

Hvorfor USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og Tyskland må overvinde geopolitik. □

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

29. januar, 2017 – Verden er så sandelig af lave. Men én ting er helt sikkert: Den aktuelle, mangesidige krise vil ikke blive overvundet efter gamle opskrifter, og slet ikke ved hjælp af geopolitiske skaktræk, 'farvede revolutioner' à la George Soros eller den måske knap så liberale udgiver af *Der Zeit*, Josef Joffes gammeltestamentlige 'Øje for øje ...'. I stedet har vi brug for et højere fornuftsplan, som definerer alle verdens nationers fælles interesse. Præcis dette plan er netop blevet demonstreret af den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov i hans seneste tale for den russiske Duma, hvor han foreslog en alliance mellem Washington, Moskva og Beijing for at finde løsninger på de globale udfordringer.

Med en modifikation af Schillers digt, »Ved det nye århundredes begyndelse« (*Der Antritt des neuen Jahrhunderts*) kunne man næsten sige: »To magtsystemer strides om eneherredømmet over verden«, nemlig det gamle, geopolitiske, krigsbefordrende system og så det nye, fremtidsorienterede paradigme for menneskehedens fælles skæbne. Repræsentanterne for den første, til undergang dømte, hidtidige, neoliberale globaliseringsorden reagerer på det opfattede tab af magt med verbale udbrud, der opfylder de kliniske betingelser for betegnelsen hysteri. Der er øjensynligt heller ikke megen ære blandt tyve i denne lejr, f.eks. de forskellige fraktioner. Det bedste eksempel: Theresa Mays besøg i Washington, som havde til formål at »indhegne« den nye, amerikanske administration i Det britiske Imperiums »fold«. I modsætning hertil er den nye orden orienteret mod ganske andre principper, en orden, som baserer sig på win-win-samarbejdet

omkring Kinas Nye Silkevej, og som hastigt ekspanderer.

Den vigtigste intervention i denne henseende kom fra Sergei Lavrov: »Vi mener, at opbygningen af relationerne mellem Rusland, USA og Kina hverken er ekskluderende eller involverer projekter, som vækker bekymring for andre stater; disse relationer er åbne og fair. Jeg er overbevist om, at Ruslands, USA's og Kinas økonomiske strukturer på mange måder komplementerer hinanden i materiel og økonomisk henseende.« Disse tre nationer kunne ligeledes med hensyn til internationale sikkerhedsspørgsmål spille en vigtig rolle. Rusland og Kina har allerede haft et godt samarbejde inden for dette område og forventer, at Donald Trump, der allerede har udtalt, at USA ikke længere vil blande sig i andre landes interne anliggender, ligeledes vil samarbejde.

Talskvinde for det Kinesiske Udenrigsministerium, Hua Chunying, støttede omgående det russiske forslag om et trilateralt samarbejde mellem disse tre nationer, som alle har global indflydelse og er permanente medlemmer af FN's Sikkerhedsråd. De har et stort ansvar for stabilitet og udvikling, sagde hun.

Hvis Donald Trump skulle vælge et tæt samarbejde med Rusland, Kina og Indien, ville dette virkelig være enden på geopolitik. Frygten for noget sådant drev øjensynligt den britiske premierminister Theresa May til, som det første, udenlandske statsoverhoved, at opsøge Trump og dér uden pauser rave løs om den vidunderlige relation mellem Reagan og Thatcher, som har »eksistensen af den moderne verden« at takke for. Denne angloamerikanske særlige relation måtte nu atter overtage lederskabet for den nye tidsalder, iflg. May. *London Times* påpegede, at May på ingen måde undervurderede Trump, men derimod ville »tappe ind« i den stemning, der havde ført til Brexit, som vigtige, ideologiske broer til Trumps Hvide Hus. *Financial Times* fantaserede over en anden hensigt med Mays mission, nemlig at udnytte denne særlige relation til at splitte Rusland og Kina gennem alle mulige koncessioner og

manipulationer. *New York Times* havde overskriften: »Britisk tilpasning til Trump sætter europæisk orden på spil«, med en hentydning til Trumps negative holdning til EU.

Den totale virkelighedsfornægtelse hos tilhængerne i den geopolitiske fraktion fremavler sære blomster. Således skriver Joffe som argument imod Trumps protektionistiske forholdsregler, at globaliseringen havde »skabt en eventyrlig rigdom, som oppebar den storslåede socialstat og afbødede stødene for taberne. Protektionisme er til gavn for favoriserede industrier, men lader landet forarme – de svage først«.

Det er den klassiske, neoliberale »narrativ«; at det er fantastisk, at kasinoøkonomiens profitmagere er blevet eventyrligt rige og dernæst spiser taberne af med almisser, og herved fremstiller sig selv som ædle. Det er netop som en modstand imod dette snæversyn, at Brexit, valget af Trump og den italienske folkeafstemnings Nej til forfatningsændring var rettet. Joffes konklusion, nemlig, at Europa måtte overtage USA's rolle, »for at redde den liberale verdensorden«, er lige så latterlig som avisen *Die Welts* spørgsmål: »Bliver kansler Merkel en modspiller til den amerikanske præsident Trump og leder af det frie Vesten?« Norbert Röttgen – fra partiet CDU – føler øjensynligt tilsvarende ambitioner for sig selv og overgår sig selv den ene gang efter den anden. Han vil gå i opposition til Trump med »nye selskabs-alliancer« og sætter i denne henseende øjensynligt sine forhåbninger til folk som McCain.

Der findes kun én sikker måde, hvorpå den her skitserede uorden kan overvindes: Et højere fornuftsplan for alle verdens nationers fælles interesser må etableres, og på hvilket plan de formentlige modsætninger forsvinder. Grundlaget for overvindelse af denne krise udgøres af de Fire, grundlæggende, økonomiske Love, som Lyndon LaRouche har defineret:

*** Som den første, bydende nødvendige forholdsregel må det**

transatlantiske finanssystems truende sammenbrud, der vil blive langt værre end det i 2008, forhindres gennem genindførelsen af Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven. Under anførsel af LaRouche Politiske Aktionskomite er mange organisationer i USA i øjeblikket mobiliseret for at forøge presset på Trump for at holde sine valgløfter og senest i sin Tale om Nationens Tilstand (den 28. februar) indføre Glass/Steagall-loven i dens oprindelige form fra 1933.

