenrigspolitiske top-regeringsperson Yang Jiechi med præsident Trump, der sagde, at USA er villig til at samarbejde om projekter relateret til Bælte & Vej Initiativet;

* Den »9. Amerikansk-kinesiske Dialog mellem virksomhedsledere og tidligere seniorregeringsfolk«, sponsoreret i fællesskab af USA's Handelskammer og Kinas Center for Internationale Økonomiske Udvekslinger, mødtes i Beijing den 20.-21. juni og erklærede i en fælleserklæring, at »begge sider aftalte, at de to lande kan indlede fuldt samarbejde under 'Bælte & Vej' initiativet og gennem flere andre midler«. De aftalte at holde en fælles konference om Bælte & Vej inden for de næste 12 måneder;

* i San Francisco mødtes 200 kinesiske og amerikanske regeringsfolk og repræsentanter for infrastrukturselskaber i »Forum 2017 for Amerikansk-kinesisk Transportsamarbejde«, hvor den kinesiske konsul sagde, at »Kinesisk og amerikansk samarbejde på infrastrukturfronten er klar til at blive det nye fokus i de to landes handelsengagement«;

* i Detroit Michigan var 3000 mennesker proppet sammen i Cobo Center den 20.-21. juni til en konference, sponsoreret af Ali Baba-direktør Jack Ma. Michigans viceguvernør Brian Calley, der talte ved arrangementet, sagde om handel med Kina: »Det er den traditionelle win-win-situation.« Ma sagde til forsamlingen: »Hvis I går glip af Kina, går I glip af fremtiden.«

Under en diskussion af disse historiske begivenheder i dag bemærkede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at vores organisation har kæmpet for, at USA gik med i den Nye Silkevej, i mindst tre år, siden udgivelsen af *EIR*-rapporten, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. »Først var vi de eneste«, sagde Helga, »men nu er det blevet almindeligt. Vi bør høste

anerkendelsen – tænk på, hvor mange arrangementer, vi sponsorerede, i hele verden, for denne idé. Dette viser, at ideer virker!«

»Folk bør bestemt være optimistiske«, understregede hun. »Hvis dette udvikles yderligere, så kan alle problemer løses. Gå ud med en optimistisk rapport til befolkningen – vores politik virker!«

Foto: USA's præsident Donald Trump møder Kinas statsrådgiver Yang Jiechi i Det Hvide Hus torsdag. (Photo @ChinaDailyUSA / twitter)

Trump vil samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej / Indsats for Glass/Steagall optrappes: LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 23. juni, 2017

... Ifølge det Kinesiske Udenrigsministeriums rapport om mødet, responderede præsident Trump til denne udtalelse fra rådgiver Yang ved at sige, at han – præsident Trump – ville være åben over for at samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej Initiativet og hermed relaterede projekter. Han sagde, han er tilfreds med de positive fremskridt, der er sket i de kinesisk-amerikanske relationer, siden sit møde med præsident Xi i Mar-a-Lago. Og

han meddelte, at han planlægger at besøge Kina inden for det næste (nuværende) år.

Matthew Ogden: Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg Paul Gallagher, redaktør for *EIR's* økonomiske stof, og som har været meget aktiv i Washington, D.C., i den eskalerede kamp for genindførelsen af Glass/Steagall og resten af hr. **LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love** i Hamiltons tradition. Han har mange opdateringer til os på denne front. Og via video har vi Diane Sare, LaRouche PAC Policy koordinator for New York, med os fra Manhattan. Hun har netop skrevet en artikel med titlen, »*Gullivers rejse til Manhattan! Kun LaRouches Fire Love og Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ kan løse Manhattans infrastrukturkrise.*« (*EIR*, 23. juni). Som vi alle ved, venter »Helvedessommeren« forude i New York City, mht. transportinfrastruktur.

Jeg vil straks begynde med nogle meget signifikante udviklinger i kampen for at bringe USA ind i den Nye Silkevej, ind i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ. For det første vil jeg rapportere direkte, at *Xinhua*, et kinesisk nyhedsmedie, rapporterer, at præsident Donald Trump i går mødtes med Kinas statsrådgiver Yang Jiechi i Det Hvide Hus, og til statsrådgiveren Yang sagde, at USA er villig til at samarbejde om projekter relateret til det kinesiske Bælte & Vej Initiativ. De to havde dette møde i Det Hvide Hus som en del af statsrådgiver Yangs besøg til Washington; dette var et møde på højt niveau. Og, iflg. nyhedsrapporter, sagde Yang til præsident Trump, at Kina var meget tilfreds med, meget glad over og satte meget stor pris på det faktum, at Trump-administrationen havde besluttet at sende en repræsentant på højt plan – Matthew Pottinger – til at deltage i Bælte & Vej Forum i Beijing i sidste måned. Vi har rapporteret, at denne repræsentant for USA var en beslutning i sidste sekund fra Trumps side, og at det var en meget god beslutning. Rådgiver Yang sagde også til Donald Trump, at Kina ville være villig til at arbejde sammen med USA om Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

Ifølge det Kinesiske Udenrigsministeriums rapport om mødet, responderede præsident Trump til denne udtalelse fra rådgiver Yang ved at sige, at han – præsident Trump – ville være åben over for at samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej Initiativet og hermed relaterede projekter. Han sagde, han er tilfreds med de positive fremskridt, der er sket i de kinesisk-amerikanske relationer, siden sit møde med præsident Xi i Mar-a-Lago. Og han meddelte, at han planlægger at besøge Kina inden for det næste (nuværende) år. Dette blev bekræftet af udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson i en pressekonference, han holdt onsdag. Præsident Trump rapporterede ligeledes, at han ser frem til igen at mødes med præsident Xi Jinping ved G20-topmødet i Hamborg, Tyskland, i juli måned. Det var første punkt, og det er naturligvis en meget signifikant udvikling.

Det andet punkt er, at der samtidig, dagen før dette møde mellem præsident Trump og statsrådgiver Yang, var en møde på højt niveau mellem tidligere kinesiske regeringsfolk og amerikanske erhvervsledere på højt niveau, i regi af et bilateralt eller fælles møde, der fandt sted mellem USA's Handelskammer – der repræsenterer førende, amerikanske erhvervsinteresser – og Kinas Center for Internationale Økonomiske Udvekslinger, der er en regeringstilknyttet tænketank med base i Beijing. Under dette møde udstedte disse to grupper et fælleskommuniké, der promoverede fælles samarbejde mellem USA og Kina.

Her følger resten af webcastet på engelsk:

So, I'm going to put on the screen here a picture of this meeting that occurred [Fig. 1]. As you can see, it's the 9th U.S.-China CEO and Former Senior Officials Dialogue; jointly sponsored by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the China Center for International Economic Exchanges. What the joint communiqué reports is that not only would the U.S. businessmen be interested in joint cooperation on the Belt and Road, but they would also

be

interested in cooperation on building U.S. infrastructure here domestically. So you can see here a direct quote from their communiqué. This is under the subtitle “Strengthening Investment

Cooperation Under the Framework of Belt and Road Initiative and

Through Other Means.” So, here’s what it says:

“Investment is an important driver of China-U.S. trade relations and the growth of the two economies. There is great potential for the two sides to further expand mutual investment.

China’s Belt and Road Initiative, which has spurred investment in

infrastructure building, will considerably broaden the space for

Chinese and U.S. investment and open many opportunities for Chinese and U.S. companies to cooperate in third countries.

Significant participation by U.S. companies, including in partnership with Chinese companies, can make new contributions to

the furtherance of China-U.S. economic and trade relations.

In

certain areas, U.S. companies can offer the world’s best technology and management capability, thereby helping to insure

smooth and efficient completion of Belt and Road projects.

Infrastructure building in the U.S. will generate an enormous need for investment, and the new U.S. administration has indicated that this is a major priority. China has strong capabilities and cost advantages in infrastructure building, including the building of urban roads, expressways, fly-overs, high-speed rail, and ports.”

It goes on to say: “Chinese companies and financial institutions are ready to contribute to this effort through financing and through the provision of goods and services. Chinese investment in certain areas of U.S. infrastructure

development has the potential to help strengthen business relations between the two sides, and in some cases, speed up completion of the needed projects at lower cost and with greater

efficiency. Both sides agreed that the two countries can engage

in full cooperation under the Belt and Road Initiative and through a number of other means, including the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, the World Bank, and other multilateral investment and financing institutions.”

Then it has a subtitle: “Agreed Action”

“Within the next twelve months, the CCIEE and the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce will organize a conference on the Belt and Road in China or in the United States; which will allow the Chinese side to brief the U.S. side on the Belt and Road plans,

including initiative content, current progress and projects that

might be appropriate for U.S. company participation, including in

partnership with the Chinese companies. The U.S. side will brief

the Chinese side on the latest infrastructure developments in the

United States and share reflections on pathways for Chinese companies to participate in U.S. infrastructure revitalization initiatives.”

So, this is a very important development. And now, third, here’s an article from {China Daily} which reports on a rather extraordinary forum that happened in San Francisco yesterday, which was titled “2017: U.S.-China Transportation Cooperation Forum.” Before I get to the next slide, just see here, the beginning of the article. It’s titled “Chinese Builders Wanted

in the U.S..” The beginning of the article says, “Chinese infrastructure techniques are urgently needed to rehabilitate America’s poorly maintained and in some cases dilapidated

bridges

and road system, industry experts from both countries agree.

The

fact that the U.S., the world's most economically and technologically powerful country, should import fast-train know-how from a developing China, reflects a new normal for China-U.S. cooperation and communication." Then, the article quotes Chinese Consul-General to San Francisco Luo Linqun, who

gave the keynote. He said, "China and the U.S. cooperation on the infrastructure front is posed to become the new highlight in

the trade engagement between the two countries. California along

with its neighboring states has especially close trade relations

with China," he added. "The import and export volume between this

region and China has mounted to more than \$201 billion in 2016.

The One Belt, One Road Initiative was conceived in China," he added, "but it provides a global platform for economic development for all the countries participating."

So clearly, all three of these are extraordinary developments, highlighted by this meeting in the White House, where Donald Trump said – according to Chinese reports – that the United States would be happy to participate in the Belt and

Road Initiative. This is clearly coming along very rapidly; and

as Helga LaRouche said when she was briefed on these developments

earlier today, she said "Remember, it was only three years ago,

in 2014, that the LaRouche movement put out the call for the United States to join the Silk Road." I think you can remember

the pamphlet that was printed by the LaRouche Political Action Committee that was called "A Hamiltonian Vision for the Future of

the United States: The United States Joins the New Silk Road."

But Helga LaRouche said, at that point – 2014 – this idea was almost unheard of. But now, as you can see from these developments and otherwise, this initiative has really gained prominence and is becoming a dominant reality. It is very urgently needed. "We've seen a very significant victory," she said, "on this front; and we should recognize it as such." She

said, "I think an appropriate for this is 'Ideas Matter; Ideas Shape History'."

I think you can really expect the consolidation of this with the meeting between Trump and Xi at the G20 summit in July. And

I think we can also see some dramatic developments between the potential for a bilateral meeting – and this is becoming more solid as the days go on – between Trump and Putin. But, as the

lead article on the LaRouche PAC website states very clearly today, although it's widely expected that President Trump and President Putin will meet for the first time on the sidelines of

this G20 summit, it's very clear that the opponents of this world-changing event of the United States-Russia-China cooperation, are doing everything they can in an hysterical fashion, to try to undermine this before it ever happens, to force the cancellation, to cause it to become totally hostile, or

to cause there to be no positive progress that can be made out of

such a summit. You see this crazy Russian sanctions bill that was rammed through the Senate 98-2; you can see the efforts by the U.S. forces shooting down this Syrian jet over Syrian territory, which has the potential to develop very rapidly.

This forced the Russians to again terminate the non-confliction hotline between the United States and Russia. You can see Steve Mnuchin's efforts to levy new sanctions against 38 Russian and Ukrainian firms and individuals. Then you can see this F-16 that buzzed the military aircraft that was carrying Russian Defense Minister Shoigu. All of these are very dangerous, and are obviously planned to try to derail any potential for a positive relationship between the United States and Russia. One only has to read this hysterical article in the {Washington Post} today, "Obama's Secret Struggle to Punish Russia for Putin's Election Assault," which only continues this false narrative.

PAUL GALLAGHER: Not so secret.

OGDEN: Not so secret. So, that gives you a picture of where we stand, but a very optimistic picture, as Helga LaRouche underlined; if we see in terms of the potential for this United States New Silk Road, New Paradigm consolidation. But it's very urgent that this happen as well. That was why I asked both Paul and Diane to join me on the show today. First, I'd like to ask Diane to go through a little bit of what you have in this article. As I said, it's titled "Gulliver Travels to Manhattan! Only LaRouche's Four Laws and the Belt and Road Can Save Manhattan Infrastructure Crisis." So Diane.

DIANE SARE: Sure. I was inspired, if one can call it that,

by my attendance at a Cranes, New York real estate conference, where they had three panels. The way it was billed was that – and they had the CEO of the Port Authority, and the building trades union, and Staten Island and Brooklyn. And given what's

about to happen here, which people may or may not be aware of, basically we are at a total breakdown point in the greater Manhattan area. During the day in Manhattan, you have about 3.1

million people; at night, it's about 1.8 million. There's something between 1.5 million and 1.8 million who commute into the city to the island of Manhattan on a daily basis. That's a

very large traffic flow. Penn Station handles about 650,000 people a day; I think that's triple what it was built for. Similarly, every other major transit point, whether it's coming

in from Long Island and Brooklyn across the East River, or coming

in from New Jersey on the western side, everything is completely

overloaded; at or well above capacity. So now, the system itself

is anywhere from 70 to 100 years old, and very little maintenance

or repair or upgrading has been done. We're using switching systems which were built before World War II largely; I think they've modernized one line so far, and another one will be done

in a few years. It really is insane.

So, I went to this conference, because starting on July 10, since there were two train derailments in early April in Penn Station on the tracks there, they've decided they cannot put off

repairing those tracks. But of course, to repair tracks, then you cannot use them while you're repairing them. They're saying

they're going to have to reduce the traffic coming in from Long Island by 20%; I don't know what the percentage is from New Jersey, but it's probably something similar or greater. I know the commuter routes from Essex and Morris Counties, which include commuters coming in from Pennsylvania who go to various places and then take a train into Penn Station, that's all going to be rerouted into Hoboken; the PATH system which is also overloaded. At any rate, these repairs start on the 10th of July, and they're going to be going on for at least six weeks or longer. Who really knows, frankly? There's no redundancy. This is a system that any section of it that you shut down, if you're talking about transit points that are already functioning or not functioning I should say, at over capacity. And you're going to add 20% more traffic, or 30% more traffic, or 50% more traffic to it; you could have a total breakdown of everything. None of the plans I've seen so far really are adequate. I don't know what they're going to do as they get closer; maybe they're going to have to have people come into work on rotating shifts, people's hours are going to change, I don't know. But at any rate, I was hoping that this conference might address it. What I heard there – and it's not as though these speakers were completely incompetent or were not aware of the crisis in some way – but what you saw was that people's thinking has been so warped. One, as I said in the article,

by

this Bertrand Russell legacy that there's no such thing as a creative idea, or a new idea; but that everything is an algebraic

system of linear deduction. Of course, from that standpoint, you

could never conceptualize where this region should be in 50 or 100 years.

So, the things that they were proposing be done, like turning Rikers Island into a part of LaGuardia Airport – LaGuardia Airport, as people may know who have travelled into New

York, is very much overloaded. They don't have the space for the

number of flights that are coming in, and they're projecting that

by 2030 there will be another 30 million people per year trying

to fly into the city. So, how do you handle this? They said, well we need 75 more flight operations per hour. Taking over all

of Rikers Island for this and a new wastewater treatment plant,

only gives you an increase of 30 more flight operations per hour.

So, why would you do that? What is the point of investing in something that doesn't even meet either the current needs or what

you are projecting? It's really insane. So, you have that factor; and the other factor is the funding, which I think Paul

may deal with more; but the idea that everything can only be done

through public-private partnerships. As people know, my colleague Bill Roberts has an article in the same issue of {EIR}

about the Soo Locks, where of course they figured out in 1986

that this is a key transshipment point for coal and other things in the United States; and they really needed to be repaired and modernized. So, this was approved in 1986, but they concluded that you'd only make back 75 cents on the dollar of what was invested. Clearly by Bertrand Russell-type methods, where it's all linear, because if you cause 11 million people to be unemployed, which is what would happen if this thing wasn't done, that's not taken into account. Similarly, the speaker at this conference from Brooklyn, showed pictures of the damage from Hurricane Sandy, which were horrific; I was here in New Jersey when that occurred. We didn't have electricity for about two weeks; it was very damaging, very devastating. There were several proposals made in 2009 at a conference in Manhattan for storm surge barriers. My favorite was a five-mile one that went from Sandy Hook in New Jersey to the Rockaways. So you go across the whole area before you even get to Staten Island, and it would have an underground tunnel and it would have gates that came up; but normally the ocean would be flowing through. I think that would cost something like \$6 billion. I can see these silly accountants with their mathematical methods saying \$6 billion, what's the profit? Well, how about saving \$80 billion? \$6 billion versus \$80 billion in damage when you get one of these storms. But nonetheless, they decided not to build it, and we got what we got with Hurricane Sandy. So, because of the way people think in terms of

worshipping money, as opposed to seeing money as a means of credit generation, or as a means of figuring out how to measure

the cost of an improvement that you need; which will lead ultimately to the increase in the productivity of your population.

What does it mean when you say we want our standard of living to be higher? Well, that doesn't mean having seven television sets in every room as opposed to one, or something like that. When you say the standard of living, we mean things

like life expectancy, being free from disease, being better educated. How many Americans speak only one language, and maybe

that's an exaggeration to say that Americans even speak a language. Many people now do not have a very good command of the

English language, which is our language in this country. In other words, how many Americans know how to read music? How many

Americans have conducted basic scientific experiments in school;

have ever tried to make a painting or a work of art or write a poem? In other words, by standard of living you mean that there's a life expectancy which allows for a young person to be

educated to the age of 22, 25, 28; and then that person has an adult lifespan in which they're still developing and learning. You can get human beings developing a quality of genius which contributes to the future for all mankind.

The only reason for money, is to create a situation where you can think in those terms. That the people living 100 and 200

years from now will live longer, be healthier, be better educated, and be better; which is what you would want. Who really wants to be the best of all time? That means, in effect,

that your life is meaningless, if everything coming after you is going to be worse than you. So, that's the point of economy; but none of these people was thinking that way at all. It really struck me that here we are sitting on potential complete chaos; you already had two weeks ago, there was a subway that got stuck, and it didn't have air conditioning because the power was out. So you had people packed in this car, and the temperatures were getting to 100 degrees, it was like a sauna in there. No one could move for 45 minutes and they were on the brink – as you might imagine – of getting completely panicked. Happily, no one had a heart attack or other medical disaster, but it does make people nervous. A few days ago, another subway car was stalled out, so people went out the back exit and got down on the track and started walking to the station. That's extremely dangerous. What happens if you lose all order because people just panic because they don't know if they're going to reach their destination? They don't want to be stuck in a subway for hours on end. We're really on the brink of a situation like that. People would be prepared to tolerate hardship if they knew that there was a plan to actually address it. For example, if President Trump, as a result of his dialogues with Xi Jinping and President Putin, were to say "Look, we actually think the Bering Strait tunnel should be built within the next decade; and we're going to launch a crash program

with

China and Russia to develop high-speed rail corridors across the

United States. So that Manhattan really should be connected with

Paris; and that's something that will happen. I'm going to initiate that in my Presidency, and it's something that will be

completed during a future administration." Now knowing Trump, he'd probably say "Well, it has to be done within my first term."