* **For det andet**, så må der skabes en Nationalbank i Alexander Hamiltons tradition, og hvis absolut eneste formål må være, strengt efter principperne for fysisk økonomi at finansiere investeringer i infrastruktur, industri og grundforskning, som øger arbejdskraftens og den industrielle kapacitets produktivitet, og således frembringer fuld, produktiv beskæftigelse.

* **For det tredje** må et internationalt kreditsystem efter de samme principper muliggøre et langfristet, internationalt samarbejde omkring genopbygningen af verdensøkonomien.

* **For det fjerde** må det fremtidsorienterede, højere plan etableres, som er nødvendigt for at skabe en virkelig fredsorden, gennem et internationalt samarbejde omkring et forceret program for at virkeliggøre kernefusionsteknologien, der vil give menneskeheden sikkerhed for forsyningen af energi og råstoffer, samt omkring udforskningen af rummet.

Hvis Trump tager imod Lavrovs tilbud, og der kommer et konstruktivt samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina, vil et sådant win-win-samarbejde også være inden for rækkevidde for alle andre nationer. De første kontakter mellem Trump og den indiske premierminister Modi har allerede ført til positive hensigtserklæringer.

Under disse omstændigheder må Tyskland tilslutte sig denne nye, strategiske alliance. Der er i vores egeninteresse at samarbejde med USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og mange andre

stater omkring den økonomiske opbygning af Mellemøsten og det øvrige Sydvestasien, såvel som også at gå i gang med den længe udsatte opgave med at industrialisere Afrika. Kun på denne måde vil flygtningekrisen blive løst på en human måde og til dels gøre godt for det faktum, at vi så længe har set passivt til, hhv. tilladt, at Bush', Obamas, Blairs og Camerons angrebskrige i Sydvestasien fandt sted; at de europæiske regeringer indirekte eller delvist støttede disse krige.

Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier har ret i sin iagttagelse, at, med valget af Trump, er det 20. århundredes gamle orden endegyldigt forbi. Og det er en meget god ting. Det påhviler os alle at bidrage til, at den nye orden vil retfærdiggøre menneskets sande identitet som kreativ skabning, hvor vi koncentrerer os om de store opgaver, som vi alene, blandt alle eksisterende, levende væsner, kan løse. Til dette hører sådanne spørgsmål som selve livets karakteristik, den menneskelige kreativitets rolle i universet og udviklingsprincippet i universet, som, ifølge vores nuværende erkendelsesniveau, består af henved to billioner galakser. Og ikke mindst, spørgsmålet om realiseringen af en skøn karakter ved hjælp af den æstetiske opdragelse.

Briterne i hektisk aktivitet for at ødelægge Trump og redde Imperiet

Leder af LaRouchePAC, 31. januar, 2017 – Massedemonstrationerne imod præsident Trump og nyhedsmediernes 24-timers dækning, hvor han fordømmes, er ikke alene hykleriske, men demonstrerer, at briterne er ved at blive

hysteriske over, at de er i færd med at miste kontrollen over USA. Siden Franklin Roosevelts død, og i særdeleshed siden det britiske mord på John F. Kennedy, har det britiske system fået et fast greb i Washington. Mens Wall Street overtog den totale kontrol over nationens økonomiske politik og brugte den britiske »frihandel« til at erstatte Hamiltons dirigerede kreditpolitik, brugte briterne også USA som den »dumme kæmpe« til at føre kolonikrige på vegne af London og Wall Street, fra Vietnam og til evindelige krige imod suveræne, fredelige nationer i Mellemøsten under både Bush og Obama. Dette opretholdt den imperiale opdeling af verden i Øst versus Vest og førte til Obamas sluttelige bestræbelser på at fremprovokere en krig mellem USA/NATO og Rusland og Kina.

Nu truer Donald Trump med at vælte hele imperiesystemet, hvor han etablerer et partnerskab med Rusland for at besejre terroristsvøben (som i sig selv er en skabelse af briterne og deres kontrollerede monarki i Saudi-Arabien); hvor han afslutter frihandelspolitikken, hvis virkning var, at Vesten nedlagde sine egne industrier og udnyttede billig arbejdskraft i de underudviklede nationer; hvor han gør op med anti-vækst og svindelen med den anti-videnskabelige globale opvarmning; og hvor han lover at genoprette Det amerikanske, økonomiske System gennem Glass-Steagall for at genopbygge amerikansk industri, infrastruktur og videnskabelig forskning. Det er langt fra sikkert, at Trump vil opfylde disse løfter, men den blotte trussel om det har fået det britiske monarkis blå blod til at fryse.

Nu fører den britiske »Stop krigen«-koalition an i protesterne imod den selv samme person, der har stoppet Obamas evindelige krige! Den britiske agent George Soros finansierer massedemonstrationer imod Trump i USA, for, formentlig, at være anti-muslim, alt imens Soros støtter Obama, der slog titusinder af muslimer ihjel og drev millioner af muslimer ud af deres hjem. Trump fordømmes som værende »anti-videnskabelig«, fordi han afviser den forskruede Prins Charles

og dennes miljøfantasier, og i stedet kræver fornyet udforskning af rummet og ægte, videnskabelig forskning.

Den alvorligste fejltagelse, som den nye præsident har begået – hans valg af Steven Mnuchin, der er imod Glass-Steagall (og sætter folk ud af deres hjem på striben), som sin finansminister – blev i dag forpurret af en boykot fra de Demokratiske medlemmer af Senatets Finanskomite. Ved at nægte at deltage i det planlagte komitemøde for at stemme om Mnuchins godkendelse, har de nægtet en »tværpolitisk« godkendelse, som det kræves, og således udsat godkendelsen på ubestemt tid og skabt tid til yderligere bestræbelser for at blokere for godkendelsen. En massemobilisering fra LaRouchePAC-støtter og andre for at standse Mnuchins godkendelse vil fortsætte ud over denne midlertidige sejr og vil omfatte en betydelig delegation fra hele Østkysten til Capitol Hill på onsdag, som tilsigter at tvinge spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall frem i den politisk kaotiske situations forreste frontlinje. I betragtning af Mnuchins 15 år lange associering til George Soros, bør Republikanerne også forstå, hvorfor hans godkendelse må stoppes.

Vil amerikanerne og europæerne kapitulere til den fascistiske idé, at en amerikansk leder, der er i opposition til kolonikrige og forpligtet over for industrielt fremskridt, på en eller anden måde skulle være det modsatte af »vestlige ideer«? I årevis har det angloamerikanske oligarki og deres pressehorer bragt den løgn til torvs, at russisk og kinesisk »aggression« må stoppes for at redde »vestlige værdier«, når fakta er, at Rusland og Kina har taget føringen mht. at fremme den vestlige civilisations historiske, men kasserede værdier – og således giver tryghed og velstand til deres egne befolkninger og, gennem processen med den Nye Silkevej, bringer denne tryghed og velstand til resten af verden. I mellemtiden er USA sunket ned i massearbejdsløshed og underbeskæftigelse, sammenbrud af vareproduktion, en narkoepidemi uden fortilfælde og dyb, kulturel dekadence, mens

nationen under præsident Obama har befundet sig i en permanent tilstand af krig, hvor Obama stolt, på ugentlig basis, udarbejder en liste over »dronedrab«. Var det »vestlige ideer«?

Øjeblikket er svangert med muligheder for et nyt paradigme, der forener verdens folk i en ny renæssance, baseret på videnskab og det bedste fra alle nationers klassiske kultur. Dette vil ikke komme fra Donald Trump; men den kendsgerning, at han bryder Det britiske Imperiums lænker og arbejder sammen med Rusland og potentielt også med Kina om global udvikling, skaber grundlaget for, at verden kan respondere til Lyndon LaRouches historiske lederskab for en ny, virkeligt menneskelig verden.

Foto: Processen med 'farvede revolutioner', styret af Soros, har nu ramt USA for fuld styrke.

Trump og de britiske royale har slet ikke en »særlig relation«

30. jan., 2017 – Den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump udviser stærk modstand mod at blive kontrolleret af Londons imperie-elite. På trods af den britiske premierminister Theresa Mays forsøg på at spille en Margaret Thatcher med den »russiske trussel«, reagerede Trump stærkt, om end sarkastisk, under deres fælles pressekonference, hvor en reporter fra BBC angreb ham omkring flere af hans politikker. Traditionen tro havde May, som besøgende regeringsleder, valgt den første spørger. Da BBC-reporterens ordsqualder endte, sagde Trump til May: »Var det, hvad du valgte som det første spørgsmål? Dér

røg den særlige relation.«

Londonavisen *Sunday Times*, og nu også alle andre aviser i UK, rapporterer, at Trump ønsker at undgå Prins Charles fuldstændigt under et forestående statsbesøg til UK, fordi Trump har aversion mod at blive belært om klimaforandring.

»Han vil ikke finde sig i at blive belært af nogen, ikke engang et medlem af kongefamilien«, citerer *Sunday Times* en kilde i Det Hvide Hus. »For at sige det ligeud; de bør tænke sig om to gange, hvis de vil sætte Trump og Prins Charles sammen i det samme lokale.«

Charles på sin side udsendte søndag en tweet, der direkte fornærmede Trump. I mellemtiden kræver en appel, der har fået en halv million underskrifter i UK, at Dronningen ikke mødes med Trump; måske aflyser hun det og sparer ham for prøvelsen.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 30. januar
2017:**

**Hvad vælger Trump? Den
»særlige relation« til
Storbritannien, eller
Rusland/Kina/Indien?**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Mobilisér for at genindføre Glass/Steagall- bankopdelingsloven NU; stands et globalt finanssammenbrud!

Det følgende er Helga Zepp-LaRouches åbningsbemærkninger til et hasteaktivistmøde (i USA, pr. tlf.) søndag 29. januar, 2017:

Jeg tror, alle ved, at, med valget af Donald Trump, har verden totalt forandret sig. Den tyske udenrigsminister Steinmeier sagde det knivskarpt, at valget af Trump betyder afslutningen på det 20. århundredes orden.

Det er helt klart, at USA nu står over for et valg: Det ene valg består i at fortsætte med den »særlige relation« med Storbritannien, som har været grundlaget for den unipolære verden i de seneste 25 år, mere eller mindre, med få undtagelser under Clinton-årene. Og det står ganske klart, at briterne gerne vil fortsætte med dette, hvilket er grunden til, at Theresa May var den første regeringsleder, der kom (til Washington) for at forsøge at genetablere denne særlige relation, og som ville være meget, meget dårligt.

På den anden side, så foreligger det klare perspektiv, at USA går ind i en strategisk alliance med Rusland – og muligvis Kina og Indien – hvilket ville skabe grundlaget for virkelig at bevæge verdenspolitik over i et fuldstændig nyt paradigme med samarbejde mellem store nationer for at løse presserende problemer, såsom den økonomiske krise, problemet med

terrorisme og mange andre lignende problemer.

Det står ganske klart fra den første uge af Trumps præsidentembede, at han har til hensigt at gennemføre alle sine valgløfter. Set fra mit standpunkt, så er det meget vigtigt, at – i betragtning af, at problemerne er så mangeartede – folk ikke flipper ud over denne eller hin handling, men virkelig koncentrerer sig om de to, absolut mest afgørende spørgsmål, uden hvilke absolut intet andet kan løses. Det første, meget, meget afgørende spørgsmål er, at Trump lovede at forbedre relationerne med Rusland, og det er, for verdensfredens skyld, det absolut vigtigste spørgsmål. For, hvis Hillary Clinton havde gennemført sin politik for Syrien, med flyveforbudszonerne og hele den provokerende politik over for Rusland i særdeleshed, ville vi have været på en meget kort vej til Tredje Verdenskrig.

Den kendsgerning, at Donald Trump i går talte med fem af verdens ledere – heriblandt præsident Putin fra Rusland, og at de tilsyneladende etablerede en god forståelse – er af højeste, strategiske vigtighed. Og ser man på det, som Det Hvide Hus og Kreml bagefter udstedte, så er dette virkelig vigtigt, for »Trump overbragte sine ønsker om lykke og velstand for det russiske folk og sagde, at det amerikanske folk havde varme følelser for Rusland og dets borgere«.

Dette er meget, meget vigtigt, og jeg mener, at vi virkelig bør forstå, at, hvis USA og Rusland kan fikse deres forhold, så kan alle andre problemer potentielt set tackles.

Det andet, absolut vigtigste spørgsmål er selvfølgelig, at Trump under sin valgkamp lovede at genindføre Glass-Steagall, for alle ved, at verden stadig befinder sig i absolut fare for en gentagelse af sammenbruddet i 2008, som denne gang ville blive langt, langt værre end selv kollapset af Lehman Brothers og AIG i september 2008, af den simple grund, at for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-bankerne er vokset med 40 % eller endda mere, derivaterne er vokset, og alle centralbankernes såkaldte

instrumenter er blevet opbrugt, inklusive kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), inklusive hele spørgsmålet om bail-out (statslig bankredning) og om helikopter-penge, som diskuteres.