But at any rate, what would that mean for Manhattan? What kind

of infrastructure would you want to have in place? If you had high-speed rail connecting Washington D.C., Philadelphia, Manhattan, New York City, and Boston, then you would know that you might have a free flow of people in the entire northeastern

coastline – this huge metropolitan area – because you're talking about taking an hour to travel from D.C. to New York. So, what does that mean? What do you want New York City to look

like under those circumstances? Maybe we have to consider taking

advantage of this massive 22% of New Jersey's land areas in the

Pine Barrens, and convert part of that into a large city where part of the population of New York City could be relocated, while

you build something which is actually appropriate. But no one is

thinking in this way.

Apparently, plans have been made, as we know with the Soo Locks, plans have been made. There are engineers who are highly

competent who are aware of these things, who know that there are

limits on the life expectancy of cast iron and things like that.

They may have long life expectancies, but there is a point at which things begin to corrode and things like that. So, plans have been made, plans exist. But where do you get the funding to

implement it? What is the magnitude of these plans? If the population were aware that such a thing existed, that is was going to be set into motion, then people would be prepared to put

up with a certain amount of hardship; probably very happily, knowing that their children were going to live in a much more beautiful and functioning location than we currently do now. So, this is the battle. And I think Matt, what you reported just at the beginning of this show, in terms of the commitment of

President Trump to work with the Chinese, the commitment of the

U.S. Chamber of Commerce explicitly to collaborate with the Belt

and Road Initiative; this is extremely promising, and should absolutely be promoted.

OGDEN: Well, I think those scare stories you have from New York City should probably encourage people that this is a rather

urgent initiative. I know from talking to Paul, that you have a

few more scare stories that you might want to share with us. I'm

going to just let you go through a few of those also.

GALLAGHER: Well, I'm going to come back to this. I wanted to just briefly sketch the fight around Glass-Steagall; but I'm

going to come back to this in particular on the character of the

PPPs – public-private partnerships – as actually “poison pill policy,” which is really threatening this entire potential for collaboration, China-U.S. collaboration both on the Belt and Road, and also starting with the Bering Strait Tunnel. Also in regard to infrastructure in North America and infrastructure in the United States.

But on Glass-Steagall, let me just indicate, you have a very stark comparison in terms of infrastructure investment between the United States and China. In the United States, about \$300 billion is invested in infrastructure every year, and that is, every school, every hospital, every road job, every subdivision’s

new sewer and water and optical fiber, and so forth – that is absolutely everything, public, private, local, Federal, amounts

to about that much investment. In China, the four major state banks which provide the credit for the infrastructure breakthroughs that have been made in China, those four banks issue about \$140 billion worth of credit annually for high-speed

rail in China alone. And just that form of advanced infrastructure and just that public investment by those four national banks: the Exim Bank, the China Development Bank, the

other China policy banks, as they’re called. That investment in

just high-speed rail is half of the total investment made by the

United States – public, private, in every form, on every kind of

infrastructure and every public band-aide that’s put on, and claimed as infrastructure, every year.

In addition, those banks in China have invested and committed \$300 billion just in the three years since the Belt and

Road Initiative of President Xi began to take off, and that \$300 billion invested and committed by those banks is outside China.

So that's going on simultaneously with the large-scale investments in completely frontier, including things like maglev subways, in the major cities of China, and there are many, many, many major cities in China as people know.

So this is widely in the financial press in the United States and Europe, the old imperial liberal order defends itself by saying, "This credit issuance of China can't possibly be sustained. There will be a tremendous, earthshattering collapse of all of this infrastructure credit, because the banks – it has dwarfed even what the Federal Reserve has done for the banks here, and for a good purpose, and it can be sustained; it'll all blow up." There is a very fundamental difference here, though, in that China, for the last 20 years has had bank separation; it has many shadow banks, it has a lot of investment companies involved in broker-dealers, but they are completely separated from the both private commercial banking system, which they want to build up further, and also from this kind of public banking.

So that these banks are not involved in the \$550 trillion derivatives exposure of the banks in London and New York. These banks are not involved in securities speculation. They are able to handle bankruptcies; they're able to handle non-performing

loans when they appear in various sectors as the economy develops. So, Glass-Steagall, although they don't call that law "Glass-Steagall" in China, that bank separation is important to what they are able to do and the fact that they've been doing it now for 20 years on a level of spending nearly 9% of their GDP on new infrastructure every year, for more than 20 years. Compare that to the United States, which spends about 1.3% of its GDP now on infrastructure annually. They've been able to do that, and keep it up. Now, we've been fighting for Glass-Steagall in Washington. It's really taken on much more of the characteristics of a good brawl, in the recent weeks. It's become a big public fight, for one thing, where you have on the one hand, especially for the last two months, three months, – on the one hand, you have all the financial press and the major national {Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, New York Times}, running all kinds of editorials and op-eds on why Glass-Steagall is not necessary, why it's terrible, why it's completely outdated; it was only repealed 20 years ago, but it's completely outdated, practically a relic of the Middle Ages, why it didn't have anything to do with the crash in 2008, and so on and so forth. You have that going on, you have think tanks in Washington, like Heritage Foundation and American Enterprise Institute running whole events which

consist
of nothing but examining Glass-Steagall. I went to one recently,
at the American Enterprise Institute, where six different speakers were attacking Glass-Steagall. The only person in the
room who was fighting for Glass-Steagall was me, and I was not one of the speakers.
So you have these kinds of attacks on it, but also the sponsors. The main sponsors of the House bill, Marcy Kaptur (D)
of Ohio, Walter Jones (R) of North Carolina, the Republican main
sponsor, have started to really fight publicly. They had a public press conference when they introduced the bill three and a
half months ago with 25 sponsors. They now have about 55 sponsors as a result of fighting for it publicly since then. This is a much faster rate of getting sponsors onto the bill than
was the case in the last session, where eventually there were about 85 sponsors after two years of work. But in this case, the
week before last they had a congressional briefing for the staffs
of Congressmen throughout the House, about somewhere between 35
and 40 other Congressmen sent their staffs to this briefing, so
it was really quite a packed event in one of the office buildings, to take notes and report back to their Members of Congress. And not only Kaptur and Jones, but also experts from
the AFL-CIO, from the Americans for Financial Reform, from Public
Citizen; Nomi Prins, an independent, former investment banker and

author on banking, independent expert – they all testified. And this is causing a tremendous amount of discussion throughout the House in particular. On the Senate side, the leading sponsors have all made it a point to draw out the Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, and make it clear that what he was advising Donald Trump to do during the campaign essentially, was not the real Glass-Steagall or anything like it; but rather Mnuchin's advice to Trump during his campaign, was to talk about Glass-Steagall while Mnuchin privately was designing something which was really Wall Street deregulation like the bill that recently passed the House. So the fact that they have really broken Mnuchin down on this and made him say "No, no, no, I don't believe in anything like separating commercial and investment banking." This has also dramatically clarified issues for people in both the Senate and the House. And secondly, we have begun to get close to the mobilization of large organizations, large trade unions, coalition organizations like Public Citizen, and in this I don't mean them endorsing Glass-Steagall, I mean them mobilizing their hundreds and hundreds of thousands of members to demand this from Congress. We've come very close to getting to that stage, and in particular you saw last week a broadcast that Public Citizen ran on their Facebook page with Rep. Marcy Kaptur, in which they were motivating and calling on their reportedly 400,000 members to

go

after Congress to get this.

So the objective is to get from the 55 sponsors now to 100 – fast. Because it's not so important in the Senate, to pile up

a lot of sponsors – there are only a 100 Senators. It's very important in the House, when the leadership of both parties is against Glass-Steagall, which they are: Both the Republican and

the Democratic leadership do not want to see it; the Democratic

leadership wants to cling onto this failed Dodd-Frank Bill, and

pretend that Obama came up with something nice there. And the Republican leadership wants to give Wall Street every kind of deregulation that they've ever asked for.

So in that situation, it is crucial to get to 100 sponsors.

This is the stated objective of the major sponsors in the House

and when they do that, then they really want to go public and start to hold the kind of press conferences and press bugging of

other Members which will get widely covered in the media and really make this into a bigger brawl.

So that's just an indication of some of the things we have been getting going. And one of the arguments that Jones and Kaptur have started to use, for example when they – I didn't mention this, but they also went to the Rules Committee when it

was marking up this crazy Republican deregulation bill called the

"Financial CHOICE Act." They went to the Rules Committee with an

amendment that said, strike CHOICE Act, take it away, and put Glass-Steagall reinstatement in its place, and that's our amendment." So they got to make a fight in front of the Rules Committee on that.

But they've begun to make the very coherent argument that not only did Glass-Steagall's elimination lead directly to the crash in 2008; there's no need to go over this now, it's the most

obvious thing in the world to most thinking Americans. It's like

the guy who ate nothing but McDonalds food for four months and after four or five months his organs were failing, he was catastrophically obese, he was near death! And this is like saying "there was no connection, there were other factors that brought this guy into this condition. It wasn't the McDonald's

Big Macs that he was eating." That's what it amounts to to tell

Americans that less than 10 years after getting rid of Glass-Steagall, the whole banking system blew up simultaneously,

which has never, for all of the major banks to be bankrupt at the

same time, as Ben Bernanke admitted they were, has never happened

in the entire history of the United States. It took less than 10

years without Glass-Steagall to bring that about.

So they also are now arguing that the period in which Glass-Steagall was in effect, which is also the period in which

the biggest infrastructure investments in new infrastructure in

the United States were being made, from the '20s, up through the

end of the '60s and into the '70s, that that was a golden era of

productivity in the United States. We had a banking system then,

which concentrated not only on loaning to – but you see it in many examples of the history of that period – concentrating on

making commercial and industrial loans to businesses for expansion and for participation in major projects. You don't have that kind of a banking system without Glass-Steagall; instead, you have a banking system which wants to underwrite bond

issues for only the biggest corporations, with which they can play around with their stock prices and so on. And it brings the

entire economy down.

It gets us right back – and they're making now the right argument and very powerful argument, that if we want to rebuild

the United States, and particularly build new, frontier new infrastructure in the United States, we have to have a commercial

banking system which is separated from securities broker-dealing

and speculation in the derivatives markets; and which is concentrating on household lending and commercial and industrial

lending to the companies participating in these great projects.

Now, public-private partnership is, again, back to Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, the conference that was held in Washington last week, SelectUSA, which was a conference trying to get foreign investment in the United States. So this is the Treasury

Department; you've already given the context for this, along with

what Diane reported, in terms of the imminent potential, absolutely imminent potential for large-scale investment, particularly from China in an infrastructure build in the United

States. instead, what the Treasury Secretary went there and offered was, he said: We want this kind of investment and public-private partnerships are critical.

Suffice it to say, never in the United States has a major

infrastructure project or major new element of the infrastructure of the United States, {never} has such a thing been constructed with a public-private partnership, let alone by private investment alone. The Transcontinental Railroad was by no means a public-private partnership. And these things simply don't work. The investors in them want their capital back in 10 years, and they want 10-12% rates of interest in their invested capital during that 10 years. Well, that means they want it back, if it's anything major, while the thing is still not finished, and still not being used to a full extent; and they want to absolutely rob the public taxpayers whose money is going into such a project. It simply cannot work, and it will sabotage foreign investment in new infrastructure building in the United States if this method is used.

We have a threadbare public investment in infrastructure now. What President Trump has spoken about, the time has run out for him and for the Congress to implement it. They have to now create, immediately, a National Bank on the order of \$1-2 trillion in capital, in the way that Alexander Hamilton and his successors in the American System built such National Banks starting in 1790, through the 19th century. They have to create such a bank {now}, so that there is a credit institution here, to cooperate with the credit institutions like those in China that I was discussing earlier.

Otherwise, we are really facing disaster. I'll give you an example: I went to a Congressional hearing yesterday and talked to some of the witnesses who were involved in exactly trying to organize some of the infrastructure developments that Diane indicated are so needed in the New York area. One of them is a bridge over the Hackensack River near Secaucus, New Jersey, called the Portal Bridge, which is 108 years old. It was designed in the 19th century, completed in 1910. It has ships go under it by splitting the bridge, but opening as a drawbridge. All of the rail traffic, freight and passenger, between Florida and Massachusetts goes over that bridge – all of it! And that bridge, when they open it to get a ship go through, when they try to close it now, 9 times out 10, according to the fellow who spoke to me there, 9 times out of 10 it doesn't close properly, so that rails don't align. And they then send workers out on the concrete abutment of the bridge with sledgehammers, and they hammer at the iron trusses of the bridge to get the rails to align. All that it would take is for them to be able to unable to get them to align, once, and as he estimated, that would be a single-point loss of potentially 10% of U.S. gross domestic product. Right there. And then you have, in the Poe Lock, the potential failure of the Poe Lock between Lake Superior into Lake Huron, and the whole Mesabi Iron Range, and all of the ships which are carrying all of the strategic metals, the iron, the coal coming out of Northern

Minnesota, Ontario, the Mesabi Range, all of that would be stopped: another 10% of the gross domestic product of the United

States would be frozen and they estimated up to 11 million jobs

would be lost.

So you say, "well of course, they're replacing this bridge at Hackensack," but actually, they're not! They don't have the

funds! They have a plan, it's all worked out, it's engineered,

but the replacement is not under way.

So you have here, the makings of a movie you could call it, a suspense thriller: "The Bridge over the Hackensack River."

But

with 10% of the U.S. economy hanging on the guys banging those rails back into place, but there is not any funding arranged to

replace that bridge. And you can multiply that for all the other

things that have to be done.

We're very far from the frontier, national high-speed rail network, nuclear desalination plants, the Western water management systems, – we're very far from the frontiers in space infrastructure that we have to be building. We're actually

threadbare in terms of just continuing to use, and have an economy, what we already have.

So there's no time at all left, for these wonderful prospects by the discussions with the Chinese now at the highest

level, between President Trump and one of the tope people in the

Chinese government, State Councilor Yang Jiechi, for these wonderful prospects to be backed up by the institution which issues credit for the United States, a Hamiltonian bank for investment. It must be formed. It must come out of the

Congress

with the drive from the White House in order to get it done.

OGDEN: As you said, time is running out: We're five months now into the Trump administration, and you highlighted the role

of Steve Mnuchin: I think this continues to be a very bad element in the Trump administration. And the kind of support that Trump gained from his support for Glass-Steagall during the

Presidential election campaign, is something that has now – that

has to become visible. That has to become a visible, vocal, sort

of element from the population, from the constituency. And I just want to put on the screen the URL that we have for the mobilization that we have for H.R.790: That's the bill that's in

the House, the "Return to Prudent Banking Act" –

GALLAGHER: The Glass-Steagall bill.

OGDEN: Which was introduced by Marcy Kaptur and Walter Jones. This is the return to Glass-Steagall. As you can see, this is the website: <http://lpac.co/hr790> And I think that this

goal of reaching 100 cosponsors in a very short amount of time,

is a very tangible goal that we can mobilize for, along with this

vision of, the United States joining the New Silk Road. But Paul, as I think you just laid out very clearly, that is impossible without Glass-Steagall. You cannot set up the kind of

national credit institutions, the national banking credit institutions that would channel that kind of joint investment into this infrastructure in the United States, without this critical first step of the return to Glass-Steagall.

One thing I wanted to ask you about, Paul, is just the prognosis on how close we could be to another disastrous blowout of the trans-Atlantic banking system. I know Nomi Prins did an interview a few months ago with you, where she highlighted a few of these things with the corporate debt bubble. But that's something that Marcy Kaptur cited in her testimony to the Rules Committee, and I think that element of urgency is also necessary to put in here.

[<https://larouchepac.com/20170319/interview-nomi-prins>]

GALLAGHER: We don't know how much time, because it's impossible to put a finger on a date when a really huge and increasing unproductive debt bubble, in this case, as Representative Kaptur identified, the corporate debt bubble in the United States, when it's going to blow up. But, the size of corporate debt in the United States has doubled in seven years, from about \$7 to about \$14 trillion, with really the great majority of that tremendous debt expansion being used for what they call "financial engineering" by large companies: Meaning buying back their own stock, mergers and acquisitions, finding ways to increase the dividends they give to their stockholders, increasing their own executive compensation – all of this kind of financial engineering has been used in various years up to 80-85% of this new corporate debt.

What has really suffered in the process has been business capital investment and the commercial and industrial lending, which it depends on. So that that tremendously expanding bubble

has stopped expanding. And this has been noted rather suddenly,
by everybody from the IMF to individual bank research teams, since April of this year, that suddenly that tremendous expansion
has stopped; as happens with an immense bubble that's about to explode, and it started to shrink. And there was a report put out by UBS bank in Switzerland about two weeks ago which caused a
certain amount of alarm, because they found that what they call
the "credit impulse," had gone negative in the last six months —
they're talking globally now — meaning that the second derivative, the rate of the rate of growth of business lending around the world had suddenly in the last six months become negative. And that is something which virtually always points to
a bubble about to collapse.
This is a very huge one, indeed. The IMF estimated that if interest rates were to go up sharply in the United States, 20% of
all the companies in the United States would default. That's way
above the rate of defaults on mortgages even at the worst 10 years ago; and the whole thing would come crashing down.
So we need the reorganization of the banking system, urgently, for that reason, also in order to make the commercial
banking side of it proof against this kind of a blowout. And so
you don't have, again, a situation in which the bankruptcy of any
investment bank, let's say, becomes, almost overnight, the bankruptcy of every major U.S. based bank as happened in late September 2008.

OGDEN: I would say, this is real policy. This is what anybody who's serious is discussing right now. And the failed decision by the Democratic Party, for example, to just be the party of resistance, is increasingly proven to be an increasingly proven to be very ill-advised policy. And I think even Sen. Chris Murphy made some headlines this week where he said: Look, none of my constituents are talking about "Russia," when I go home. They're talking about jobs, drugs, poverty. They're talking about exactly what we're discussing here! Hmm, gee, maybe we shouldn't be pumping anti-Putin propaganda all day every day.

So, I wanted to ask Diane, you know, we've had some surprising reports – or surprising for some – from the streets of Manhattan, where you would assume because of the 24-hour-a-day anti-Putin propaganda that people are being inundated with, that this would be the only thing that's on people's minds. But as we saw, the reality on the ground in New York is the collapsing infrastructure. This is what people are actually interested in talking about. And we've had some rather surprising readings from the population there in New York and northern New Jersey, in the recent weeks.

SARE: Sure. We've had numbers of teams set up by the roadside in New Jersey or right in the middle of the large sidewalks in Manhattan, with giant signs saying "Defend Trump. Stop Here. Donald can't do it alone, join LaRouche PAC. The U.S. must join the Belt and Road. Russia-Gate Is a Comey Plot!"

And many people are coming up to our tables and we're actually

getting a very hot response, much more intense than at any period

since the election, with people coming over saying, "You know, I

thought I was the only one. The propaganda is so intense, I don't dare to say that I supported Trump at my workplace."

We had a very strong response also in Connecticut, Long Island, Jersey and Manhattan per se, where we are getting this type of response.

And I also just wanted to add, in light of this crazy continuing of the story about the alleged Russian hacking which

somehow caused people to change their mind on how they were voting. Remember we did just did have the special election for

Congress, in South Carolina and Georgia, where the Democratic candidates, one of whom I think spent \$33 million or some absolutely obscene amount of money, and still lost the election.

And it's not because the Republican candidates were so brilliant;

it's because the population has really had it and this is where,

if President Trump moves in a very big way, very public way to embrace the Chinese offer, to reinstate the Glass-Steagall Act so

we can have a sane banking system, and to launch some of these infrastructure projects on a Federal basis, you would just see an

incredible upsurge of support. And most of this vicious, including assassination threats and so forth, these attacks on the President, would simply evaporate and the people that persist

would be shown for the paid agents of the British Empire and George Soros that they are.

OGDEN: I think it was clearly said by Helga LaRouche: We

have a very significant victory to claim, I think both in terms of the further consolidation of this idea that the United States should join the New Silk Road, and the fact that these discussions are now going on at the very highest level between the United States and China. But also in terms of this fight for Glass-Steagall and as Paul said, this is something that LaRouche PAC has been directly involved in, on the forefront of leading for year – 2008, 2009? Lyndon LaRouche's call at that time was for a complete bankruptcy reorganization of the economy. It was initially the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act and that became this idea of the Four Laws.

GALLAGHER: August 2007 was the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act.

OGDEN: That's right. So now we're coming up on 10 years! I think that's widely recognized, the leadership that the LaRouche movement has played, including on Capitol Hill from the sponsors of this legislation. So this decision now to mobilize and to really enter into a brawl, the fight is on on that front and we have a responsibility to pour as much as we can, from around the country, in mobilizing on that front, too. I think that's a good conclusion for our webcast here, today. Thank you Diane, for joining us from New York, and thank you very much Paul for joining me here.

GALLAGHER: A pleasure.

OGDEN: Stay tuned to larouchepac.com and we'll talk to you soon.

»Gør amerikansk-kinesisk samarbejde om den Nye Silkevej til hjertet af menneskehedens fælles skæbne« Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter og formand for Schiller Instituttet, indspillede denne videotale den 16. juni til en Schiller Institut-konference i Detroit, USA, den 17. juni, 2017.

Vi befinder os stadigvæk i den menneskelige races udviklings barndom. Jeg mener, vi er meget heldige at leve og kunne forme fremtiden på dette tidspunkt; men jeg mener, at det mest afgørende aspekt for, at hele dette perspektiv skal lykkes, er: Få det amerikansk-kinesiske samarbejde om de Nye Silkevej til at fungere i den umiddelbart forestående periode.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Hvad alle lader som om, de ikke bemærker

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 22. juni, 2017 – Der er en udbredt forventning om, at præsidenterne Trump og Putin vil mødes personligt for første gang, blot to uger og én dag fra i dag, på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Hamborg, 7.-8. juli. Dette møde har potentiale til at blive en begivenhed, der forandrer verden. Den russiske senator Alexander Pushkov sagde den 20. juni, at dette møde, hvis det finder sted, vil blive højdepunktet af G20. »Meget vil afhænge af dette møde«, sagde han, og »det er grunden til, at det allevegne imødeses med så store forventninger – fra Tallin til Lissabon, fra Beijing til Kairo«. Jo, det er afgørende vigtigt – og alligevel taler ingen om det! Det »skjuler sig for alle at se«, et begreb, som Lyndon LaRouche ofte har nævnt, fra Edgar Allan Poes historie 'The Purloined Letter' (Det stjålne brev).

Vore modstandere i den britiske imperiefraktion siger absolut ingenting om dette snarlige Trump-Putin-topmøde, fordi de er forfærdelig bange for, hvad der kunne ske dér. For hvorfor skulle de neokonservative og neoliberale ellers i så mange måneder have løjet, så det driver, om, at præsident Trump og hans medarbejdere på en eller anden måde skulle være russiske agenter? Nu er dette forventede topmøde, der hastigt nærmer sig, så vigtigt, at de nægter så meget som bare at nævne det!

I stedet har de åbenlyst gjort ting, i forsøg på at få Trump-Putin-mødet aflyst – eller, hvis de ikke kan få det aflyst, da at forsøge at sikre, at det bliver ødelagt, og at det blive fuldstændig fjendtligt, så der ikke kan udvikle sig nogen positiv, personlig relation.

Det er baggrunden for, at et sindssygt lovforslag om russiske sanktioner blev banket igennem Senatet gennem et skævt 98-2 flertal for blot en uge siden i dag – og dernæst fejlagtigt benævnt som »Trump-sanktioner« af de løgagtige, britiskskørte medier – til trods for, at Trump-administrationen er modstander af loven og forsøger at standse den, før den vedtages som lov. Det er også grunden til, at amerikanske styrker nedskød et syrisk jetfly den 18. juni, hvilket tvang russerne til atter at afslutte den hotline, gennem hvilken amerikanske og russiske styrker havde 'dekonfliktet' – altså reduceret risikoen for sammenstød mellem fly og luftskyts i et område ved at koordinere deres bevægelser – deres operationer i Syrien. Det var af denne grund, at Steve Mnuchins Finansministerium den 20. juni gennemtvang sanktioner mod 38 russiske og ukrainske firmaer og individer og herved tvang Rusland til at aflyse et planlagt møde mellem viceudenrigsminister Ryabkov og USA's understatssekretær i Udenrigsministeriet, Shannon. Og hvis F-16 fly var det, der cirkulerede rundt om den russiske forsvarsminister Shoigus fly, blot i går?[1] Og hvilke, endnu værre forræderiske handlinger vil disse folk begå i morgen, i deres hysteri over udsigten til bedre relationer mellem USA og Rusland?

Disse dystre kræfter har nægtet at anerkende det amerikanske folks forfatningsmæssige valgbeslutning fra dag ét, og de nægter stadigvæk. De af os, der støtter præsidenten og Forfatningen, må træde frem for at knuse de forræderiske kræfter, og for at støtte præsidenten i at opnå sine mål gennem at slutte USA til Rusland og Kina i den Nye Silkevej og genskabe amerikansk infrastruktur gennem massiv statskredit, og i partnerskab med Kina, gennem Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Nye Love« fra juni 2014. Og, i morgen kunne være for sent.

En yderligere indikation på de britisk-elskende lags hysteri ved udsigten til et samarbejde mellem Putin og Trump kan findes i den tyske finansminister Schäubles bemærkninger den 20. juni (da han modtog Henry Kissinger-prisen):

»Jeg tvivler på, at USA virkelig tror på, at verden ville være lige så god, hvis Kina eller Rusland udfyldte svælgene, efterladt af USA, og hvis Kina og Rusland simpelt hen fik frie hænder til at dominere de indflydelsessfærer, de har defineret for sig selv. Det ville være afslutningen af vores liberale verdensorden.«

Han lyver, og han ved, at han lyver – men kan I ikke føle hysteriet bag hans løgne?

Foto: Vladimir Putin holdt et møde med regeringsmedlemmer om forholdsregler til beskyttelse af rettigheder hos folk, der er involveret i byggeprojekter med delt egenkapital, og om at definere den juridiske status for folk, der er selvstændige erhvervsdrivende. 22. juni, 2017. (foto en.kremlin.ru)

[1] Et NATO F-16-fly forsøgte at komme tæt på den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigus fly over neutrale, baltiske vande nær Kaliningrad i dag, men blev jaget væk af et russisk Su-27-kampfly, rapporterer Sputnik Internationale i dag (21. juni).

Shoigu var en route til den vestligste, russiske by, Kaliningrad, da F-16-flyet forsøgte at nærme sig. Ruslands Sukhoi Su-27 kampfly, et af de fly, der eskorterede Shoigus fly, viste dernæst sine våben, hvilket fik F-16-flyet til at trække sig.

**New York til LPAC:
Tak for, at I forsvarer**

præsidentskabet.

LPAC kortvideo, 22. juni, 2017

»God eftermiddag, jeg er Michelle Fuchs fra LaRouche Political Action Committee, der rapporterer live fra gaderne i Manhattan. Vi står her på krydset mellem 32. Gade og Broadway, på Greeley Square, hvor vi fører kampagne til forsvar for Donald Trumps administration imod kuppet og for en succes for hans økonomiske program, med LaRouches Fire Love. Jeg kan rapportere, at vi har fået en masse støtte her i dag, med mange mennesker, der kommenterer, at de er glade for, at vi er her, og at de påskønner, at der kræves meget mod for at gøre det, vi gør.

En meget sød dame rapporterede, at hun var glad for at finde en organisation, fordi hendes mand mener, han er den eneste, så hun ønsker, han skal kontakte os.

Jeg vil opfordre jer til at gå med i LaRouche-bevægelsen og hjælpe os med at uddele vores avis, 'The Hamiltonian', hjælpe os med at få opbringninger ind til Kongressen og til Det Hvide Hus til støtte for denne administration og til forsvar for denne nation. Slut for nu.«

Offentliggjort den 22. jun. 2017

LaRouche PAC organizers in Manhattan have been reporting a sense of gratitude from the population when they see our organizers, 1. Because we've got the guts to be on the street defending the Presidency and 2. Because we pull no punches in discussing the orchestrated coup against Trump. Here's Michelle Fuchs on Greeley Square.

LaRouche: Det britiske Imperium bruger krig og penge til at kontrollere nationer.

EIR-kortvideo, 20. juni, 2017

»Briterne har altid haft magt over os ved at få os ind i krige på steder som Asien. Det er sådan, briterne kører verden; Det britiske Imperium har magten over verden ved hjælp af krige, på samme måde, som de fik imperiemagt, ved at få Europas tåbelige nationer til at gå i krig med hinanden i den såkaldte 70-års krig. Og Europas førende nationer gik i krig mod hinanden i 70 år! Mens briterne stod på sidelinjen og opmuntrede processen og grinede. Og så, i februar af 1763, i Freden i Paris, blev Det britiske Imperium erklæret som imperiet for et privat selskab ved navn Britisk Ostindisk Kompagni (British East India Company), og dette Britisk Ostindisk Kompagni overtog, og blev til, Det forenede Kongerige (UK), og har kørt lige siden frem til dets moderne modsvar – Britisk Ostindisk Kompagni gik selvfølgelig bankerot i en senere periode, der blev indført ændringer, som under Victoria; men princippet forblev det samme: med en maritim karakteristik, det var oprindeligt bygget på den maritime magt over Middelhavet og bredte sig senere til Atlanterhavet. En søfartsmagt, der havde skabt magten over brugen af penge. Magtgrundlaget var penge. Magten over penge, som en imperieform. Al europæisk imperialism, inklusive britisk imperialism i dag, er ikke baseret på et land-territorium, men er baseret på magten over penge. Disse penge kontrolleres i realiteten af private interesser, af personer, der danner

samlinger af private interesser, og som etablerer kontrol over penge, deres skabelse og management. Og nationalstater er underordnet denne internationale pengekontrol. Det britiske Imperium, der udvikledes ud af denne proces, er intet andet end dette. Det er ikke et imperium, der består af befolkningen i UK. Det er et imperium, der består af et internationalt konsortium for denne type af interesser, hvis brug af magt over penge bruges til at have magt over nationer.«

Offentliggjort den 20. juni, 2017.

Lyndon LaRouche at his best—the only statesman alive today who pulls no punches identifying the British Empire. Here, an excerpt from a September 2009 webcast.

This video is copyrighted by EIR News Service Inc. To encourage the widest distribution possible, we encourage you to spread it, repost it, and use it. We will only enforce our copyright if the video is altered in any way other than strict translation into another language or it is placed in a context, which in our sole judgement is racist or defamatory regarding any ethnic or religious group or person.

Giv amerikanerne nogen anerkendelse / kredit!

Leder fra Larouche PAC, 21. juni, 2017 – Med det rette lederskab afviser amerikanere det britisk-ansporede forsøg på at »kuppe« præsident Trump, tvinge ham ud af embedet gennem impeachment, tilbagetrækning eller endda mord, fordi han ønsker samarbejde med Rusland og Kina. Dette kup, der implicerer Obamas efterretningstjenester og FBI-direktør, har

drevet det Demokratiske Parti vanvittigt med antirussisk McCarthy-isme imod Trump – og det taber fortsat valg på grund af det.

Med hensyn til anti-Trump-intrigemagernes motivering, lyt blot til den fanatisk nærige, tyske finansminister, Wolfgang Schäuble, der i går angreb Trump i en tale i Berlin:

»Jeg tvivler på, at USA virkelig mener, at verdensordenen ville være lige så god, hvis Kina eller Rusland ... simpelt hen fik frie hænder til at dominere de indflydelsessfærer, de har defineret for sig selv. Det ville være enden på vores liberale verdensorden.«

Fuldstændig rigtigt – den »liberale« verdensorden, som afindustrialiserede USA's økonomi og gjorde den til en rustbunke, og som amerikanerne stemte for at blive af med. De betroede Trump atter at gøre Amerika til en industrimagt, en teknologisk magt, en magt i den nuværende og fremtidige udforskning af rummet. Kongressen – begge partier – skal omgående gå i gang med at genopbygge og erstatte nationens forældede, økonomiske infrastruktur. Samarbejde med Kina, med dets »Bælte & Vej Initiativ«, der er mange gange større end Marshallplanen, kan på dramatisk vis hjælpe, lige fra højhastigheds-jernbanenet og til Månelandinger.

I en tale for USA's Handelskammers »topmøde« for udenlandsk investering i mandags, sagde finansminister Steven Mnuchin:

»At arbejde med udenlandske investorer vil blive en afgørende del af enhver infrastrukturplan, vi fremlægger.«

Fint. Mange kinesiske ledere af foretagender blandt de 1.200 deltagere ønsker at se Kina investere i byggeri af ny, amerikansk infrastruktur, gennem amerikanske, statslige kreditinstitutioner som de fire, store nationalbanker, der har finansieret Kinas utrolige infrastrukturgenembrud i de seneste tyve år.

Men dernæst sagde Mnuchin:

»Partnerskaber mellem det offentlige og det private er afgørende ...«

for byggeri af ny infrastruktur – den mislykkede »liberale verdensorden«. Så kaldte PPP'er (Public Private Partnerships), hvor investeringsselskaber vil have deres kapital tilbage inden for 10 år, og 10-12 % årligt afkast, bygger IKKE nye infrastrukturplatforme.

Et netværk af højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer over hele nationen?

Systemer af sluseporte, der ville have beskyttet New Orleans fra orkanen Katrina, og New Yorks transportsystem fra superstormen Sandy?

Afsaltningsanlæg og vidtrækkende vandføringssystemer til kunstvanding af det vestlige USA?

Baser til menneskelig beboelse på Månen?

PPP'er skaber ikke sådanne ting!

Men det gør statskredit. EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, sagde for et par år siden:

»Vi taler om en investering over mere end én generation. Alle de store projekter, som vi nu behøver, ligesom i fortiden, er projekter, der kræver flergenerationsinvestering. Det er at påtage sig gæld, en gæld, der løber over flere generationer. Og én af de ting, vi må mestre i denne henseende, er, hvad er menneskets natur ...

For det første, så er ideen om kredit menneskelig. Det eksisterer ikke for noget som helst, undtagen for mennesket, så vidt vi ved. Vi udarbejder derfor et monetært system, eller et finanssystem, baseret på et system med kredit, hvilket vil sige udviklingen af en person, der videregiver noget, der er til fordel for den næste generation. Og dette er ikke en

proces, hvor noget fortsætter; det er en proces, hvor noget udvikles. Og udviklingsenheden er det, vi bør kalde 'kredit'.«

Store projekter ved hjælp af statslig kredit, en gæld, som den næste generation vil kunne »tilbagebetale« ved at bruge infrastrukturen på et højere, teknologisk niveau til at producere og til at leve på et højere, og mere produktivt, menneskeligt niveau. Kun nationer kan skabe den form for kredit, individuelt og gennem internationale udviklingsbanker, som LaRouche har foreslået det i femogfyrre år.

Der er ikke mere tid til at »tale om at bygge en ny infrastruktur«. En nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition til sådan kredit, må skabes nu.

Foto: Finansminister Steven Mnuchin aflægger ed i det Ovale Kontor. (Photo V.P. Mike Pence's Twitter)

EU vil lukke to italienske banker

20. juni, 2017 – I overensstemmelse med deres erklærede politik for udryddelse af banker i lokalsamfundet, kræver den Europæiske Kommission en »markeds«-indsprøjtning på €1,25 mia. i de to, betrængte, italienske regionale banker, Veneto Banca og Popolare Vincenza, som en betingelse for hjælp fra staten. Dette synes umuligt at opnå, så nu har staten kun én løsning tilbage under EU-lov: adskil de gode ting (bankindsud, kredit, der betales på, selskabscentre, formueforvaltning og statsobligationer) fra de dårlige ting, og så sælge de førstnævnte og beholde sidstnævnte. Rothschild er forsigtig.

Selvfølgelig mister detailkunder deres penge gennem bail-in

(ekspropriering) af underordnede obligationer. Som vi tidligere har rapporteret, er dette allerede begyndt, med regeringens udstedelse af et dekret, der suspenderer betalingen af en mindre Veneto Banca-obligation, der forfalder den 21. juni. Dette kunne udløse en panikbølge i hele systemet med lokale banker, med kunder, der motiveres til at trække deres opsparing ud og sætte dem i større banker.

Ifølge en kilde i Europaparlamentet, var dette sandsynligvis EU's plan fra starten. Kilden sagde, at de først ville løse det spanske bankproblem med Banco Popolar, for derefter at fokusere på de italienske banker. Formanden for Den europæiske Centralbanks bestyrelse, Danièle Nouy, blev i en EP-høring i går spurgt, hvorfor hun, som ECB-bestyrelsesmedlem, ikke kunne forudse problemerne med Banco Popolar og lod banken bløde under stormløbet på bankindsud. Nouy svarede, at der ikke var noget, de kunne have gjort for at forhindre det. Det tog så lang tid at intervenere, fordi ECB var i færd med at vurdere bankens niveau af likviditetsproblemer. (!)