Faren for banksystemets kollaps er således en afgjort trussel, der hænger over *hele* verden.

Det er ganske klart, at Wall Street selvfølgelig ikke vil have Glass-Steagall, fordi det, for at sige det mildt, ville reducere deres magt enormt; *men det er en absolut forudsætning for at fikse situationen*. Hr. LaRouche har ikke alene talt om Glass-Steagall, men han har også, på videnskabeligt grundlag, defineret de Fire, grundlæggende Love, som det er absolut afgørende, bliver implementeret, for at få verden ud af denne krise. Disse Fire Love er:

☒ * Glass-Steagall, præcis, som Franklin D. Roosevelt implementerede denne lov i 1933;

* En Nationalbank i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton;

* Et nyt kreditsystem (også i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton);

* Og dernæst selvfølgelig, et forceret program for højteknologisk fusionsenergi og internationalt samarbejde omkring rumforskning som den absolut nødvendige måde, hvorpå arbejdskraftens produktivitet, der er kollapsede, kan forøges.

(Se: Lyndon LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love:)

Det faktum, at den forventede levealder i USA for første gang er *faldet*, er den klareste indikator, for, at, hvis en økonomi kolliderer, så falder den forventede levealder.

Dette er formålet med dette aktivistmøde, for desværre sagde den nominerede finansminister Mnuchin under sin høring i Senatet med senator Maria Cantwell, at han ikke støtter Glass-Steagall i FDR's form – han sagde, det var 'en meget gammel lov' – men at han vil have en lov 'for det 21. århundrede',

for ellers vil markederne ikke have tilstrækkelig med likviditet. Se, dette argument er forkert, for, hvis man etablerer en Nationalbank i Alexander Hamiltons tradition, samt et kreditsystem i Alexander Hamilton tradition, så vil præcis dette system yde kredit til produktiv investering. Så dette argument er ikke relevant, og denne nominering (til finansministerposten) kunne blive Trump-administrationens Akilleshæl, hvis det ikke rettes. For jeg tror, alle har set det enorme oprør; der finder en deployering sted på vegne af det selv samme Britiske Imperium, der forsøger at fastholde Trump i den 'særlige relation' med Storbritannien, men det forhindrer dem ikke i at deployere George Soros og princippet om 'farvede revolutioner' – det samme princip, der blev deployeret imod Ukraine i 2004 med den 'Orange Revolution', eller i Georgien, eller i det Arabiske Forår – hvor man grundlæggende set vil bruge de samme midler for en farvet revolution til at få et regimeskifte, denne gang imod Trump.

Dette er altså ikke en fredelig tid; dette er ikke en tid, hvor man sidde det ud, men jeg mener, at det faktum, at Trump har vist, at han ønsker at gennemføre sine valgløfter, virkelig er meget lovende. Men jeg mener, at vi har brug for en mobilisering, der sikrer, at denne absolut afgørende flanke med Glass-Steagall ikke forpasses, for det er den ene ting, der virkelig ville kunne ødelægge hele potentialet.

Lad mig slutte her. Jeg mener, at folk i USA må være bevidste om, at hele verden ser på dette valg af Trump med store håb – ikke de gamle neoliberale folk og de folk, der tror på en konfrontation med Rusland og Kina – men en masse mennesker, i Indien, i Europa, ser på potentialet i Trump-administrationen med store forventninger og håb. Det er en unik historisk chance, så meget afhænger af at få det til at virke.

Potentialet eksisterer, med Kinas Nye Silkevej, der allerede nu er et nyt finansielt og økonomisk samarbejde på en »win-win«-basis, hvor flere end 70 nationer samarbejder; tilbuddet til USA om at få en Ny Silkevej passer præcis sammen med

Trumps løfte om at investere \$1 billion i et infrastrukturprogram i USA og således lancere en økonomisk genrejsning. Men, det forudsætter den originale Glass/Steagall-lov.

Jeg vil slutte her, for dette er virkelig kernen i situationen, og jeg mener, at vi har brug for jer alle for at hjælpe med og intervenere.

Lyndon LaRouche (med på linjen): Dette understreger jeg.

Theresa Mays besøg i Det Hvide Hus var klassisk, britisk, geopolitisk intervention

27. jan., 2017 – Fra første øjeblik, hun åbnede munden på et møde i det Republikanske Parti den 26. jan., gjorde den britiske premierminister Theresa May det klart, at hendes besøg i Washington havde til hensigt at sikre, at præsident Donald Trump ikke forvilder sig bort fra den britiske, geopolitiske fold. Med stor fanfare meddelte hun i en fælles pressekonference i dag i Det Hvide Hus, at Hendes Majestæt Dronningen havde inviteret Trump til et statsbesøg senere på året, og at han havde accepteret indbydelsen.

May kartede rundt i den »særlige relation« *ad nauseam* (så man var ved at kvæles i det ...) og nævnte Ronald Reagans og Margaret Thatchers samarbejde og udgød, at »vi har gjort alting sammen ... vi skabte den moderne verden«, og nu »har vi muligheden for – ja, ansvaret for – at forny den særlige

relation for denne nye tidsalder – muligheden for atter at lede sammen.«

Lede hvorhen? Hen til at støtte NATO 100 %, f.eks. I dagens pressekonference erklærede May, at dette var Trumps standpunkt, selv om han knap nok nævnte dette. Som hun sagde i går aftes, »Amerikas lederskabsrolle i NATO – støttet af Storbritannien – må være det centrale element, omkring hvilket Alliancen er bygget.«

May advarede skarpt Republikanerne om, at politikken over for Rusland bør være den, »at engagere, men være varsom« – engagere med Rusland ud fra en styrkeposition og forsikre de østeuropæiske nationer om, »at deres sikkerhed ikke står på spil«. I dagens pressekonference svarede Trump på et spørgsmål om den mulige ophævelse af sanktionerne mod Rusland, at, alt imens det var for tidligt at sige noget om dette, så »håber jeg, vi får et fantastisk forhold til Rusland. Hvis vi sammen går efter ISIS, vil jeg anse det for at være en god ting ... Hvis vi kan få et fremragende forhold til Rusland og Kina, er jeg helt for. Det ville være en enormt aktiv.«

May indskød hurtigt, at hendes regering insisterer på, at sanktionerne fortsætter, indtil Rusland fuldt ud agerer i overensstemmelse med Minsk-aftalerne. Uenighed omkring nogle spørgsmål er naturligt, tilføjede hun koket, men formindsker ikke den tætte relation.

Under drøftelser af kampen mod Daesh og islamisk ekstremisme, sagde May ved GOP-mødet, at »vi må arbejde internationalt«, men dette betyder tilsyneladende ikke en afvisning af regimeskift. Hun understregede, at et sådant samarbejde betyder ikke alene en sikring af »en politisk løsning i Syrien, men også at udfordre alliancen mellem det syriske regime og dets støtter i Teheran«.

May udtrykte sin bekymring over, at lande med »meget lidt tradition for demokrati, frihed og menneskerettigheder – især

Kina og Rusland – er blevet mere selvhævdende inden for globale anliggender« og rejste frygten for, at der kunne komme en 'formørkelse' af Vesten i betragtning af den finansielle krise »og dens nedfald«, tab af tillid i Vesten i kølvandet på 11. september og »vanskelige militære interventioner i Irak og Afghanistan«. »Ansvaret for at lede« betyder ikke en tilbagevenden til »fortidens forfejlede politikker«, sagde hun. Men vi kan ikke stå passivt og se til, »når truslen er reel. Vi må altid gå i brechen for vore venner«.

Foto: USA's præsident Donald Trump og Storbritanniens premierminister Theresa May i Det Hvide Hus under hendes besøg. Over deres hoveder ses et portræt af Thomas Jefferson, en af USA's grundlæggende fædre og hovedforfatteren af Uafhængighedserklæringen (fra britisk koloniherrredømme, selvsagt), og senere USA's tredje præsident, og over ildstedet et portræt af George Washington, en anden af de grundlæggende fædre, der stod i spidsen for den amerikanske hær i Uafhængighedskrigen mod briterne, og senere blev USA's første præsident ...

Sergei Lavrov: Det er de vesteuropæiske ledere, der forsøgte at influere på USA's valg, ikke Rusland

19. jan., 2017 – Under en pressekonference i Moskva den 18. jan. med den østrigske udenrigsminister, Sebastien Kurz, og den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov, fandt følgende ordveksling sted:

Spørgsmål: På det seneste har de vestlige medier svirret med historier om kompromitterende materiale, læk, skræmmehistorier om spionage og plantede historier. Rusland nævnes og anklages for ikke alene hackerangreb, men for næsten alt muligt. Kunne De kommentere på dette?

Sergei Lavrov: Vi er ærligt talt blevet træt af at diskutere spørgsmålet og russisk indblanding i USA's interne anliggender, i særdeleshed valgkampagnen, der endte med Donald Trumps valgsejr til præsident. Fordi disse grundløse, ikke-beviste bagtalelsesanklager fortsætter med at cirkulere, vil jeg gerne sige, at det kyniske i denne situation er, at vi bliver anklaget af dem, der rent faktisk selv intervererede i valgkampagnen.

Rusland har gentagne gange erklæret, at vi er rede til at arbejde sammen med enhver præsident, som det amerikanske folk vælger i overensstemmelse med amerikansk lov ... Men, ulig os, så talte flere ledere af USA's allierede lande imidlertid til fordel for Hillary Clintons kampagne. Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel, den franske præsident François Hollande, UK's premierminister Theresa May og ledere af andre europæiske stater var aktivt involveret i dette. Hvad mere er, udover direkte at føre valgkampagne for Hillary Clinton, så havde regeringsrepræsentanter for europæiske lande ingen skrupler ved at dæmonisere Donald Trump. For eksempel kaldte min tyske modpart, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, ham for én, der prædikede had. UK's udenrigsminister Boris Johnson sagde endda, at Donald Trump var utilstrækkelig, alt imens daværende franske premierminister Manuel Valls udtalte, at den Republikanske kandidat blev afvist af hele verden. Og alt dette blev sagt, ikke som en hvisken i en snæver kreds, men højt og for hele verden.

Tiden er måske inde til at indrømme, at det ikke var Rusland, men USA's allierede, der groft intervererede i USA's interne anliggender i valgkampen. Og flere af dem kan i øvrigt stadig ikke beherske sig og dæmpe sig ned. Vi blander os ikke i disse

skænderier. Vi holder os, som en principsag, ude af det, der i øjeblikket foregår i USA mellem den afdøde administration og Donald Trumps team. Men angrebene fra Barack Obamas team imod den nyvalgte præsident synes imidlertid til tider hykleriske. For blot et par dage siden, den 15. januar, i et interview med *The Times* og *Bild*, hvor Donald Trump udtale sin mening om den tyske migrationspolitik, sagde min amerikanske modpart John Kerry, at det var uetisk og udgjorde indblanding i tyske interne anliggender. Og dette siges af mennesker, der forsøgte at prædike for andre lande, inklusive Europa, (f.eks. talte Barack Obama personligt mod Brexit), ikke blot i ord, men som intervenserer i andre landes interne anliggender på en måde, der langt fra er uskadelig, med anvendelse af militærmagt, der har til formål at fremtvinge regimeskifte. Dette er derfor udtryk for ikke alene dobbelte standarder, men sandsynligvis tredobbelte standarder. Vi mener, at de folk, der fremkommer med sådanne anklager imod os, hvor de forsøger at lægge skylden (for egne handlinger) over på en andens skuldre, bør rødmæ af skam, i det mindste.

Foto: Sergei Lavrov holdt en fælles pressekonference i Moskva med den østrigske udenrigsminister, Sebastian Kurz, der er på statsbesøg i Moskva efter indbydelse fra Lavrov.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19.
januar 2017:**

Dagen før Trumps indsættelse

Med formang Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

Kom til koncerten:

En Musikalsk Dialog Mellem Kulturer

Fredag den 17. februar 2017, kl. 19,

Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur

Vester Voldgade 11, København.

Gratis adgang.