EU-institutioner har for længe siden erklæret, at der er for mange små banker i Europa, og deres politik agerer i overensstemmelse med en sådan erklæring. Små banker er underkastet en straffende EU-regelramme og gjort nonprofitable gennem nulrentepolitikken, og de tvinges enten til at blive fusioneret, eller også udstykket og sluttelig lukket ned. Således forsvinder banker i lokalsamfund langsomt, og cancerøse TBTF-banker vokser.

Prognose fra EU-kommissionen:

Afbetaling af græsk statsgæld kunne kræve op til 56 % af BNP!

21. juni, 2017 – Selv den Europæiske Kommission giver udtryk for bekymring over den græske gælds erholdelighed, idet de frygter, det kunne kræve mere end 50 % af Grækenlands BNP at afbetale på den!

En analyse af den græske gæld, der kræver yderligere forholdsregler for at gøre den erholdelig, var vedhæftet den endelige gennemgang. Ifølge *Bloomberg* og den græske avis *Kathimerini* krævede EU-kommissionen en forlængelse af obligationernes løbetid og en forlængelse af de afdragsfri perioder for afdrag og renter, så vel som for afkastet af nationalbankernes profit af de græske obligationer, de har.

Ifølge Kommissionens analyse af gældens erholdelighed, så forventer det »optimistiske« scenarie på bundlinjen, at gælden vil absorbere, i gennemsnit, 20 % af Grækenlands bruttonationalprodukt frem til 2060 (!), hvilket ville kræve et gennemsnitligt, primært overskud på 2,2 % af BNP i hele perioden efter 2022 – frem til dette tidspunkt bør det primære overskud være 3,5 %, som Eurogruppens beslutning for nylig dikterede.

Dette negative scenarie ser gælden nå op på 241 % af BNP i 2060. I dette scenarie overstiger brutto-finansbehovet 20 % af BNP fra år 2033 og når op på ikke mindre end 56,6 % af BNP i 2060! Betingelserne for dette scenarie er et primært overskud på 1,5 % af BNP mellem 2023 og 2060, med en gennemsnitlig vækstrate på 2,7 % i samme tidsrum.

Menneskeheden på en ny kurs: Rusland og Kina udvikler Arktis – Vil USA tilslutte sig?

Rusland og Kina er i færd med at optrappe deres indsats for at udvikle en af Jordens sidste, fremskudte grænser for menneskeheden – Arktis' udstrakte vidder med et rigt resursegrundlag. ... Vil USA, under præsident Trump, gå med i denne proces? Svaret på dette spørgsmål vil spille en afgørende rolle i det større spørgsmål, der i betydelig grad vil afgøre menneskehedens skæbne – nemlig, om Trump fuldt ud vil integrere USA i Bælte & Vej Initiativet (BVI); den Nye Silkevejsproces, der først blev fremmet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i 1990'erne, og som nu er blevet fuldt ud vedtaget og implementeret af Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, på vegne af alle Jordens nationer.

Af Mike Billington, EIR.

12. juni, 2017 – Rusland og Kina er i færd med at optrappe deres indsats for at udvikle en af Jordens sidste, fremskudte grænser for menneskeheden – Arktis' udstrakte vidder med et rigt resursegrundlag. Alt imens Ruslands enorme kystlinje langs det Arktiske Hav er den primære base for deres operationer, så er Kina stærkt engageret i byggeriet af den infrastruktur, der er nødvendig for at gøre udnyttelsen af disse resurser mulig.

Vil USA, under præsident Trump, gå med i denne proces? Svaret på dette spørgsmål vil spille en afgørende rolle i det større spørgsmål, der i betydelig grad vil afgøre menneskehedens

skæbne – nemlig, om Trump fuldt ud vil integrere USA i Bælte & Vej Initiativet (BVI); den Nye Silkevejsproces, der først blev fremmet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i 1990'erne, og som nu er blevet fuldt ud vedtaget og implementeret af Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, på vegne af alle Jordens nationer.

En betydelig, fysisk drivkraft bag dette initiativ er den kendsgerning, at Nordøstpassagen – ruten fra Asien til Europa via det Arktiske Hav – i stigende grad er blevet sejlbart på grund af den arktiske iskappes tilbagetrækning. Alt imens den 'grønne' bevægelse er hurtig til at proklamere, at (ikkeeksisterende) menneskeskabt klimaforandring er ansvarlig for denne, de arktiske iskappes vigen, så har den russiske regering og russiske videnskabsfolk (blandt andre) bevist, at dette er et cyklisk fænomen uden forbindelse til kulstof – og som faktisk er til stor fordel for menneskeheden. Ikke alene fremmes handel af iskappens tilbagetrækning, men resurserne i Arktis gøres også mere tilgængelige – hvis verden vælger at drage fordel af de nye omstændigheder.

Ét Bælte; én Vej; én Cirkel

Hu Angang, en førende, kinesisk økonom ved Tsinghua Universitet, opfandt begrebet, »Én Cirkel« – hvorved refereres til indkredsningen af hele den eurasiske landmasse gennem at fuldstændiggøre Nordøstpassagen – som føjes til politikken med »Ét Bælte, én Vej, som initieredes af præsident Xi Jinping i 2013. Det Nye, Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, der forbinder Asien, Europa og Afrika over land, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, der forbinder Eurasien, Afrika og de amerikanske kontinenter over hav, kan nu få tilslutning af »Én Cirkel«, den arktiske rute, der reducerer sejltiden fra Østasien til Europa med mere end 30 %.

Ud over sejltiden, så omfatter de resurser, der venter på at blive udnyttet – blot venter på, at menneskeracen skal

udvikler teknologierne, der skal til for at muliggøre denne udnyttelse i et barsk miljø, på en måde, der er acceptabel for menneskelig beboelse – enorme aflejringer af guld og andre mineraler, så vel som også skønsmæssigt 30 % af verdens endnu ikke-opdaget naturgas og 13 % af ikke-opdaget olie, iflg. U.S. Geological Survey.

Alt imens spørgsmålene om suverænitet er relevante for resurserne nær grænserne af de arktiske nationer (Rusland, USA, Norge, Finland, Sverige og Danmark), så er det udstrakte, arktiske territorium uden for territoriale farvande og er således udelukkende underkastet FN's Havretskonvention (UNCLOS), der kun giver mulighed for fælles udvikling af resurserne under konsensusaftaler. Arktisk Råd med de seks arktiske nationer, og med andre til stede som observatører, inkl. Kina, styrer denne proces. Kina anser sig selv for at være en »nær-arktisk« stat og påpeger, at området har »den af hele menneskeheden arvede rigdom«. Det seneste topmøde i Arktisk Råd, som finder sted hvert andet år, var i Juneau, Alaska, i marts, hvor Finland overtog formandsskabet for den nuværende toårs-periode.

På vejen til at besøge præsident Trump i Florida i april stoppede præsident Xi Jinping op i Finland for at diskutere Finlands rolle i Bælte & Vej, men han arrangerede også, at Finland repræsenterede Kina i Arktisk Råds møder.

Alt imens Rådets overvejelser hidtil har undgået bestræbelser på at introducere geopolitiske konflikter, så har nogle medlemmer af USA's Kongres brugt den kendsgerning, at Rusland har sikkerhedsinteresser langs sin udstrakte arktiske grænse, til at kræve, at USA udarbejder militære kapaciteter til at udfordre russisk dominans i området. Dette er absurd i betragtning af, at USA alt i alt har én fungerende isbryder, mens Rusland har 40 og er i færd med at bygge eller bestille (primært fra Sydkorea) byggeriet af yderligere flere dusin.

Netop i denne uge overværede præsident Putin navngivningen af

verdens største isbryder-fragtskib til flydende naturgas (LNG) i Skt. Petersborg, bygget til Rusland af Sydkoreas Daewoo Skibsbygger- og Havingeniørselskab. Tydeligvis ikke tiltænkt militære formål, vil skibet blive anvendt i Yamal-projektet på den arktiske Yamal-halvø, ved Uralbjergenes nordlige ende. Dette område har enorme naturgasdepoter, der udvindes af et konsortium, som omfatter Ruslands Novatek, Frankrigs Total og Kinas Nationale Olieselskab. Skibet er det mest moderne af højklasse-isbrydere (dvs. forstærket) og vil blive flagskibet i en flåde af 15 lignende skibe. Yamal-projektet tilsigter at producere 16,5 million tons LNG om året.

Ved skibsdåben sagde Putin:

»Yamal-projektet banede vejen for den arktiske rute. Det vil bidrage til udviklingen af energiindustrien i hele verden, udover Rusland og Europa ... Yamal-LNG spiller en vigtig rolle i udviklingen af den Nordlige Sejlroute og i den yderligere undersøgelse og udforskning af Arktis. Jeg regner med den succesfulde lancering af nye, lovende, storstilede projekter sammen med vore franske, kinesiske og udenlandske partnere, så vel som også vores voksende samarbejde i det ekstremt rige, arktiske område.«

Rusland er også i færd med at bygge en Nordlig Breddegrads-jernbane, der forbinder Yamal med Ural-områderne mod syd og nationens transportårer, der vil sikre, at områdets mineralressurser kan transporteres hele året rundt.

I en anden, stor udviklingszone, nemlig Arkhangelsk-regionen syd for Murmansk nær ved den norske og finske grænse, planlægger Kinas Poly Group Corp. et udviklingsprojekt til \$5,5 mia., og som omfatter en ny dybvandshavn og en jernbaneforbindelse mod syd. Det er planen at udskibe kul, gødning, olie og andre råvarer fra Sibirien og Ural-området via Arktis, og dernæst mod syd via jernbane. Igor Orlov, Arkhangelsks guvernør, skønner, at projektet vil skabe 40.000 jobs, når det står færdigt i 2023.

En langfristet plan for den russiske udvikling af arktiske faciliteter er at afprøve strukturer, der kræves for menneskelige forposter på Månen og Mars.

Amerikansk samarbejde

Et møde på ministerplan i Arktisk Råd i Fairbanks, Alaska, den 11. maj, forudsås at blive omstridt af dem, der forsøger at sabotere præsident Trumps bestræbelser på at etablere samarbejdende og venligtsindede relationer med Rusland. Disse forudsigelser viste sig at være forgæves. Blandt resultaterne af mødet, som USA præsiderede, var underskrivelsen af en bindende aftale om at fremme samarbejde omkring videnskabelig forskning i området, og som vil sikre, at videnskabsfolk og deres udstyr og data kan strømme mere frit hen over internationale grænser inden for Arktis. En Arktisk Skibstrafik Database er blevet oprettet, mens et nyt Arktisk Økonomisk Råd og en Specialstyrke for Forbedret Forbundethed er i færd med at blive operationelle.

David Balton, USA's viceassisterende udenrigsminister for hav og fiskeri, og som repræsenterede USA ved mødet, modgik de neokonservatives drømme om konfrontation med Rusland og sagde, at Arktis forbliver stabilt og fredeligt.

»I Arktisk Råd har vi et mødested, der har gjort det godt mht. at promovere internationalt samarbejde blandt alle otte nationer, inklusive Rusland«, sagde Balton og tilføjede, at »Uanset, hvilke andre vanskeligheder, der måtte eksistere mellem USA, Rusland og andre medlemmer af Arktisk Råd, og mellem Rusland i relation til andre dele af verden, så manifesterer de sig ikke i Arktisk Råds verden. Det er fortsat en meget samarbejdende organisation.«

Wilson-centrets Arktisk Cirkel Forum er vært for en konference i Washington 21.-22. juni, med titlen, »USA og Rusland i Arktis«. Balton vil være taler sammen med mange andre fra USA,

Rusland og andre nationer i Arktisk Råd. Det er netop denne form for samarbejde – hvor vi forcerer udviklingens fremskudte grænser og den menneskelige videns fremskudte grænser – der, ligesom den Nye Silkevej, er i færd med at bevæge verden ind i et nyt paradigme for fred gennem udvikling.

Denne artikel publiceredes første gang i EIR, 16. juni, 2017. Artiklen er ikke tidligere udgivet på dansk.

Gør New York til et vendepunkt i historien

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 20. juni, 2017 – De hastigt voksende spændinger mellem USA og Rusland over de seneste dages udviklinger i Syrien, har bragt hele planeten ind i en meget farlig og skrøbelig situation. Vi er nu tættere på udbruddet af en global atomkrig, end vi har været på noget tidspunkt, siden Barack Obama og hans klon, Hillary Clinton, blev drevet ud af Det Hvide Hus.

Uanset nogle nyttige skridt, væk fra randen af krig, i løbet af de seneste 24 timer – inklusive meddelelsen fra det amerikanske militær om, at det »tager forsigtighedsforholdsregler for omplacering af fly over Syrien«, i lyset af den russiske advarsel om, at deres mest avancerede radarsystemer ville »være indstillet til at spore sig ind på« ethvert, og alle, fly over syrisk luftrum vest for Eufrat; samt Australiens beslutning om helt at suspendere deres deltagelse i koalitionsflyvninger i området – så kan situationen udløses af det mindste pres. Der er gentagne erklæringer, der kommer fra diverse dele af Trump-administrationen og Kongressen, om, at amerikanernes

nedskydning af det syriske fly (over syrernes eget, nationale territorium!) var berettiget; at »vi vil ikke tøve med at forsvare os eller vore partnere, hvis vi trues«, ligeledes i fremtiden; og at Syrien i realiteten skal deles.

Ingen af disse politikker er Donald Trumps – ikke som kandidat, og ikke som præsident. De er politikker, der kommer fra de selv samme kræfter, der arbejder på at vælte hans præsidentskab, eller simpelt hen myrde ham. De repræsenterer lag inden for efterretningsetablisementet, militæret, medierne og Wall Streets finansinteresser – der alle køres fra toppen af Det britiske Imperium – der har lanceret disse operationer for at forhindre Trump i at handle på sin erklærede dagsorden. Velinformerede kilder har rapporteret, at Trump belejres og distraheres af de endeløse, grundløse, juridiske trusler, der samles omkring ham – hvilket præcist er deres hensigt.

Vi må optrappe vores mobilisering for at vække den amerikanske befolkning til denne fare, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche til medarbejdere i dag, og standse det igangværende kup imod Trump. Med folkelig opbakning til de presserende nødvendige forandringer, som vi må organisere, kan Trump befries til at handle for at skabe en helt ny ramme for økonomiske og politiske relationer, med Kina og Rusland i særdeleshed.

Men en stykkevis fremgangsmåde vil ikke virke, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche. En total erstatning af det bankerotte, transatlantiske finanssystem kræves, med en ny, der er bygget op fra bunden, langs linjen af den politik, som Lyndon LaRouche har specificeret i sine Fire Love: en global Glass/Steagall-bankreform og skabelsen af et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition for at skabe højteknologiske infrastrukturprojekter og relaterede udviklingsprojekter. Det er præcist, hvad Kina har lanceret med sit epokeskabende Bælte & Vej Initiativ, og som USA nu må tilslutte sig.

Der er intet tydeligere eksempel på dette end situationen

omkring New York City og byens smuldrende infrastruktur. Ethvert stykkevisse »fiks« af ét problem vil kun gøre situationen værre andetsteds. Hele New York-områdets infrastrukturnet, især transport, må totalt udskiftes, fra bunden og op.

Lad os tage denne krise og vende den til en mulighed, fremførte Zepp-LaRouche. Problemet er så alvorligt, at det ikke kan løses på kort tid. Men hvis man har en plan, vil folk få en fornemmelse af, at en løsning er i sigte, og de vil være optimistiske og vil deltage i problemets løsning. Hvis der kun er kaos, så vil vi stå med et oprør – nationalt, så vel som i New York City.

Så lad os gøre New York til et vendepunkt i historien!

Foto: 29. maj, 2013, blev et tog på vej mod syd afsporet, lige uden for 125. station i New York.

Planen for at dele Syrien

20. juni, 2017 – Der er planer, der kommer fra visse elementer i USA's efterretnings- og militærsamfund, om at skabe en *de facto* deling af Syrien. Dette er de samme kredse, der er ude på at sabotere præsident Trumps erklærede hensigt om ikke at blive involveret i flere krige for regimeskifte generelt, og heller ikke i Syriens indre anliggender i særdeleshed.

Tidligere officer i Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA), pensionerede oberst Pat Lang, rapporterer i et blogindlæg den 19. juni, at den amerikanske koalitionsaktivitet er så aggressiv i Raqqa/Tabqa-området i det nordlige Syrien og i den sydlige del omkring Al Tanf-grænseovergangen (tæt ved Syriens grænse til Irak og Jordan), »at det synes klart, at USA har

til hensigt at dele Syrien på en de facto-basis, hvor den østlige del vil blive brugt som en base for en post-IS-kampagne imod den syriske regering.«

Etableringen af en amerikansk militærbase i Al Tanf, uden den syriske regerings godkendelse, fremkaldte kritik fra senator fra Virginia Richard Black, der til en interviewer fra Sputnik sagde: »Der kan ikke være en mere indlysende krænkelse af folkeretten end rent faktisk at rykke ind og oprette en militærbase i et suverænt land, der aldrig har udført offensive handlinger imod vort land.«

I Rusland ses den nylige deployering af to HIMARS (High Mobility Artillery Rocket System) raketaffyringssystemer til Al Tanf af nogle kvalificerede iagttagere som et tegn på disse amerikanske planer for en deling. Raqqa ligge lige uden for HIMARS' rækkevidde fra Al Tanf: USA's hovedmål er derfor at forstærke en ensidigt udråbt »dekonfliktionszone« i området for at forhindre Iran i at sende forsyninger til den syriske hær, rapporterer *Russia Beyond the Headlines*.

»Med deployeringen af HIMARS sender USA et klart signal til Moskva og Damaskus, at det ikke vil give [tillade? -red.] den syrisk-irakisk-jordanske grænse under pro-regeringsstyrkers og iranske styrkers kontrol«, erklærede Alexey Klebnikov, Mellemøstenekspert ved det Russiske Råd for Internationale Anliggender.

Bemærkninger, der faldt tidligere på ugen ved National Press Club i Washington, D.C., fra formanden for generalstabscheferne, general Joseph Dunford, lod også en dør stå åben for dem, der fører kampagne for en deling. Samtidig med, at den amerikanskledede koalition støtter lokale bestræbelser på at indtage Raqqa, sagde Dunford, så er en anden indsats, under ledelse af USA's Udenrigsministerium, i færd med at etablere en organisation til regeringsførelse, der vil tage over, når Raqqa først er indtaget. »Dette regeringsorgan vil til maksimal fordel bruge arabiske ledere,

der er fra Raqqa, og vil også arbejde på at etablere en sikkerhedsstyrke, sammensat af lokalt personel, for at stabilisere bestræbelser, der vil følge efter Rakkas indtagelse», tilføjede Dunford.

Vil Trump overvinde sabotage og få USA med i Kinas og Ruslands nye paradigme? RADIO SCHILLER, 20. juni, 2017

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/vil-trump-overvinde-sabotage-og-f-a-usa-med-i-kinas-og-ruslands-nye-paradigme

Briefing af seneste politiske begivenheder v/ Tom Gillesberg.