Kontakt os!: +45 35 43 00 33; 53 57 00 51

**Den britiske
efterretningstjeneste
afslører
sig selv i sine operationer
mod Trump.**

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

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

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

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

Forfatteren til dette dossier hedder Christopher Steele, en ruslandsekspert fra den britiske udenrigs-efterretningstjeneste MI6, der havde fabrikeret dossieret allerede i sommeren 2016. Det cirkulerede i flere måneder blandt amerikanske mediekredse og ansås for så utroværdigt, at der selv i valgkampens heftigste periode ikke var nogen, der ville offentliggøre det. Dossieret blev overgivet direkte til FBI-chefen Comey og derefter endnu engang af senator McCain til FBI, efter at McCain på en sikkerhedskonference i Canada fik en lovprisning at høre fra den tidligere britiske diplomat i Moskva, Sir Andrew Wood, af Steele og dennes troværdighed.

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

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

Så hvad drejer det sig altså om? Eric Denécé, direktør for det franske Center for Intelligence Research, offentliggjorde den følgende analyse under overskriften: »En chokerende mangel på beviser«, efter at han havde læst beretningen fra Ministeriet for Homeland Security og fra FBI om det angivelige russiske indgreb i den amerikanske valgkamp. »Washingtons establishment blev fuldstændig overrasket over Trumps valgsejr og indså, at der ville følge en større hovedrengøring, hvor mange af dets medlemmer ville miste deres politiske stillinger og dermed deres økonomiske privilegier, der var et resultat af deres internationale økonomiske alliancer.«

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

I dette arrangement var EU-bureaukratiet den hemmelige

juniorpartner, der selv nød frugterne af dette globaliseringssystem, selv var opsat på den størst mulige udvidelse af sit imperium, sådan som Robert Cooper åbent indrømmer det, og kun lejlighedsvis konkurrerede om dominansen med City of London og Wall Street. En forudsætning for medlemskabet i denne unipolære verdens establishment-klub var naturligvis også, at man overtog den officielle fremstilling («narrativ»), at det, som det drejede sig om i alle disse destabiliseringer af demokratisk valgte regeringer og disse krige, var »frihed«, »demokrati« og »menneskerettigheder«, alt imens det hos de andre altid drejede sig om »diktatorer« og »dæmoner«. Og naturligvis ville alle de, der havde disse unipolære briller på, i en analyse af »flygtningekrisens årsager« ikke slippe godt fra at nævne dette ved navn, for det ville have betydet, at man måtte have fordømt de ulovlige krige, der har kostet millioner af mennesker livet, og så var man blevet smidt ud af klubben.

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

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

Det spektakulære i operationen mod Trump er imidlertid, at den britiske efterretningstjeneste og dens amerikanske modpart,

der i årtier har arbejdet som »spøgelser« i det skjulte, nu er tvunget til at stille deres totale nøgenhed offentligt til skue. Den sidste dilettantiske påstand fra Steele, der i øvrigt også var en ledende aktør i afsløringen af korrupsionsskandalen i FIFA og var den vigtigste MI6-agent i sagen om mordet på Litvinenko, demonstrerer de direkte interventioner i USA's interne anliggender på vegne af Det britiske Imperium, som blot er et synonym for begrebet »globalisering«.

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

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

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

Trump kræver atomvåbenaftale med Rusland; støtter EU's opløsning

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

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

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

Trump's kritik af Ruslands intervention i Syrien som værende en »meget dårlig ting«, der førte til en »forfærdelig humanitær

situation«, oprørte ikke den transatlantiske elite, og det gjorde hans gentagne erklæring om, at det var »en stor fejltagelse« af Tyskland at have taget syriske flygtninge ind, heller ikke.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15. jan., 2017 – I dag rapporterer londonavisen *Sunday Times*, at Donald Trump og Vladimir Putin har aftalt at mødes inden for et par uger i Reykjavik, Island, for at tage de første skridt til en forbedring af relationerne mellem de to lande. Både Sean Spicer, Trumps pressesekretær, og Kremles talsmand Dmitry Peskov, benægtede hurtigt denne rapport. Spicer tweetede: »100 % falsk.« Peskov sagde til RIA-nyhedsbureauet, at »der hidtil ikke har fundet forhandlinger sted om noget møde«.

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

I sin dækning af historien i *Sunday Times*, bekræftede den britiske avis *Guardian* stort set, at briterne gør alt, hvad der står i deres magt, for at torpedere enhver tilnærmelse mellem USA og Rusland under Trump: »Det er ikke sandsynligt, at nyhederne [om et Trump-Putin møde] vil blive hilst

velkommen af højtplacerede personer i den britiske regering, der frygter, at en intensivering af relationerne mellem USA og Rusland under Trump kan risikere at efterlade Storbritannien ude i kulden. Det er forstået, at Downing Street forventer, at Theresa May vil besøge Trump i Det Hvide Hus i anden halvdel af februar. Storbritannien har krævet sanktioner mod Moskva over Putins aggression i Ukraine og Syrien. Det er forstået, at britisk efterretningstjeneste har søgt forsikringer fra CIA om, at britiske agenter i Rusland vil blive beskyttet, når der sker udveksling af efterretninger, rapporterer *Times*.«

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

RADIO SCHILLER den 16. januar 2017:

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

2. del om at bygge Kra-

kanalen i Thailand og Transaqua-projektet omkring Tchadsøen i Afrika

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

1. del:

2. del:

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

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

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

Med alt at tabe er Det britiske Imperium intet mindre end apoplektiske over den amerikanske, nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps udtalelser om, at han har til hensigt at normalisere relationerne med både Kina og Rusland, som han atter gjorde det klart i et interview med *Wall Street Journal* den 13. jan. Briterne afslører sig selv voldsomt, i deres forsøg på at invalidere Trump og torpedere enhver forsoning med Rusland i særdeleshed. Som Londonavisen *Guardian* indrømmede, så »frygter briterne, at en mere intens relation mellem USA og Rusland under Trump kan risikere at efterlade Storbritannien ude i kulden«.

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche forklarede, at det, som briterne »forsøger imod Trump, er en 'farvet revolution'. Trump udsættes for tiden for en kampagne med løgne og »falske nyheder«, i lighed med det, briterne i årtier hemmeligt har orkestreret imod

Lyndon LaRouche, som deres dødelige fjende. Der er ét enkelt slag, der kan leveres for at gøre en ende på denne farvede revolution, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche: Indiker, at det, man gjorde mod Lyndon LaRouche, var den største uretfærdighed, for hvilken USA har betalt en høj pris i årtier, og implementer omgående LaRouches Fire Love, begyndende med en tilbagevenden til FDR's Glass-Steagall.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, obviously, in the system of globalization as we have known it, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, that system is completely unhinged and this is cause

for a lot of freaked out reactions by those people who were the beneficiaries of that system of globalization, but I will hopefully be able to develop that this is a temporary phenomenon, and it will be replaced by some more optimistic developments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And in the trans-Atlantic sector you have a different kind of anti-globalization revolt, which is still ongoing, it's not yet settled how this will turn out. It started in a visible form with the vote of the British population in June last year with the Brexit, which was the first real upset; everybody was totally unexpected it, except a few insiders. This anti-globalization revolt was obviously continued with the election of President Donald Trump in the United States; it was continued with the "no" to the Italian referendum organized by Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, to change the Constitution. And it's coming to all of these developments, Brexit, Trump, no to the referendum in Italy, is that is caused by a fundamental feeling of injustice of ever larger parts of the population which were victims of that system, which increasingly made the rich richer, made more billionaires richer, but destroying successively the middle range of society, and making the poor poorer. It is my deepest conviction that that revolt will continue until the causes of this injustice are removed, and it will continue, it will hold the measuring rod to President Trump, if he will fulfill his election promises; and if he would not do that I believe the same people would turn against Trump as they turned against Hillary.

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

Holland, and in September in Germany which, you know, the star of Mrs. Merkel is also no longer as shiny as it may have been a while ago.

So we are looking into dramatic changes.

Now, let me start with the Trump election. Now, I have in my whole political life, which is now becoming quite long, several decades – I have never in my whole political life, seen such hysteria on the side of the neo-cons, on the side of the mainstream politicians, on the side of the liberal media, as concerning Trump. Now, admittedly, Trump does not fulfill the behavior code of Baron von Kligel, who was a German in the 18th century who developed the code for good diplomatic behavior. But what was caused Trump, is that he simply promised end the political paradigm which was the basis of eight years of George W. Bush and eight years of Barack Obama, which was a direct continuation of the Bush-Cheney policy.

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

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

problems in the world. And if that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world peace is in extreme danger.

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

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

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

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

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many cyber experts, also in Europe but also in the United States, already said that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an insider leak giving this information out, is more and more likely, and there's absolutely *zero* proof that it was Russian hacking. Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is that was the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved that Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie Sanders! That is not being talked

about any more; but if there was any thought, I would say, look there, and there are many people who recognize, for example, a very important French intelligence person with the name of Eric Denécé who is a top-level think tanker in France who said: Well, it is quite clear why they put out this story, because the neo-cons had to expect the great cleanup and many of them would lose their positions, and this is why they basically all agreed on this story and changed the narrative.

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the neoliberal system of globalization which simply violated the interests of the majority of the people, especially in the "rust belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so arrogant that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states which are formerly industrialized. Where, you have to see that the United States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western media in Europe, the United States is in a state of economic collapse. They have for the first time, a shrinking life-expectancy; there is one indicator which shows if a society is doing good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first time for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment. There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

in the region; naturally, also it's supposed to put a sour note on the U.S.-China relations.

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

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

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

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

Comey, in the Trump Tower where these three gentlemen wanted to impress Trump with their story about the Russian hacking; the other person who was with Trump was General Flynn, who is now in the driver's seat [to be National Security Advisor]. So anyway, you can expect the truth not be suppressed forever. And as a matter of fact, it was in the moment shortly before

the U.S. military intervention in 2013, the U.S. military action was prepared to occur Sunday evening; we had gotten that from

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

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

Now, I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about: I think we will see probably only by February or even into March who will be actually in his cabinet, who will get approved by the Senate. But there are other interesting elements, for example: Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion into the renewal of the

infrastructure in the United States. That is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in North Carolina,

that he would implement the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and *only* if you have a Glass-Steagall law in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt,

what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot

finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure.

But one step in a positive direction is the fact that for example the former deputy foreign minister of China, and chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs committee of the National People's Congress, Mme. Fu Ying, made a speech in New York, about

six weeks ago, where she said that indeed the Trump infrastructure program can be a bridge to the New Silk Road program of China. And that is quite the case: Just yesterday, Trump met with Jack Ma who is the chief executive of Alibaba, a

Chinese e-commerce firm, and Jack Ma said that he can help Trump to create 1 million jobs in the United States by initiating a platform for U.S. small businessmen to sell to Chinese consumers over the next five years, and vice versa, how the Chinese can invest in the United States. Trump afterwards said this was a great meeting, we will do great things together; and Jack Ma said that Trump was a very smart man and they got along very well.

So this is very good, because the Schiller Institute already in 2015 published a report for the United States to join the New Silk Road, which is a whole approach how you have to have a fast train system for the United States; as you know, China built as of the end of 2014, 20,000 km high-speed train systems. China wants to have to 50,000 km by 2020, connecting every major city in China with a fast train system. And the United States has none.

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

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

responsible for many of the ideas which are now coming into effect.

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

So I created the Schiller Institute with the idea that you needed an institute, a think tank to put the relations among nations on a completely different basis. One of the most important aspects of the work was to work towards the establishment of a just, new world economic order, in the tradition of the Non-Aligned Movement. And there, my husband, already in 1975, had proposed to replace the IMF with an International Development Bank, which would organize large credits for technology transfer from the industrialized countries to the developing sector, to overcome the underdevelopment.

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

But from the beginning, we said that such a new world economic order can only function if it's combined with a Classical Renaissance, that we have to reject the popular culture as it is associated with modern globalization, because it is depraved and degenerate. And that we had to go back to the revival, a Renaissance of the best traditions of every culture and have a dialogue among them. For example, in Germany, obviously you would emphasize the German Classical culture of

Schiller, Beethoven, the whole Classical music; in China, you would emphasize Confucius; in India you would emphasize the Vedic writings, Tagore, and so forth. So you would go and revive in every country simply what they have contributed to universal history and make that known.

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

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

Anyway: Because you had Bush, Thatcher and Mitterrand, they did not like this at all, so in '91, when the Soviet Union collapsed, we immediately proposed to prolong this program of the Productive Triangle into the Eurasian Land-Bridge: The idea that

you would connect the population and industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. The Iron Curtain was no longer there, so it was the natural thing to have infrastructure corridors to develop the landlocked areas of Eurasia.

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

As you know, then came '97 the Asia crisis; '98 the Russian GKO crisis, so this whole development became interrupted. But it basically did not stop us from making conferences about this proposal on five continents, all the U.S. cities, all the European cities; even in Latin America, São Paulo, Rio, New Delhi, even some African countries, Australia. We kept organizing for this idea that the natural next phase of the evolution of mankind would be the infrastructure connections of the entire planet.