Forrædere står bag både økonomiske og militære operationer for at

stoppe Trumps bestræbelser på at opbygge relationer med Rusland og Kina

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 19. juni, 2017 – I løbet af den seneste uge har korrupte senatorer banket nye sanktioner igennem mod Rusland (og Iran), der i realiteten var rettet imod at fjerne præsident Trumps forrettighed til at afslutte de ulovlige sanktioner, der blev gennemtvunget af Barack Obama gennem en eksekutiv ordre, baseret på løgne mht. russisk indblanding i de amerikanske valg. Søndag nedskød dernæst amerikanske styrker, der (ulovligt) er deployeret i Syrien, et syrisk kampbombefly, der var engageret i et angreb på ISIS, hvilket fremprovokede en barsk respons fra Rusland, der gik ud på, at alle yderligere sådanne ulovlige, udenlandske angreb på den suveræne stat Syriens styrker ville løbe risikoen for russiske forsvarsoperationer.

Hvem gav ordre til dette angreb? Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium har erklæret, at aftalen med USA mht. dekonfliktion i militære operationer, er suspenderet, og de har krævet, at »USA's Kommando gennemfører en omhyggelig efterforskning og rapporterer om sine resultater og de trufne forholdsregler«.

Sådanne handlinger, der udgør en krigstrussel mellem verdens to, førende atommagter, er sindssyge, rent militært. Man erindre sig, at det amerikanske missilangreb på den syriske luftbase i april var baseret på de falske efterretningsrapporter om, at den syriske regering havde brugt kemiske våben, uden noget militært eller strategisk formål, mod sine egne borgere.

Den farvede revolution, der nu udspilles imod præsident Trump, og som involverer falsk britisk efterretning, der kanaliseres via britiske aktiver i de amerikanske efterretningstjenester, Kongressen, massemedierne og elementer i det amerikanske militær, må standses. I modsat fald vil verden blive kastet tilbage til det økonomiske kaos og den strategiske katastrofe, der blev orkestreret under præsidenterne Bush og Obama.

I UK er Imperiets magt udsat for en alvorlig prøve i sin hjembase, og amerikanere gør klogt i at følge det nøje. Tory-premierminister Theresa May og de faktiske Tory'er i Tony Blairs »Nye Labour«-fraktion af Labour-partiet trues med at blive droppet i kølvandet på Mays chokerende tab af et flertal i de nylige valg, som dernæst efterfulgtes af den forfærdelige brand i et socialt højhus-boligbyggeri, der kan have kostet så mange som 100 uskyldige menneskeliv. Kilder i UK fortæller *EIR*, at May-regeringen lyver om dødstallet i håb om, at raseriet vil lægge sig, men også, fordi enhver hændelse med flere end 100 døde iflg. loven skal efterforskes som en kriminalsag. Den »gamle« Labour-kandidat, Jeremy Corbyn – hvis program omfatter en afslutning af krigsførelse for regimeskifte, en infrastrukturfond for at kickstarte økonomien, en afslutning af de russiske og iranske sanktioner, udvikling af atomkraft og deltagelse i den Nye Silkevej – ses i stigende grad som en sandsynlig vinder i ethvert nyt valg, alt imens Tory'ernes skrumpning i stigende grad indikerer, at de vil blive nødt til at udskrive et nyvalg.

Husk, at det var Tony Blair, der skabte det første »uærlige dossier«, der opfandt falske efterretninger om, at Irak havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, og som lancerede Irakkrigen, spredningen af terrorisme og flygtningekatastrofen. Det aktuelle kupforsøg imod Trump blev lanceret af »uærlige dossier nr. 2«, som blev forfattet af MI6-agent Christopher Steele, der opfandt historier om Trump og Rusland, som skulle spredes via deres netværk i USA, en operation, der nu har nået niveauet for 'ansporing til mord'.

Hidtil har Putin-regeringen nægtet at lade sig provokere ind i en konfrontationspolitik med den nye administration i Washington, hverken som respons til sanktioner eller til angrebene i Syrien. Udenrigsminister Lavrov refererede, efter nedskydningen af det syriske fly, til »deeskaleringszonerne« implementeret af Rusland, Iran og Tyrkiet i Syrien, som »en af mulighederne for i fællesskab at gå fremefter« og tilføjede: »Vi opfordrer alle til at undgå ensidige handlinger, respektere syrisk suverænitet og gå med i vores fælles arbejde, der er aftalt med regeringen for den Syriske Arabiske Republik.«

Det er USA's borgeres ansvar at erkende og identificere de kriminelle personer og institutioner, der forsøger at ødelægge regeringen og vor nations suverænitet. Kina har udsendt førende politiske ledere og industriledere til USA i denne uge, efter invitation fra Trump-administrationen, for at drøfte samarbejde om Bælte & Vej Initiativet – den Nye Silkevej – omkring byggeri af infrastruktur, investering i industri og landbrug og samarbejde med amerikansk industri om udviklingsnationer i Asien, Afrika og Sydamerika. Det er denne, USA's deltagelse i det nye paradigme for fremskridt og samarbejde for alle nationer og folkeslag, der nu er på plads under kinesisk og russiske lederskab, som det henfaldne Britiske Imperiums og dets Wall Street-aktivers dinosaurer er desperate for at ødelægge. Deres dødbringende kupforsøg må stoppes, og det amerikanske folk befriet til at bidrage til menneskehedens fremtid.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump, 9. juni, 2017. (Whitehouse Photo)

Xi Jinping: BRIKS-samarbejde vil indvarsle et nyt Gyldent Årti

19. juni, 2017 – I en åbningstale ved BRIKS-konferencen for udenrigsministre i dag, understregede den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, at samarbejde mellem BRIKS-nationerne »er en innovation, der transcenderer det gamle mønster med politiske og militære alliancer og forfølger partnerskaber snarere end alliancer«. BRIKS-organisationen overgår »den gamle tankegang med nulsumsspil« og »praktiserer i stedet et nyt koncept for gensidig fordel og win-win-samarbejde«. Han understreger, at BRIKS-mekanismerne for samarbejde meget godt imødekommer de fem medlemsnationers behov.

Den kinesiske leder understregede også, at »BRIKS-samarbejdsmekanismen har eksisteret i ti år, og BRIKS-medlemmer har fokuseret på udvikling, som ikke alene kommer befolkningerne i de fem lande til gode, men også giver verden en opskrift på at adressere fødevare- og sikkerhedsproblemer ... BRIKS-lande er et fællesskab for fælles interesser og fremtid«. Han opfordrede medlemsnationerne til at »udvikle win-win-ånden mest muligt« og arbejde sammen for at bidrage til organisationens udvikling. Han opfordrede dem til at prioritere udvikling og til at »følge multilateralisme og de grundlæggende normer for internationale relationer. Når vi blot tænker og arbejder hen imod det samme mål, vil BRIKS-samarbejdet blive mere produktivt og indvarsle et nyt, gyldent årti«, forudsagde han.

I sine bemærkninger ved det samme møde sagde den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi, at Kina »er rede til at lægge skulder til den vigtige mission med at åbne op for BRIKS-samarbejdets andet årti. Kina er klar til at diskutere BRIKS-Plus samarbejdsmønstre og former«. Forespurgt om dem, der

giver udtryk for tvivl om BRIKS' fremtid, svarede Wang, »der er nogle tvivlende røster. Jeg tror, dette viser, at det internationale samfund er opmærksomt på BRIKS. Med hensyn til, om BRIKS er ved at svinde eller ikke spiller en vigtig rolle, så mener Kina, at den vigtige tilgang er den, at se er at tro«. Han sagde, at alle lande burde erkende, at BRIKS yder et betydeligt bidrag til global, økonomisk udvikling, og at landenes økonomier viser stærkt »momentum og stærk vitalitet«.

Foto: Kinas præsident holdt åbningstalen ved BRIKS-topmødet for udenrigsministre.

Forslag om anti-russiske sanktioner i USA's Senat: Putin ubekymret; Merkel rasende

17. juni, 2017 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin bedyrede i et Tv-interview i dag, efter det amerikanske Senats fremsættelse forleden dag af sanktioner imod Rusland, at Rusland ikke vil lade sig puffe ind i et dødvande mht. dets relationer med Washington. »Det er vigtigt at bemærke, at, uanset, hvad der foregår – vist, sandsynligvis; lad os se, hvad det sluttelige resultat bliver. Men uanset, hvad og hvilke beslutninger, man tager udenlands, så vil dette ikke puffe os ind i et dødvande«, understregede Putin. »Vi må sandsynligvis korrigere noget og træffe yderligere forholdsregler, være ekstra opmærksom på nogle ting, men dette (stramningen af sanktioner) vil ikke føre til et dødvande eller et sammenbrud«, advarede han. »Jeg mener, dette er

skadeligt«, sagde Putin. »Men det er endnu tidligt at tale om gengældelsesskridt (henimod en forstærkelse af sanktioner), men lad os se, hvad resultatet bliver.«

Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel er derimod rasende over lovforslaget. Merkels talsmand, Steffen Seibert, sagde, det er »besynderligt«, at sanktioner, rettet mod at straffe Rusland, også kunne føre til straffe over europæiske selskaber. »Dette må ikke ske«, sagde han. »Vi afviser generelt sanktioner, der har virkning på udenforstående områder, altså en virkning på tredjelande.« Den tyske økonomiminister Brigitte Zypries sagde til Reuters, at Berlin ville blive nødt til at tænke på modforholdsregler, hvis lovforslaget bliver til lov. »Vi må overveje, hvad vi skal gøre imod det.«

Afsnit 257 af lovforslaget, der handler om USA's politik for ukrainsk energiforsyningssikkerhed, rammer, blandt andet, forsyningen af russisk gas til Europa, inklusive den foreslåede Nordstream 2-ledning, der efter planen skal løbe langs det Baltiske Hav fra Skt. Petersborg, Rusland, til Greifswald, Tyskland, for det meste langs samme rute som den aktuelt eksisterende Nordstream-ledning. Lovforslaget gør modstand mod Nordstream 2 til amerikanske politik pga. dens angivelige »skadelige virkning på den Europæiske Unions energiforsyningssikkerhed, udviklingen af gasmarkedet i Central- og Østeuropa og energireformer i Ukraine«. Det, som europæiske kritikere af lovforslaget virkelig falder over, er imidlertid den følgende klausul: »USA's regering bør prioritere eksporten af USA's energiresurser med det formål at skabe amerikanske jobs, hjælpe USA's allierede og partnere, og styrke USA's udenrigspolitik.«

Foto: Angela Merkel er rasende over de antirussiske lovforslag om sanktioner i USA's Senat.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fortæller de sande kendsgerninger om Helmut Kohl



Helga Zepp-LaRouche

19. juni, 2017 – Schiller Institutets internationale formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, skrev følgende erklæring til *EIR Strategic Alert Service* den 18. juni, to dage efter Helmut Kohl (CDU), der var Tysklands kansler fra 1982-1998, i perioden for Tysklands genforening, afgik ved døden.

»De forskellige vurderinger af Helmut Kohl som 'faderen af tysk genforening' og 'den, der forudså et forenet Europa' lyder mere som en PR-beskrivelse af den politisk korrekte opfattelse, som Kohls samtidige bør have af denne historiske periode, der faldt sammen med hans embedsperiode. Det, der fuldstændigt udelades, er de geopolitiske operationer, der udløstes imod Kohl, især i tiden for den tyske genforening, og som stadig i dag udspilles under andre former.

Det er Kohls fortjeneste, at, med udgivelsen af hans 'Ti-punkts-plan for en konføderation af de to Tysklunde' den 28. november, 1989, tog han det første, spæde skridt hen imod etableringen af tysk suverænitet, et skridt, som han ikke havde koordineret med de Allierede eller med sin koalitionspartner, daværende udenrigsminister Hans-Dietrich Genscher [FDP]. Et sandfærdigt billede må inkludere den kendsgerning, at mordet, to dage senere, på Alfred Herrhausen, daværende formand for Deutsche Bank og en nær rådgiver til

Kohl, og som angiveligt udførtes af tredje generations Rote Armee Fraktion (RAF), havde til hensigt omgående at begrænse denne impuls til at opnå suverænitet.

Det, der ligeledes mangler i de mange kommentarer, er Margaret Thatchers hadefulde »Fjerde Rige Kampagne« imod Kohl, så vel som også François Mitterands trusler om krig i tilfælde af, at Kohl ikke var rede til at opgive Deutschmark som nationalvaluta som prisen, der skulle betales for genforeningen, og at acceptere begrænsningerne i Maastrichttraktatens spændetrøje og euroen, som det rapporteres af Jaques Attali i dennes biografi af Mitterand. Kohl beskrev senere det Europæiske Fællesskabs Topmøde i begyndelsen af december 1989 i Strasbourg, hvor han blev konfronteret med disse angreb, som en af hans livs mørkeste stunder. Ifølge hans egne udtalelser var det ikke, før han besøgte Dresden den 19. december, 1989, hvor befolkningen glædesstrålende råbte 'Helmut! Helmut!', at han indså, at øjeblikket var kommet for tysk genforening.

Helmut Kohl var selvfølgelig også et levende vidne til de løfter, amerikanerne gav Mikhail Gorbatsjov, og som blev rapporteret af daværende amerikanske ambassadør til Sovjetunionen, Jack Matlock, blandt andre, om, at NATO aldrig ville ekspandere frem til Ruslands grænser. For Kohl var den Kolde Krig afsluttet med opløsningen af Sovjetunionen, og det er yderst tvivlsomt, om han ville have været enig i den dæmonisering af Vladimir Putin, der har fundet sted i de senere år. Det faktum, at fr. Merkel nu anser sig selv for at være prokonsul for Barack Obamas politik for konfrontation, ville han sandsynligvis heller ikke have syntes om.«

Foto: Storbritanniens Margaret Thatcher; Tysklands Helmut Kohl; Frankrigs François Mitterand.

Storbritanniens ambassadør til Tyskland fra 1988 til 1992, Christopher Mallaby, om Kohl versus Thatcher: 'Det faldt dem ikke naturligt at nyde hinandens selskab'.

Og foråret gik over i sommer

...



Lyndon H. LaRouche og Helga
Zepp-LaRouche, november,
2013.

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 18. juni, 2017 – Fremtidige generationer vil se tilbage på disse dage i midten af 2017 som en hovedkorsvej i hele menneskets historie frem til i dag. De grundlæggende kendsgerninger, der stadig er stort set ukendte for de fleste amerikanere i dag, vil være velkendte for dem. Den måde, hvorpå Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i årtier, og på trods af intens forfølgelse, havde udarbejdet et Nyt Paradigme for en global civilisation, hvor mennesket endelig ville blive fuldt ud menneskeligt, og som var knyttet til et udstrakt program for en Verdenslandbro og for udvikling af fusionskraft og en genlancering af udforskning af rummet som et globalt rumprogram.

At dette LaRouche-program for Verdenslandbroen blev officielt vedtaget som kinesisk statslig politik i 2013 og i løbet af fire år fik tilslutning fra flere end 100 nationer, der repræsenterede flertallet af menneskeheden. At, takket være dette program, begyndte håb atter at indfinde sig i Afrika, efter årtiers fortvivlelse. Vejen var åbnet for en afslutning af Det britiske Imperium og det oldgamle imperiesystem, der havde forkrøblet menneskers sind, siden mindst begyndelsen af den optegnede historie.

At det var inden for en sådan sammenhæng, om end de

amerikanske vælgere blev holdt uvidende om det, at de afviste Det britiske Imperiums præsidentkandidat, Hillary Clinton, og i stedet valgte den kandidat, der lovede venskab med Rusland og Kina, afslutningen af udenlandske aggressionskrige og genindførelsen af Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov – Donald Trump.

USA bevægede sig mod det Nye Paradigme.

Det britiske Imperium kæmpede indædt for at skaffe sig af med præsident Trump gennem et FBI-kup, eller gennem ethvert andet middel, de kunne udtænke. De fleste amerikanere hældede til at støtte deres valgte præsident og udviste ikke alene støtte, men også entusiasme, når de blev vist tillid. Men, for faktisk at kunne handle på dette, havde de brug for et virkeligt begreb om den globale proces og LaRouche-parrets mission, som var blevet dem nægtet.

Og her står sagerne i øjeblikket. Som en digter har sagt, »det sidste kapitel er endnu ikke skrevet«.

Foto: LaRouche-parret: Lyndon H. LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, november, 2013.

Vladimir Putin siger, Arktis er af afgørende betydning for Rusland

18. juni, 2017 – Under sin fire timer lange, årlige Spørgsmål-og-Svar-optræden på russisk Tv den 15. juni, svarede Vladimir Putin, forespurgt, hvorfor Rusland er så fokuseret på Arktis:

»Frem til år 2050 vil omkring 30 % af al organisk kulbrinte

blive produceret i det arktiske område. Nogle af vore meste betydningsfulde projekter gennemføres allerede dér, med Novatek, der bygger et anlæg, en firmaby, en flyveplads og en havn i den arktiske zone. ... Fra et økonomisk standpunkt er dette af afgørende betydning ... Derudover, ud fra et strategisk standpunkt, så går USA's landbaserede missilers flyverute netop over Nordpolen ... Dette er, hvad Arktis betyder for os.«

Putin forklarede, hvordan smeltningen af de arktiske isbjerge yderligere åbner op for den nordlige rute mellem Europa og Asien og nævnte verdens største isbrydere, som Rusland er i færd med at bygge, og som vil gøre sejladsen nemmere.

I dag rapporterede Sputnik, at eksperter fra Rosneft, under en forsøgsboring i Khatanga-bugtens sokkel i Laptevhavet, en del af det Arktiske Hav, fandt, at kernen er mættet med olie. Den russiske minister for naturlige resurser og miljø, Sergei Donskoi, sagde i dag, at disse oliefelter kunne være de største på soklen.

Foto: Rosneft har opdaget kulbrinte-aflejringer på det Arktiske Havs østlige sokkel i Laptevhavet, Rusland.

Ruslands briefing til FN om genopbygning af Aleppo understreger behov for hjælp til genopbygning

15. juni, 2017 – Ruslands FN-mission i Genève sponsorerede en live-streamed briefing i går om »Aleppo: En by uden terror. Nyt liv, nyt håb« (Aleppo: A City with out Terror. New Life,

New Hope), hvor flere talere understregede betydningen og nødvendigheden af en genopbygning af den syriske by Aleppo, der blev befriet fra jihadisternes sidste december. Alexey Borodavkin, Ruslands ambassadør til FN i Genève, opfordrede det internationale samfund til at udstrække deres hjælp til de syriske myndigheder til genopbygning af Aleppo, og ikke hindre denne indsats med sanktioner. »Det er afgørende at hjælpe de syriske myndigheder i deres bestræbelser for at genoprette normalitet i byens liv og ikke forsøge at blande sig i dette arbejde ved anvendelse af ensidige, ulovlige og umenneskelige sanktioner og falske anklager«, sagde han. »Disse praksisser burde have været afsluttet for længe siden.«

»Vi opfordrer alle lande, internationale organisationer og ikke-statslige organisationer til at udgøre en fælles front i sagen om hjælp til Aleppo for at lade folk i denne, igennem mange år hårdt ramte by glemme deres vanskeligheder, som de har overlevet, så hurtigt som muligt og genoprette fred, ro og fremgang til landet Syrien«, sagde Borodavkin.

Hussein Diab, guvernør for provinsen Aleppo, tilsluttede sig Borodavkins opfordring og påpegede, at vestlige sanktioner forhindrer importen og produktionen af vital medicin i Syrien. »Jeg vil gerne benytte denne lejlighed til at gentage vores krav om at ophæve uretfærdige sanktioner, der først og fremmest er rettet mod det syriske folk, og som hindrede, og fortsat hindrer, genstart af lokal fremstilling, først og fremmest produktion af farmaceutiske og medicinske præparater. Sanktionerne forhindrer forsyningen til vort folk af nødvendig medicin og sundhedstjenester«, sagde Diab.

General Vladimir Savtjenko, chef for det Russiske Forsoningscenter, rapporterede bl.a., at genoprettelsen af elektricitet og vand til dele af byen har gjort det muligt for 70.000 mennesker, inklusive 40.000 børn, at vende tilbage til deres hjem. Han og andre talere beskrev det intense niveau af humanitære aktiviteter, som udføres i Aleppo af det russiske militær, og som omfatter at yde lægehjælp og levering af 850

tons humanitære hjælpeforsyninger.

Foto: Aleppo, en af verdens ældste, uafbrudt beboede byer, var Syriens største by før krigen begyndte i 2011.

UK: Brandkatastrofen i Grenfell Tower kunne sænke Tory'erne, privatisering og grøn politik

16. juni, 2017 – Det frygtes nu, at over halvdelen af de 200 beboere i Grenfell Tower kan være omkommet i brandkatastrofen. Alt imens det officielle dødstal nu er 30, savnes flere end 65 personer, og tallet stiger. Katastrofen giver ikke alene bagslag for de Konservative, men også for den grønne politik, der førte til brugen af ikke-brandsikker beklædning for at gøre bygningerne mere »miljømæssigt bæredygtige«, billigt. Hertil kommer, at privatisering af eftersyn af kommunale beboelseshuse også rammes. Det er ved at blive en international skandale, eftersom den samme katastrofe kunne finde sted i Tyskland, Frankrig, Australien og andre lande.

Den massecirkulerede trykte udgave af *Daily Mail* har overskriften, »Der er tre spørgsmål omkring Grenfell, og det første er: 'Var grønne mål ansvarlige for brandtragedien'?« og stiller spørgsmålet, om »tvivlsom« beklædningsmateriale blev lagt på den 24 etager høje bygning, »for blot at imødekomme miljøstandarder«. Denne artikel findes ikke i *Mails* Internetudgave, der læses internationalt.

Times rapporterer, at beklædningen, der forårsagede

katastrofen, var forbudt i USA.

Mirror har dette ene ord i sin overskrift: »Kriminelt«, og siger, at tragedien er en »skamlet på vores nation«.

Ligeledes under angreb er privatiseringspolitik. Tidligere havde de statskontorer, der administrerede offentlige (kommunale) beboelseshuse, deres egen arkitektkontor, der forvaltede og overvågede renovationer. Dette er ikke længere tilfældet, efter at alting er blevet privatiseret.

Sagen er ved at blive til et internationalt spørgsmål, der dækkes i alle dagblade i hele Europa og andre steder. *The Guardian* citerer en australsk brandsikkerhedsekspert for at sige, at titusinder af bygninger i Australien bruger den samme beklædning, hvilket er tilfældet over det hele. En rimelig antagelse er, at millioner af bygninger i Tyskland bruger den samme, brandfarlige beklædning.

Den britiske premierminister Theresa May har endnu ikke indgået en aftale med det nordirske loyalistiske Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), men nu lover denne katastrofe også at sænke hende. Alt imens hun krævede en efterforskning, så indleder Londons politi nu en kriminel efterforskning. May besøgte brandfolkene og udrykningstjenesterne, men hun kritiseres stærkt for ikke at besøge de overlevende. Hvorfor skulle hun det? De fleste er asiater og afrikanere, og ikke Tory-vælgere.

Labour-partiets leder Jeremy Corbyn var ikke sen til at besøge de overlevende fra branden. Han kaldte Kensington, hvor Hendes Majestæts Kensington Palace ligger, et område, der er halvt rigt, halvt fattigt, for »To byer« (Charles Dickens roman 'A Tale of Two Cities') mellem et rigt syd og et fattigt nord. Han foreslog, at »beslaglæggelse« af tomme ejendomme ville være en løsning på manglen på tilgængelig indkvartering for disse mennesker, fordrevne af branden.

»Ejendomme må findes – beslaglægges, om nødvendigt – for at

sikre, at beboere bliver genhuset lokalt«, sagde Corbyn ved et møde mellem MP'ere. »Hvordan kan det accepteres, at man i London har luksusbygninger og luksuslejligheder, der holdes tomme som opkøbte til senere salg, samtidig med, at hjemløse mennesker leder efter et sted at bo?«, spurgte han.

Foto: Grenfell Tower i brand.

FOLKEMØDET PÅ BORNHOLM: SCHILLER INSTITUTTET DELTAGER MED FIRE REPRÆSENTANTER I MANGE DEBATTER OG INTERVENTIONER



Nyhedsorientering maj/juni
2017

18. juni, 2017 – Schiller Instituttets 4 mand store delegation fik skabt en del opmærksomhed ved at synge toastemmig kanons, som fik mange mennesker til at stoppe op, og vi uddelte **Schiller Instituttets Nyhedsorientering**, der handler om den historiske konference i Beijing, "Bælte & Vej Forum". På vores plakat stod der, »Fremtiden ligger i Kinas Bælte & Vej«, med et billede af infrastruktur, der binder verden sammen.

Vi deltog i debatmøder, hvor vi kunne stille relevante spørgsmål. Vi uddelte over 900 eksemplarer af Nyhedsorientering og kom i samtale direkte på stedet med mere end halvdelen af de mennesker, der tog vores materiale. Vi har bl.a. talt med folk, der har været i Kina og er meget begejstret for den udvikling, der er i gang dér. Mange af de mennesker, vi talte med, kunne huske os fra før. En dame kom op til os og sagde, »Det er jo jer, der har talt om Silkevejen, før det blev til Kinas politik«. Hun var meget imponeret over, at Kina har vedtaget den Nye Silkevej, og hun tog vores materiale med stor interesse. En bornholmer stoppede op, da han kendte os fra før og i mange år havde støttet os. Han var glad over at se, at hans støtte har båret frugt.

Vores sang fik mange mennesker til at komme op til os. Mange stoppede op for at lytte, fordi, som nogle sagde, det varmede deres hjerte. Flere klappede og andre kom op til os for at rose os for at synge så dejligt.

Den første dag var det hovedsaglig sang og uddeling; de andre dage deltog vi i flere debatter og blandede os med spørgsmål.

På Folkemødets anden dag deltog Schiller Instituttets repræsentanter i et politisk møde, der fandt sted i Akademikernes Hus, organiseret af DJØF'erne. Emnet var »Verdensordenen efter Trump og Brexit«, hvor Mogens Lykketoft (S), Storbritanniens ambassadør til Danmark Dominic Schroeder og USA's fungerende ambassadør Laura Lochman talte.

Diskussionen var meget baseret på den forandring, der er i gang omkring den kendsgerning, at Donald Trump er blevet valgt til præsident, hvilket Mogens Lykketoft ikke var så glad for. Mogens udtrykte mest sin bekymring for, at USA har trukket sig ud af Paris-klimaaf-talen, og at Trump ikke vil samarbejde med Kina. Vi benyttede muligheden for at stille nogle spørgsmål.



Feride på
Folkemødet 2017

Feride I. Gillesberg fik stillet første spørgsmål, hvor hun bl.a. sagde:

»For en måned siden var der 'Bælte & Vej Forummet' i Beijing, hvor USA havde en særlig udsending, Matthew Pottinger. Konferencen skulle konsolidere Kinas politik for Bælte & Vej, der omfatter hele verden; ikke kun Kina. Bælte & Vej er allerede nu omkring 30 gange større en Marshallplanen (for Europa efter krigen). Den amerikanske præsident er åben over for samarbejde omkring det. Det andet, vigtige spørgsmål er samarbejdet med Rusland ... De amerikanske medier har kørt en kampagne for at begå karaktermord på præsidenten, lige siden han blev valgt, i bl.a. New York Times, og med et teaterstykke, 'Julius Cæsar', der spilles i New York Central Park, og som går ud på at myrde den amerikanske præsident. Der er et billede i omløb, hvor præsidenten har fået skåret hovedet af ... Scenen er sat til at myrde præsidenten. Det gamle paradigme med Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, briterne, MI6 og de britiske imperialister vil have en unipolær verden. Den nye præsident er åben over for en multipolær verden ... Medierne skulle jo netop dække, at det, præsidenten vil, er en positiv, og ikke en negativ ting.«

Derefter blev der taget tre andre spørgsmål, hvor Lissie Brobjerg fra Schiller Instituttet kom til som den sidste. Hun understregede følgende i sit indlæg:

»Lyndon LaRouche siger, at kuppet mod Trump vil føre til generel krig; hvad skal vi gøre for at forhindre det, således at Trump kan opbygge USA og skabe samarbejde med Rusland og forhindre en verdenskrig og skabe fred?«.



Lissie Folkemødet

2017

Ordstyrerne prøvede at underspille de to kontroversielle kommentarer. Den fungerende britiske ambassadør sagde straks, at han ikke har tænkt sig at svare på 90 % af de ting, der blev taget op i diskussionen.

Mogens Lykketoft, der stod og sagde, han er bekymret over Trumps forhold til Kina, ignorerede totalt, hvad der blev taget op; han skiftede emnet tilbage til den gamle verden med Paris-aftalen og klimaforandring.

Vi delte på dette debatmøde vores Nyhedsorientering ud til flere deltagere, der gerne vil læse vores materiale.

Kort efter fik vi mulighed for at tale på »speakers corner«, der er et åbent forum til korte taler, som Bornholms Tidende organiserer, så andre holdninger end de officielle også kan komme til udtryk.

Feride I. Gillesberg fik ordet og benyttede chancen til at fortælle om den historiske konference, »Bælte & Vej Forum«, der fandt sted i Beijing.

»Vesten burde deltage i det paradigmeskifte, som »Bælte & Vej Initiativet« repræsenterer for udvikling af hele verden. Det er kampen mellem på den ene side dem, der vil have en unipolær verden og dem, der er for en multipolær verden. Obama, Hillary, MI6 og det Britiske Imperium kæmper for at bevare den gamle, unipolære verdensorden. Det er årsagen til angrebene på den amerikanske præsident, som skal stoppes. I stedet skal vi tilslutte os det nye paradigme.«

Feride sluttede talen med at synge den kinesiske sang, »Kangding Lovesong«. Flere af tilhørerne ville gerne læse Nyhedsorientering om Bælte & Vej Forum, og en mand kom senere

op til os for at sige, hvor bevægende den kinesiske sang var.

Schiller Instituttet fik mulighed for at deltage i en anden debat med Rasmus Jarlov (Konservativ; formand for Folketingets Forsvarsudvalg), Nick Hækkerup (næstformand, Socialdemokratiet) og Marie Krarup (Dansk Folkeparti) om »Truslen fra Øst«. Der var 80 mennesker til stede. De to førstnævnte mente, at Ruslands Putin var en trussel, og at han havde manipuleret det amerikanske valg, hvilket sidstnævnte ikke mente. Alle mente dog, at der var brug for øget forsvar.

Lissie Brobjerg fik det første spørgsmål:

»Hej, jeg er Lissie fra Schiller Instituttet. Trump siger, at han vil samarbejde med Rusland, da han ønsker at forhindre en atomkrig, og han sagde til et NATO-møde, at han ikke betragter Rusland som sin nummer 1 fjende; skulle vi ikke hellere samarbejde med Rusland i stedet for at opspinde historier om, at de vil erobre verden? Det var jo faktisk Obama, som støttede neonazister i Ukraine og væltede regeringen«.

Dette skabte tumult, hvorefter Lissie refererede til Stepan Bandera-folkene (i Ukraine). Marie Krarup tog Lissies spørgsmål op. Bagefter uddelte vi vores Nyhedsorientering til deltagerne, der var interesseret i at læse vores materiale.



Christian Folkemøde
2017

Christian Olesen fra Schiller Instituttet talte efter debatten med Rasmus Jarlov, der under debatten havde beskrevet begivenhederne i Ukraine fra en meget propagandistisk vinkel. Christian sagde til Jarlov, at han havde et meget unuanceret syn på Ukraine, hvortil han svarede, »Det kan man altid sige, når man ikke har nogen argumenter«! Til det svarede Christian, at de søde og venlige demonstranter, Jarlov havde beskrevet,

havde brændt folk levende i Odessa. Det fik Jarlov til at vende ryggen til og skynde sig væk.

Til en debat ved Femerns venner, hvor man diskuterede fremtidsperspektiverne for tunnelen (Femern Bælt-forbindelsen), fik Lissie Brobjerg det første spørgsmål:

»Hvad tænker I om ideen om, at Danmark går med i Kinas Nye Silkevej? De vil forbinde hele verden med store infrastrukturprojekter, højhastighedstog, tunneller og broer, og projektet er nu 30 gange større end Marshallplanen.«

Responsen fra den ene taler var, at hvis Kina havde stået for tunnellen, havde den allerede været færdig i går, men at, i Danmark har vi dog en demokratisk proces, hvilket han foretrækker. Flere mennesker kom bagefter op til Lissie for at få en Nyhedsorientering, inklusive ordstyreren og den anden taler, der glad modtog en Nyhedsorientering.



Feride diskuterer

Den tredje dag på Folkemødet begyndte med et debatmøde, der fandt sted i Enhedslistens telt over emnet, »Russerne kommer«. Talerne var lektor ved Forsvarsakademiet Peter Viggo Mortensen, forfatter Jens Jørgen Nielsen og Nikolaj Villumsen (Enhedslisten). Man diskuterede faren for krig med russerne. Jens Jørgen forsøgte at give deltagerne en idé om, hvordan russerne tænker, mens de andre analyserede Rusland baseret på, at Rusland agerer ud fra stormagtspolitiske interesser.

Feride intervenserede blandt andet ved kort at fortælle om den

historiske konference, der fandt sted i Beijing, og om, at Europa ikke 'skyder sig selv i foden'. Rusland har tilsluttet sig et samarbejde med Kina omkring Bælte & Vej Initiativet, som Vesten aktivt burde være en del af. Feride tog spørgsmålet om NATO's rolle op, om det ikke er en forældet institution, og at man skal forstå, at Rusland har set, hvad der er sket med de nationer, hvor man har lavet regimeskifte, der har efterladt lande i kaos og elendighed; og at russerne ser Vestens politik, med regimeskifte i Ukraine og udvidelsen af NATO, i denne sammenhæng.

Lissie fik nummer to spørgsmål og sagde:

»Trump har gjort det klart, at han vil samarbejde med Rusland, og der har allerede været en koordinering med russerne. Effekten har dog været, at New York Times og britiske medier skriver om en mulig afsættelse af eller mord på Trump, og flere Hollywood-skuespillere har været ude og fremvise Trump med et afskåret hoved eller er kommet med voldelige udtalelser imod ham. Ligger faren for 3. Verdenskrig ikke nærmere i faren for, at briterne/ Obama/ Hillary og FBI skal lykkes med at få ham afsat, da de ønsker krig med Rusland?«

Den sidste del af debatten handlede om, hvordan man kunne løse konflikten mellem Rusland og Vesten. Peter Viggo Mortensen indrømmede blandt andet, at politikken for regimeskifte har slået fejl, og at den Nye Silkevej er en naturlig udvikling, som lande vil gå med til. Den anden del af diskussion handlede om løsninger. Da fik Christian det sidste spørgsmål og pointerede blandt andet, at en del af løsningen ligger i, at man begynder at tale ærligt omkring, hvad Rusland er og gør, bekyndende med, at Rusland ikke invaderede Ukraine.

I en debat hos Informationen, »Will Trump Last the Entire Presidential 4 Year Period?«, talte den tidligere amerikanske ambassadør til Danmark, Rufus Gifford, om sandsynligheden for, at Trump kunne blive afsat gennem en rigsretssag (impeachment) gennem det 25. Forfatningstillæg, eller evt. selv gå af. Han

mente ikke, at det var sandsynligt, omend han ønskede det. Hvis en rigsretssag skal være mulig, kunne det være pga. 'forhindring af udøvelse af retten' (obstruction of Justice), men ellers skulle man bruge kræfterne på demokraternes mærkesager. 300 mennesker deltog, det foregik i centrum og den generelle konsensus var, at Trump er forrykt. Lissie kom op til ambassadøren bagefter og sagde, at Lyndon LaRouche havde sagt, at, hvis Comey og Co. lykkedes med et kup mod Trump, ville det føre til generel krig, og at briterne var efter Trump, fordi han vil samarbejde med Rusland, medens Obama derimod forsøgte at starte en atomkrig med Rusland. Han skyndte sig blot væk efter at han blev noget chokeret over det, Lissie sagde.

Vi inter文nerede også i et andet møde med titlen »Atomkraft, ja tak! Hvor skal fremtidens energi komme fra?« i Dansk Erhvervs telt. I panelet deltog en repræsentant for Greenpeace, en repræsentant for Århus Universitet og Villumsen fra Liberal Alliance. Kun hr. Villumsen mente, at man måtte søge nye energikilder inden for nye teknologier og understregede, at vindmølle-fanatikerne var religiøse og foruden ræsonnement. Én fra publikum spurgte ind til thorium-reaktorer, hvor Villumsen havde en god respons, mens ham fra Greenpeace ævlede om, at det var dyrt og tog lang tid. Lissie stillede det sidste spørgsmål, hvor hun sagde:

»Nu har vi en situation i verden, hvor man, siden Kinas Bælte & Vej og BRIKS-projektet, er begyndt at bygge en masse atomkraftværker; i Sydafrika har man planlagt 11, Bolivia skal have et atomkraftværk, Kina planlægger at udvinde helium-3 på Månen til fusionsbrændsel, så verdens fremtid er faktisk atomkraft. Skal vi ikke hellere gå med dér, da energigennemstrømningstætheden er meget højere, og med 30 tønder olie har man, hvad der svarer til få gram fusionskraft. Desuden har Henrik Svensmark (astrofysiker) lavet forskning, som viser, at solpletter og kosmisk stråling skaber klimaforandring.«

Repræsentanten fra Greenpeace sagde blot, at ingen tager Svensmark seriøst, og at 97 % af alle klimaforskere er enige. Villumsen svarede positivt og udtrykte respekt for, at nogen tør tage diskussionen op i et sådant forum.

Bagefter delte vi ud til alle, og mange var interesserede.

Alt i alt var vores tilstedeværelse på Folkemødet på Bornholm en fantastisk mulighed for at nå ud til så mange borgere, politikere, akademikere og eksperter med vores ideer, der dækker politik og fremtidens verden med Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

– *Feride I. Gillesberg; Lissie Brobjerg; Christian Olesen.*

Titelfoto: Feride I. Gillesberg i diskussion med en borger på Folkemødet. På plakaten står der, »Fremtiden ligger i Kinas Bælte & Vej«.

Oliver Stones Putin-interviews, sidste del

Vladimir Putin taler med Oliver Stone om valget af Trump

15. juni, 2017 – TASS udgiver visse højdepunkter af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putins interview med Oliver Stone. Ifølge en oversættelse af Salon.com sagde Putin, »Jeg tror ikke, nogen kan udfordre resultatet af dette valg. De, der blev slået, burde i stedet have draget konklusioner af det, de gjorde, af hvordan de byggede deres arbejde; de burde ikke have forsøgt at lægge skylden på noget udefrakommende.«

Bemærkninger om Oliver Stones interview med Vladimir Putin,

sidste del.

Putin: [Jeg har haft med] fire amerikanske præsidenter at gøre, og der er ikke mange forandringer, bureaukratiet er meget stærkt.

Om indblanding i valget: Dette er meget tåbeligt. Selvfølgelig er vi glade for, at Trump ønsker at genoprette relationer med Rusland. Vil han gøre det? Vi får se. Vi hackede ikke – hvis der var nogen, der hackede (DNC), så kunne det komme fra hvor som helst, men det kunne ikke have fået nogen indflydelse på valget. Under alle omstændigheder var der ingen løgne, kun sande ting blev afsløret, skaber falske historier.

Om den amerikanske befolkning: De fleste amerikanere tror på traditionelle værdier, en puritansk tradition, i hvert fald i mange dele af landet. Dette appellerede Trump til. Jeg synes, han undertiden gik for vidt

– De, der tabte valget, bør tænke over, hvorfor. Obama og hans hold skabte en landmine for den næste administration.

Om den 24 sider lange efterretningsrapport om russisk indblanding: Jeg læste den. Alt dette minder mig om antisemitisme. Alle problemer, »jøderne gjorde det«. Nu er det Rusland.

Om [senator John] McCain [vises en af hans tirader]: Han er patriotisk, ligesom romeren Cato, der afsluttede alle sine tale med, »I øvrigt mener jeg, at Kartago bør ødelægges«. De lever i en bestemt verden, de ser ikke, at verden forandres, kan ikke lægge fortiden bag sig. Og dog var vi allierede i Første og Anden Verdenskrig.

Alle løgnene om russisk indblanding i valget, de er alle våben i den interne krig i USA, der tilsigter at stoppe normaliseringen af relationerne med Rusland.

Mange i USA ved, at dette er falsk. Til syvende og sidst løj

hackerne jo ikke – de fortalte sandheden om Amerika. Og der er ikke fremlagt beviser, kun beskyldninger.

Forespurgt om USA's indblanding i valgene i Rusland i 2000 og 2012: Jeg sagde til både Obama og Kerry, at det er en skandale, at I har regeringsfolk og penge, der åbenlyst støtter demonstrationer imod regeringen [der afspilles et langt stykke med Victoria Nuland, der praler med støtten til oppositionen, støtte til folk i eksil, til journalister, der angriber regeringen, osv.]. De finansierede stævner og NGO'er, der forsøgte at vælte regeringen – også østeuropæiske lande.

[Afspilles et klip fra Stones Snowden-film om aflytning af vore allierede, forberedelser til sabotage af Japan og andre, i tilfælde af, de skulle vende sig mod USA] Putin: For at være helet ærlig, så bekymrede vi os ikke om cyberkrig efter 1990. Vi troede, den Kolde Krig var forbi. Vi købte vestligt udstyr uden at være bekymrede.

Da vi så, at Obama og Biden sagde, at Rusland havde blandet sig i valget, og at de ville respondere på en tid og et sted, de valgte, mindede det mig om det kommunistiske regimes sidste dage, hvor de uddelte æresbevisninger til hinanden.

Om cyberkrig – Vi foreslog en cyber-aftale i august 2015 – det blev afvist.

Om Stalin – Churchill var indædt antikommunist, men da Hitler angreb mod vest, kaldte han Stalin en stor krigshelt. Dernæst startede han selvfølgelig den Kolde Krig. Der har været mange blodige diktatorer i historien; Oliver Cromwell, men der er statuer af ham i hele England. Napoleon, et katastrofalt nederlag, med der er stadig statuer. Så vi har altså stadig statuer af Stalin. Russerne elskede ham under krigen. Vi glemmer ikke grusomhederne, men vi ærer ham. Dæmoniseringen af Stalin i Vesten er i virkeligheden blot endnu en måde at angribe Rusland på. Men Rusland har ændret sig.

Om oligarkerne: Da jeg kom til Moskva, var jeg forbløffet

over, hvor mange skurke, der var. Ingen skrupler. Oligarkerne interesserede sig kun for rigdom, ikke for forretninger eller landet. Det var min opgave at skelne mellem forretninger og oligarker. Nu er der halvt så mange, det er ikke et stort problem, men der er stadig for mange.

Forespurgt om rapporter om, at han skulle være den rigeste mand i verden, korruption: At være rig bringer ikke lykke. Man har et talent, og evnen til at bruge dette talent til at gøre en forskel i verden – det er det, der tæller.

De langvarige hilsner mellem Stone og Putin endte således:

Putin: Tak for Deres tid og spørgsmålene. Tak, fordi De har været så grundig. Er De nogensinde blevet slået?

Stone: Slået? Åh jo, jeg er blevet slået.

Putin: Så det bliver altså ikke noget nyt, for De kommer til at lide for det, De har gjort.

Stone: Åh ja, helt sikkert, det ved jeg, men det er det værd. Det er det værd, hvis det bringer mere fred og bevidsthed til verden.

Se opsummering af første og anden del.

YouTube, The Putin Interviews, part 1 – 4 (English subtitles):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xej07e2xUJc>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xej07e2xUJc>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0e0cnng0to>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=avr4gGxNP4k>

Showtime:

Trumps eneste valg for vort land er at implementere LaRouches Fire Love i Hamiltons tradition. LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 16. juni, 2017

Matthew Ogden: ... Jeg vil gerne begynde i dag med direkte at referere tilbage til lederartiklen, der blev udgivet på larouchepac.com sidste lørdag, og som fortsat er meget relevant og har vist sig at haste mere og mere, som ugen er skredet frem. Jeg viser den på skærmen. Som I kan se, var artiklens overskrift, »Lyndon LaRouche: Stop FBI's bedrageri; Stop kuppet mod præsidenten – Hvad de løgnagtige medier ikke fortæller«

Hr. LaRouche kom med en meget klar advarsel.

Lyndon LaRouche lancerede en appel til det amerikanske folk om at stoppe det igangværende kup imod præsident Trump, som torsdag fik yderligere næring gennem den fyrede FBI-direktør, James Comeys løgnagtige vidneforklaring for Senatets Efterretnings-Udvalgskomite. LaRouche sagde, at kuppet er en

FBI-operation, der forsøger at ødelægge USA, og hvis det ikke standses, vil verden stå over for generel krig.

Som I husker, så forklarede artiklen yderligere:

»Den 7. juni afslørede tidligere direktør for Nationalt Efterretningsvæsen, James Clapper, den faktiske motivation for kuppet imod Trump, med bemærkninger i Australien. Han sagde, at Trumps åbenhed over for fred med Rusland – det valprogram, som Trump blev valgt på af det amerikanske folk – i sig selv var totalt imod USA's sikkerhedsinteresser og i realiteten at sidestille med forræderi. Det var allerede før valget almindeligt kendt i det officielle Washington, at præsident Obama, i aftalt spil med briterne, kandidat Clinton, DNI-chef Clapper, CIA-chef Brennan og FBI-chef Comey, havde styret USA på en kurs for krig med Rusland og Kina, som efter planen skulle aktiveres fuldt ud med valget af Hillary Clinton. I stedet blev Trump valgt, hvilket udløste kuppet, der fulgte.«

Hr. LaRouche kom med en meget afgørende pointe:

»Præsident Trump har holdt sit løfte og etableret bedre relationer med både Rusland og Kina, der begge søger samarbejde med USA omkring udvikling af verden, baseret på store infrastrukturprojekter. Det er det virkelige, og eneste, spørgsmål her.«

Jeg har gentaget vores reference til denne artikel, for det er en meget afgørende advarsel fra hr. LaRouche, Og som jeg sagde, er den kun blev mere relevant og mere presserende, som ugen er skredet frem. Som I måske har set, udlagde vi også en video på LaRouche PAC's webside, med titlen, »Stop kuppet mod præsidenten«, som allerede cirkleres temmelig vidt omkring og bør fortsætte med det.

[<https://larouchepac.com/20170614/stop-coup-against-President>]

Men, præcis som hr. LaRouche advarede om i denne erklæring, jeg netop oplæste, så, hvis denne kampagne mod præsidenten ikke stoppes, kan det føre til meget alvorlige konsekvenser for USA, og for verden.

(her følger resten af udskriftet på engelsk):

Although the very disgusting propaganda and even direct threats against the life of President Trump began very early on in his administration – practically immediately after his inauguration, as we saw with the article in the German news magazine {Der Spiegel} – over the last week and a half, we saw a very alarming escalation of such threats in increasingly explicit form. Such as comedienne Kathy Griffin holding an image of President Trump's severed head, or the ongoing production of {Julius Caesar} in Central Park which depicts a caricature of President Trump and his wife, First Lady Melania Trump. These threats are serious; they should be stopped immediately. They're very dangerous. They create the environment, as is characterized correctly, "a climate of violence" in which very deranged and disturbed individuals such as the shooter in Alexandria act out this kind of propaganda and act on those threats. Thanks to the Capitol Police detail of Rep. Steve Scalise, a massacre was thankfully averted at that Republican baseball practice on Thursday. But responsible parties in this country must recognize Lyndon LaRouche's warning that this coup attempt and this climate of violence must be stopped immediately, or it will lead to chaos and even general war. As Mr. LaRouche said later in that same statement, "[I]t is

time for the people to speak and end this disruptive and highly dangerous attempted coup.” We are seeing a shifting attitude among certain sectors of the population around the United States, due to the very vocal and direct intervention by LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche movement; including in New York City and elsewhere.

A push-back against this propaganda campaign, including an increasing recognition that the never-ending, round-the clock Russia-gate hearings happening practically every day in the U.S.

House and Senate are, in fact, nothing more than a McCarthyite witch-hunt – President Trump correctly used that term; and have been ongoing now for several months with unlimited resources invested in them, and have turned up zero evidence so far.

What the American people {do} want to hear about is not this fabricated media narrative, but rather how their duly elected government – be it Republicans or Democrats – but the people who they voted to represent them plan to solve the truly urgent life or death issues that are facing the American people every single day. Collapsing infrastructure. As we know, we have the so-called “Summer of Hell” coming upon us in New York City; collapsing living standards; collapsing wages; a failing health care system; epidemic proportions of drug addiction and drug overdose deaths. A Wall Street bubble which is about to explode, which would have consequences worse than 2008. It’s exactly those issues which the Trump administration was elected to address; but the Trump administration must now begin to deliver.

It's not a question of piecemeal form, a little fix here, a little bit there, but it's a national mission which we require from the U.S. Presidency which will mobilize the American people

in the way that Franklin Roosevelt did; in the way that John F.

Kennedy did that. Getting this infrastructure project moving in

a very big way and really delivering on this front is crucial for

the President, as we've made the point over recent days; not to

mention making good on his campaign promise to restore

Glass-Steagall. Frankly, if there's anybody who this President

should be firing right now, it should be this clown, Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin; who is repeatedly going in front of Senate committee hearings and lying through his teeth that the Glass-Steagall that Trump was talking about, was not the

Glass-Steagall that was in the Republican platform, is not the Glass-Steagall that is called the 21st-Century Glass-Steagall.

This has been called out correctly by a number of sitting U.S.

Senators; Senator Warren, Senator Sanders. But these are

concrete steps which must be taken immediately, if President

Trump is to mobilize the American people and to effectively

counter this mass propaganda assault and recruit the citizens to

mobilize behind the duly elected Presidency of the United States.

One thing that I know we're going to address in the course

of the discussion in this show today, is Mr. LaRouche's

{emphatic} point that what we need now is directed, Federal credit on a massive scale in a Hamiltonian form. Helga

Zepp-LaRouche has reiterated that point several times in

discussions this week. What keeps coming up in discussions

around so-called infrastructure, including a major event that

Diane Saxe attended up in New York City a few days ago, is

this
question of privatization of major infrastructure and funding
new
infrastructure through so-called private investment.
As Helga LaRouche said, this is not only grossly inadequate
and will never work, but it is also criminal in fact. As we
saw
in the very real criminal privatization after the collapse of
the
Soviet Union, the mass privatization of state-owned utilities
there in Russia and the former Soviet countries and
privatization
of infrastructure; which plunged the population there into a
demographic collapse and a real dark age while a few criminal
oligarchs looted the entire region. What we need is not that,
but
what we need is the American System; as President Trump
himself
referred directly earlier during his administration. That is,
Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln; that is the American
System
which built the United States.
What I want to shift to right now, before we get into a
deeper discussion on that, is what Mr. LaRouche also made a
very
strong point about in that warning that I referred in the
beginning of the broadcast. He said the fact that Trump was
elected, triggered this kind of coup from these factions which
had been trying to keep him out of office and escalate the war
confrontation between the United States and Russia and China.
Instead, you've seen President Trump reach out to China,
continue
to reach out to Russia despite massive pressure not to. And
you
see these countries seeking cooperation with the United States
on
developing a new paradigm, a new international system based on

great projects and development. That is what the underlying issue here is; and nothing else. Do not get distracted.

What I want to do right now, before I get into the discussion with Michael, is to share with you a little bit of footage; some excerpts from a dialogue that President Putin of Russia had with the people of his country and also with people internationally on his annual direct webcast call-in show. This

lasted over four hours. I'm going to put up on the screen for you a couple of pictures from these and I'm going to read some questions and then the answers that he had, because these statements from President Putin are directly addressing this question that Mr. LaRouche just raised. What is the perspective

for a peaceful relationship between the United States and Russia?

So, as you'll see, this is a picture of President Putin [Fig. 2]; this was a call-in show where he received questions live. This was the first question from an American. It said, "Greetings, Mr. Putin! My name is Jeremy Bowling. I live in Mesa, Arizona in America. I'm a big supporter of you. I am very pro-Russian, and I wish you much health and success in your life.

My question to you is this. As an American who sits here in America and sees the racist Russian phobia running crazy in my country, what advice would you give me to help set the record straight, to help my fellow Americans understand that Russia is not the enemy?"

President Putin replies: "To begin with, I am very grateful to you for this call. I can tell you as the current head of the

Russian state, that I know the attitudes of our people. We do not consider America our enemy. Moreover, twice in history when

we were going through very rough times, we pooled our efforts;

we

were allies in two world wars. In the past, the Russian Empire

played a substantial role in helping America gain independence and supported the United States. We see that Russo-phobia is running high in America, and think this is primarily a result of

the escalating political infighting. I do not think I have the

right to give you any advice. I simply want to thank you for this stance. We know that we have very many friends in the United States. My American colleagues tell me so, and public opinion polls show the same results. At any rate, those polls taken a month ago, show that we have many friends there.

True,

regrettably, such hysteria is bound to affect the frame of mind,

but let me assure you that there are also very many people in Russia who have deep respect for the achievements of the American

people and are hoping that eventually our relations will get back

on track, in which both we and the United States are extremely interested."

So, that was his answer to the first question, and then coming up next, he had a question from an editor of a Moscow-based Russian-language newspaper, who also asked about the

same question. He said "One of the current trends is that bilateral relations are deteriorating and there is Russo-phobia,

along with daily reports about new anti-Russian initiatives including sanctions. At the same time, there is a growing demand

not only for stabilizing, but also for improving Russian-American

relations. At a Senate hearing the day before yesterday, U.S.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said something to the effect that every time he meets with his foreign colleagues since his appointment, they have asked him to stabilize relations with the

Russians.” He went on to say, “In three weeks’ time, the G20 will convene in Hamburg, where you are to meet with U.S.

President Trump. Is it possible that these talks will help prod

this negative trend towards a more positive one, and possibly even towards a radical improvement in our relationships with the

United States? In what areas and on what issues can Russian-U.S.

cooperation be productive and mutually beneficial? I believe these questions are of concern not only to people in Russia and

in the United States, but many other countries as well.”

President Putin answered as follows: “You know as well as I do the areas in which we can work together with the United States. This includes above all control over non-proliferation

of weapons of mass destruction. We are the biggest nuclear powers and so our cooperation in this area is absolutely natural... Cursing and trading barbs and insults with the U.S. administration would be the worst road to take... We must work together to fight poverty in the world... There is a disastrous situation in many parts of the world, and this is one of the sources of radicalism and terrorism, this poverty around the world; and we must decide together how to address this problem.”

Then President Putin continued by saying: “By the way, we worked

together with the United States to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue, and we did reach an agreement, we did find a solution.

There are positive examples of cooperation, then. The previous

U.S. administration directly recognized the substantial role

that
we played in resolving this issue. We can reach agreements
and
work together then. Of course we can. On the Syrian problem
and
Middle East in general, it is clear to all that no progress
will
be made without joint constructive work. We hope greatly too,
for the United States' constructive role in settling the
crisis
in southeast Ukraine." Then he said, "A constructive role as
I
said. You see then that there are many areas in which we must
work together. But this depends not only on us. We see what
is
happening in the United States today. I have said before and
say
again now, that this is clearly a sign of an increasingly
intense
domestic political struggle, and there is nothing that we can
do
here. We cannot influence this process, but we are ready for
constructive dialogue."
So again, this was from a four-hour dialogue that President
Putin engaged in with the Russian people and people
internationally. But it's a very important point that he
makes
there, that the Russians are ready for a constructive
dialogue.
Obviously, President Trump has a very good opportunity now in
three weeks' time with the G20 summit which is coming up, to
sit
down directly with President Putin and engage in that dialogue
directly.
I also just want to point out that during the course of this
week, there was a real blockbuster feature presentation on
Showtime, of a four-part series of interviews that were

produced
by the film director Oliver Stone. This was based on
interviews
with President Putin which occurred over the last two and a
half
years before the election, and then a final one that occurred
after the election. There's far too much to go through, to
summarize these interviews in any detail. But it really is a
chance that Americans rarely get, to hear President Putin in
his
own words talk about how we reached this point; his view of
perspective points of collaboration with the United States;
the
Russian view of what has been done to encircle and threaten
Russia over the recent 10-15 years; and his understanding of
what
the strategic necessities and the strategic realities are, not
only of the present moment, but as he repeatedly said, there
are
very few people who have the ability to think 25 or even 50
years
in the future. And to see the present from what the
challenges
are that the future generations will have to resolve together.
At one point, he even calls for a "new paradigm of
international
relations"; very similar to what the LaRouche movement has
been
calling for, for several years.

II With that said by way of introduction, let me just
invite
Michael to come in, add a few points here, and then I think we
can get a little bit more going in terms of the discussion.

MICHAEL STEGER: OK, sure. It's probably worth to start
from where you left off, Matt; which is this interview between

Oliver Stone and Putin. There are a number of layers to the interview. It's 20 hours of recording, only 4 hours are presented, edited down. But what you see from the discussion –

and it's useful because it's not simply an interview with Vladimir Putin; but what Putin does provide – as you referenced

– is a 25-50-year perspective. He captures a sense of leadership in a way that's unseen in American culture for some time, except for probably Lyn. It recognizes that what governs

an individual's value and life is a sense of immortality. He references the 25-50 years; he discounts the questions of money

and power and says the reason he continues to be President is not

that he's gotten so accustomed to power that he couldn't do without it, but that he's committed to a single objective of the

economic development of his country. That really does capture on

that 25-50-100-year perspective, a sense of immortality of an individual. What are we contributing our lives to? That's actually the basis of political leadership. That's why Putin has

become so successful on the world stage; why he's been able to handle the failures of leadership from Clinton – especially from

the end of his term – but more so obviously Bush and of course,

Obama. And why he's able to deal with the insanity inside the United States today. But the other layer which is important to

point out, is that Oliver Stone has clearly made a shift in terms

of his intervention. He recognized at some point, that we were

converging again on another potential nuclear annihilation and nuclear war. There's a courage and a vulnerability in Oliver Stone himself in the intervention; because he's there to have a very open and vulnerable dialogue with Putin. And he's intending to make a political intervention into the United States. I think people have to realize this: He's taking on what's become this kind of perverse political culture in the United States; this so-called Obama left wing, which is now calling for a coup by the CIA and FBI, war with Russia, police state-like measures, complete control of the media, assassination of the President. This is the Obama left now; it's just fascism, as Lyn had said in the last couple of days. But he's intervening on that, but on the entire culture; a certain kind of courage is expressed by this interview and by what he's presenting. Clearly, people should engage it, watch it, find ways to access it. Hopefully, it becomes more public. There is footage on YouTube that people can capture. But there is an intervention, and I think it makes it clear what kind of intervention is now necessary. Lyn has set the standard on this kind of political intervention in the United States. Let's put it in context. As you mentioned, there is an ongoing coup against the United States Presidency. This is something that was stated clearly after President Trump was elected. That either he is going to have to resign, be impeached, or assassinated. And you have the {Weekly Standard}, a number of publications throughout Europe – especially Great Britain – who are very focussed on Trump's removal by any

means

necessary. I think what we've seen over the last seven months is

a very sad attempt at trying to link Trump's campaign to Russian

collusion. The enemies targetting Trump knew the entire time there was no collusion with Russia; this entire thing is a made-up fraud. But what they did hope for was that, one, they could either prevent him from taking the oath of office.

Remember, soon after he won, there was attempt to prevent him from even taking the oath because of allegations and concerns that maybe he was a Russian agent. That didn't prevent him from

taking the oath. Since then, we've seen an escalation towards this so-called Russian collusion question. They attempted to capture the Presidency with an attempted coup run through the National Security Council, as we saw with the Syria attack; but

that also then failed. So, you're now beginning to see a regurgitation of the same stories. Jeff Sessions was called in

to testify in the Senate; it went nowhere. He called out; you're

calling me, who served this country for 35 years? Regardless of

where Jeff Sessions stands on policies, he served the country for

35 years; he's not a Russian agent, he's not a traitor to the country on behalf of Russia. These allegations are just wild; they're almost inconceivable, if you didn't understand the broader context. And so, this Russia-gate story is dying. The independent counsel that was appointed when Trump fired Comey is

now not even investigating Russian collusion per se, it's now just investigating obstruction of justice. And President Trump

has been sharp on this with his Twitter account, and pointed

out

that since there's no Russia story, so now it's just obstruction

of justice on the Russia story. It doesn't add up.

In that context, what do we see happen? As they continue to push this – and they will continue to push it; they're now going

to bring in other former Obama people, Jay Johnson, Homeland Security Secretary; they'll continue to regurgitate or hold hearings, to keep the media story going. But clearly what we've

seen over the last couple of weeks, you see it in the New York play of {Julius Caesar}, where a Donald Trump character, or Julius Caesar dressed as Donald Trump, is ritually stabbed, night

after night after night on the stage in New York City. This is

backed by CNN, this is backed by the {New York Times}; it's backed by other media companies ["Shakespeare in the Park"]; it's

backed by the City of New York. You see the Kathy Griffin ISIS pose with the beheaded Trump mask.

So you see there is an intention to escalate the violence.

And then you see a mass murder attempt against up to 15 people,

members of Congress, Senate and House, House leadership; all of

the Republican Party, targetting them because they {are} Republican. And this [the shooter] is a guy who apparently left

his wife and his home, to live in a van for two months in Alexandria, Virginia, well-known for targetting the LaRouche organization and falsely targetting us for prison sentences in the so-called "rocket docket." So, of course, swarming with FBI,

CIA, swamp-like creatures. This guy sets up camp for two months,

targets Republicans for mass murder, and simply perhaps because of just circumstances, that there were a couple of Capitol Police members there because the gates were locked on one side of the ball field, it didn't end up in a full massacre. And hopefully, everyone recovers; two people are still in critical condition. But that's a clear message: You are associated with Trump, you're associated with Trump's Republican Party; a Republican Party, by the way, that Trump took over, away from much of the Republican establishment. But yet, now you're Republicans associated with Trump, you're now targetted for mass murder. This is an assassination attempt directly targetting the Presidency of the United States. Not surprising, because they stated this is where they were going to go. I think the fact that's shown by all of this is the desperation and panic and hysteria by our enemies, by a British Empire, is increasing. The panic is increasing, the desperation is increasing, for the very reasons we've covered on this website and in these discussions. Because the Belt and Road paradigm, a growth paradigm between Russia and China, is now becoming consolidated throughout Eurasia, in Africa. There were attempts by the U.S. Senate, just the last couple of days to increase sanctions on Russia, targetting even their oil and natural gas exports. Germany, the foreign minister and the Austrian Chancellor Kern, who have been opposed to Trump on everything, have now just come out and backed Trump and Secretary of State Tillerson in opposition to these sanctions, because, one, it hurts Germany; it also hurts the United States and it hurts the world.

So there is a constantly changing situation, and yet the people in the U.S. Congress are rabidly off. They've gone rabid

on this Russia question. They're being pulled by the nose by the

media on this question.

The question is, what do the American people do? What do you do in the face of an attempted coup by the FBI, CIA, Wall Street, British Empire factions, and now, an outright call for murder and violence on anyone associated with Trump, including the President himself, or the direct overthrow of our government.

This is why it's so important to understand what Putin presents in these interviews, and what he and China and Belt and

Road Forum present. There is an option. And the main reason this coup is taking place is because there is a threat from the

Trump Presidency to go with the full LaRouche option: not just to

work with Russia and China, not just to take away the threat of

war – that was a critical factor, in the entire Obama Presidency, especially in the second term. But not just to end

the danger of war, but to create an all-out collaboration of these nations around a paradigm of growth and development, something Putin himself is committed to growing and developing the Russian people, the Russian economy; the same thing China is

committed to, growing more people. You see this in Africa: Africa is burgeoning with new levels of growth because of Chinese

investments. We could do a whole show, and maybe we should, on

just the developments in Africa alone: The Congo Basin is facing

huge potential developments to provide electricity to all of Sub-Saharan Africa. So there's real growth potential. There's an option in the United States to do the same thing. That's the LaRouche program.

Now Donald Trump has raised much of these issues for the U.S. economy, the space program, infrastructure, there's been a whole week on infrastructure; job training programs, apprenticeship programs, an entire week this week, on apprenticeships in jobs training programs. He's called for the Glass-Steagall fight. But what we don't see, with all of this talk of infrastructure, even from Democrats who have commended Donald Trump for his commitment to infrastructure, but nobody's presenting the question of how do you finance these projects? How do you develop the country?

We are, personally, as an organization; Elliot Greenspan gave a very thorough briefing last night on the Thursday night Activists' Call on this website [http://action.larouchepac.com/fireside_chat_june_15], on the event that we attended in New York City: There is a lot of discussion and we can go through more of that, Matt, if you want to in a second. But the point is this: There is a chance to go with the full LaRouche program, to create the public credit, to create the national banking system, to shut down this Wall Street fraud, to shut down the bail-in orientation; and to go with the program of unleashing trillions of dollars of U.S. credit, immediately. Staged over time, but trillions of dollars to begin

to rebuild and develop the country.

What this will accomplish, if Trump moves on this, the LaRouche program, Glass-Steagall, the National Bank, it will eliminate the artificial political divide of the country. It focusses the nation on the nation's potential for development, pulling people out of poverty, giving young people a sense of a

future, and it puts us directly in coherence with Russia and China on a growth perspective. That's how Trump can outflank this attempted coup, that's how the American people can participate in this kind of historical fight.

And it takes courage, but there's a pathway by which we win this fight, with an enemy that is increasingly panicked and desperate by any means possible to shut down what is a very viable LaRouche option. And I think that really captures where

we are today, and why we have to be so aggressive, joyfully aggressive, about the potential mankind has if we can win this fight in the United States, because it's certainly winnable today.

So I'll add that, and see what else we have to discuss.

OGDEN: Great. You mentioned this event up in New York City, I think that also actually goes to the point, of, number one, the LaRouche movement – Lyndon LaRouche, Helga LaRouche – when it comes down to it are the leading authorities in the room,

and the representatives of the LaRouche movement are the leading

authorities in the room, on exactly this question: How would Alexander Hamilton apply the American System in this present situation? But number two, it makes the point that the world is

a completely different place, following this Belt and Road Forum

that happened in Beijing. One of the organizers of that event in

New York obviously had been at the Belt and Road Forum, changed his attitude. Helga LaRouche's presence at the Belt and Road Forum is a very key reference point; I think that this really allows us to put two bookends on maybe the last 20 years of history at least, from the collapse of the Soviet Union and the proposal of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, this New Silk Road idea, when it originally came out of the LaRouche movement in 1990-1991. And then the adoption of that in 2013 by Xi Jinping, and then this world-historic forum with Helga Zepp-LaRouche herself, personally in attendance. And so, she continues to make the point, the world has completely changed. The world is a different place, now that this dynamic has begun to consolidate itself. And this is the reality which Americans continue to fail to recognize, and must be presented with. The opportunities are {so} strong for a direct participation, by the United States in this initiative, coming from China but also with strong support from Putin in Russia, and it's already changing the reality on the ground, as you said, in places like Africa, has a strong potential to be the key to peace in the Middle East and so forth. But you made the point, there is nobody, even despite all the best intentions to say "we need to build infrastructure, we need to create jobs, we need to increase manufacturing," there's nobody who understands the science of economics behind how you do that, other than the leadership of the LaRouche movement right now. People should remember in the context, obviously, of what we've been talking about with these threats against President

Trump – I mean, he did make these two speeches referencing the American System, several months ago now, but they were a leading feature of his economic initiative. But who was the founder of the American System? It was Alexander Hamilton. What fate did Alexander Hamilton meet? It was Aaron Burr, it was the duel which killed Alexander Hamilton: {This has been the fight in the United States} since the founding of the United States, and before. Will the United States adopt a scientific approach to economics as it was elaborated by Alexander Hamilton, which is based on the recognition that the creative powers of the human mind {are} what creates wealth? This is what changes the platform over time, as new technologies are introduced, step by step; or, will the United States continue to be a satrapy of the British Imperial system, as we've seen, increasingly over the last 50 years. This is the role that the United States has played. And now we have the opportunity from outside of the United States, from elsewhere, from China and other countries who are adopting exactly this kind of development perspective for the United States to reclaim its birthright, and to become, again, that Hamiltonian type of nation that we were founded to become. So, as people continue to become disillusioned with the kind of propaganda that they're being fed, day in and day out, about what this Russia-gate thing is all about, the proper perspective is needed, and you need to be able to step back and say, "what's the real issue here? What is the conjunctural point in world history that we find ourselves at? And what's the decision-

making

point, which we're being confronted with?"

So that's the kind of leadership I think, but it's not just a question of where does the United States go? It's a question

of do we recognize that the world has completely changed, and are

we at the point of saying, "Yes, that's the change, that's the next 25 years, that's the next 50 years, and we have to put behind us the failed system which is now collapsing."

I don't know if you want to say a little bit more about the change in the attitude of the American people, Michael. I mean, I

would like to see what the effect is if this Oliver Stone interview receives more widespread circulation, what people's reaction to that will be, but even up to this point.

STEGER: Yeah, we can say, we know for certain an increasing number of the American people are getting fed up and frustrated

by the outright obstruction of the Trump Presidency. I mean, Trump does have a real base in the American people, and most Americans don't want to see their government overthrown by a CIA/FBI/{New York Times}/Wall Street operation – they just don't. They might be intimidated; there might be a {vox populi}

kind of French mob out there. But most Americans are not of that nature.

And they're fighting back. We see this in field squads in New Jersey and throughout other parts of the country, that many

people are wanting to come over to the table and discuss it. You

know, we have signs "Defend Trump, Stop the Coup, Support Trump.

Stop here." "End the British Empire, Arrest Obama." So it's

very

clear that people are willing to fight if there's a quality of leadership. But we have to make it very clear to the people around President Trump and to him directly, you will not be able

to accomplish anything, if you don't change the system.

Perhaps we put it in the form of an analogy: You know, Trump can change the building all he wants to – he can put in new walls, he can expand it, he can build it taller, he can build

it bigger, he can change the electrical system, he can change the

plumbing system, he can do all those things if he wants to, to the building. The problem is, he's not going to actually give the building long-term survival if he doesn't change the foundation.

The foundation of a nation's economy is the system which allows it to grow and develop, it's its credit system, and right

now our credit system is locked into Wall Street. Just a couple

of numbers stand out: \$6 trillion was spent on the wars over the

last 15 years, since we launched the war in Afghanistan.

There's

\$4 trillion apparently on the Federal Reserve books, largely from

buying junk speculative assets from Wall Street banks. That's \$10 trillion. So the credit of our country has been locked up for 15 years in these wars, in these bailouts, – like you said,

20, 25 years, the American people have been living under a reign

of psychological and political terror for 20, 25 years.

Now, at the same time, China's been creating this development perspective. So if Trump's going to create a change

in the orientation, he's really going to fulfill what he intends to – and you see it, he references the Hoover Dam, the Erie Canal, he talks about the big infrastructure projects that have transformed the nation's industry and its political direction, like Roosevelt did, like Hamilton did. But if he's going to do it, he's going to have to change the fundamental foundations of how that system is functioning. He's going to have to move the nation's credit back into the hands, of a focus of industry, science, and agriculture of the country. He's going to have to not just repair some infrastructure projects but set an entirely new platform and let that platform, which will last for another hundred years, it'll be a century-long platform – much like our infrastructure today is nearly a century old. But upon that platform will allow an understanding of how to make the immediate repairs we need to.

This is what he's got to do. This is the LaRouche program, the Four Laws. And I know from what Diane Saxe and Elliot Greenspan have described, we are clearly increasingly collaborating with members and leadership from China; there were leadership from China at this event in New York City just the other day. We'll be having further conferences with leading figures from China on infrastructure. We're in discussion with people throughout New York City. There is a potential and Elliot described it last night [on the Activitists' Call]: If we

work

with the Chinese today, if we started today, within just two years we can resolve immediately the infrastructure and transit

crisis in New York City, as a first step move, setting a new platform for every nation's cities and the connection between those cities on a regional and national basis.

There is an outlook we can take, but you have to change the foundations of the system the way Hamilton established, the way

Lincoln and Roosevelt applied it. And that's critical. The American people see the coup. They don't like it. They're ready

if there's leadership, but they also have to be given a direction

and they also have to be given a chance, to begin to build the country. And Trump's really got to take on these big challenges.

And again, I think the question for Trump, as Putin himself expressed, and as any real President – you maybe can say more on

this about John Kennedy, Matt, since his 100th birthday just passed – but the question any true President faces is a question

of immortality. Because what are you really there to do? And the tough questions challenge that sense, and I think the recent

political attack we saw in Virginia, the murder attempt, are going to confront this Presidency, and the leadership around him,

to have to make a decision: Are they really going to fight for the future of the American people? Putin had to make the same decision when he came into office in 1999-2000; every true President, as Lincoln did, FDR did – he faced near assassination

before his inauguration; Kennedy certainly faced it, and knew it.

And that's the question that Trump has to face, but the LaRouche program provides the alternative link, not only to end this coup, but to really launch a Renaissance for the United States.

OGDEN: About John Kennedy, he made numerous speeches which addressed that question of the immortality of the leadership of the country, in directly the terms of infrastructure. He went down to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and he said, – this was 1961 or 1962 – and he said, it was because of the decisions that Franklin Roosevelt took 30 years before, that we are able to even stand here today and look at these wonderful projects and it transformed this entire region of the country. But it makes us ask the question: Thirty years from now, once we are out of office and once we are dead and gone, what will future generations say about us? What great projects will we have built, just as FDR did for us at that time; and in 1991 or 1992, what will people living at that time say that we did for the future of the United States and for the human race? Obviously, Kennedy's greatest legacy was the space program. But it's that same kind of question, which now must be asked, and always must be asked by any great leader of any country. So I concur: That's the kind of question which President Putin very eloquently put on the table and repeatedly. And he said, unfortunately, there are very few people within the United States who think in these terms – although there are some. And I think those are the people who are responsible for taking the

leadership of the United States and consolidating this, making it work.

Michael, I think you make the point very clearly: If President Trump is going to outflank this coup attempt, not only must it be exposed in no uncertain terms, head on; but also, he must deliver on the vision and the campaign promises which the American people elected him around. And it cannot be in a piecemeal way, it has to be from the standpoint of a Hamiltonian national vision, funded by, as you say, trillions of dollars of direct Federal credit. It can't be done in any other way. But if he begins to deliver on that, the American people will be on his side and will give him the backup which he's going to need.

So: Thanks a lot Michael. We're going to be circulating even more – there was an email that went out to all of the subscribers to the LaRouche PAC email list, on some of the background material that you need to understand the timeline behind this attempted coup against the Trump Administration going all the way back to the inauguration, if not before. And I think we covered a little bit of that in detail.

And I continue to emphasize the importance of this statement that Lyndon LaRouche put out now a week ago, last Saturday, titled: "Stop the FBI Fraud: Stop the Coup against the President

– What the Lying Media Are Not Telling You!" We already know that this has received pretty wide circulation, but it's something which can continue to be circulated.

Thank you very much Michael. I think we can probably have a

countdown to this G20 summit which is coming up in less than three weeks; and look forward to some real changes in the same we

had the relationship between the United States and China; now some changes in terms of the potential for cooperation between the United States and Russia.

I'd like to thank people for tuning in tonight. Please subscribe to our YouTube channel if you haven't yet; subscribe to

our daily email list. You can get active at the Action Center at

larouchepac.com, and join in what we're doing here with the LaRouche movement across the United States. So thanks a lot, and

good night.