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

Now, in September 2013, when Xi Jinping in Kazakhstan announced the New Silk Road, we simply took all the different studies we had made in these 24 years, and published them, and we called it: "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge." This is a comprehensive proposal which has the yellow line there in the middle between China and Central Asia; this was the initial One Belt, One Road proposal by China, and we added simply – they had the Maritime Silk Road – but we had a whole infrastructure program for Africa, for the South of Europe, the Balkans, many corridors, including a Bering Strait

Tunnel connecting the Eurasian infrastructure with the American system, with highways and high-speed trains all the way to Chile and Argentina. And eventually, when all of this is built, you can go by maglev train from the southern tip of South America to the Cape of Good Hope in Africa.

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

Mr. LaRouche is probably the only economist in the West who deserves that name, because all the other neo-liberal economists have been so wrong in their predictions that they should probably take another job. Mr. LaRouche has given up his own scientific method and in this report you find there such extremely important conceptions as the connection between energy flux density in the production process and the relative potential population density, which can be maintained with that energy flux density; and there are other such important conceptions.

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

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

So, while we were publishing these reports, the New Silk Road promoted by China which has a few different names – first they called it One Belt, One Road; now they call it the

Belt and Road Initiative; I always call it the "New Marshall Plan Silk

Road," so that people get an idea. In any case, this policy of China has taken on a breathtaking dynamic. (Next slide)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, the Djibouti-Ethiopia railway just opened yesterday, so this is extremely good news. It opened yesterday, from Djibouti to Addis Abeba, 750 km and it was built by China; it employed about 20,000 Ethiopians and 5,000 Djiboutian, and it will be connected to the standard gauge railway in Kenya, which again, created 30,000 jobs. And this will obviously, among other things, transform the port of Mombasa and it will take cargo and passengers to the Ugandan border in one-tenth of the time it takes by road. A professor from the University of 'Nairobi School of Diplomacy', Prof. Gerishon Ikiara, said, and I agreed, that this whole program will "radically transform African participation in global trade in the next two decades and will catalyze the industrial transformation of Africa."

Now, there is another extremely important project

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

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

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

The concept is simply to transfer the water from the Congo River, using the unused discharge of the Congo River water going into the ocean. Now, the Congo River is the second largest river in the world and it discharges 41,000 cubic meters/second into the ocean – unused. And the idea is to take only 3-4% of that

water and bring it into Lake Chad. There was a big campaign trying to convince the people in the different states along the Congo River, that it's stealing their water, and so forth, but that was really an effort by the Greenies and it has no substance to it whatsoever.

First of all, the idea is not to take the water from the Congo River, but from the west bank tributaries at an altitude that allows to bring water per gravity until the C.A.R./Chad watershed, which is an elevation of 500 meters, and then pour it

into the Chari River which is a tributary of Lake Chad. So this way you would create a 2,400 km long waterway which would

bring eventually 100 billion cubic meters of water per year into Lake Chad and also create navigable infrastructure.

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

PowerChina is now financing a feasibility study for a first phase of the project which would involve building a series of dams in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, and the Central African Republic. It would also potentially generate 15-25 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectricity through the mass movement of water by gravity; it would potentially create a series of irrigated areas for crops, livestock, of an area of 50-70,000 sq km in the Sahel zone in Chad, in the northeast of Nigeria, in the north of Cameroon, and in Niger. It would also make possible an expanded economic zone basically creating a new economic platform for agriculture, industry, transportation, electricity for 12 Africa nations.

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

(Next) This is the expanded program of railways, nuclear power, just transforming the entire African continent. (Next) These are development plans for Latin America. The blue lines you see there, these are the longstanding, proposed high-speed railway routes in Latin America, which the Schiller Institute has proposed. In 1982, when Mr. LaRouche was

working with President José López Portillo of Mexico on these projects, he called it "Operation Juárez," to refer back to the best traditions of Mexican-American cooperation. And these are all projects which are obvious. If you look at the map of Africa or Latin America, you don't see that kind of infrastructure! If you see some railway, you see it as a small line from a mine to the port to exploit the raw materials, but you don't have infrastructure. And we had this idea, which Alexander von Humboldt, by the way, proposed in 19th century, so it's not that revolutionary; it's sort of obvious.

The red lines are the various Chinese proposals since the BRICS summit in Brazil in July 2014. The solid red line is the northern route of the Brazil-Peru transcontinental rail line. This was already agreed upon between the governments of Brazil and China a year ago; but then they had the coup in Brazil, Dilma Rousseff was impeached, so this came to a halt; also the new government in Peru is very reluctant. But there's a big movement: I just addressed a conference of economists in the Amazon region two months ago, and there's a whole movement, also associated with Fujimori party, who absolutely won the fight for that rail line because it is the step to the future.

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

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

So I can only mention the most important projects. There are many, many others. For example, China and Ecuador are building a science city in Ecuador where President Correa at the recent state visit of President Xi Jinping said that the collaboration between Ecuador and China will mean that

Ecuador soon will be on the same level as all industrialized countries. They have the idea to overcome poverty forever. The science city is going to have the most advanced fields of science.

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

Now, just on a diplomatic level, this process of integration is going absolutely rapidly, especially since September last year, when you had on Sept. 2-3, the Eastern Economic Forum in Vladivostok where the integration of the Eurasian Economic Union and the Belt and Road Initiative was on the table. The Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe participated in that conference, and Japan is now massively investing in the Far East of Russia, in terms of energy cooperation. Putin was just in Japan, as a state visit; Abe will go on a state visit to Russia this year. They're talking about settling the conflict concerning the Northern islands, the Kuril Islands. They're talk about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan, and obviously there is a complete strategic realignment going on. President Duterte changed the role of the Philippines from being the aircraft carrier for the United States in the South China Sea, to now, collaborate with China on economic cooperation, and also with Russia. The same by the way, goes for Turkey, which is now shifting and working with Russia, Iran and Syria, to bring peace to the region.

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

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

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

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

Why is Europe not joining this? Look, Europe is in bad shape. The EU is collapsing, the people in Italy *hate* by now the ECB, they hate Merkel, they have Schäuble, they hold Merkel responsible for the suffering of the population in Italy which is now reaching dimensions like Greece; Greece was destroyed – one-third of the Greek economy was destroyed by the austerity policy of the Troika. And you know, there's *nothing* left of the idea of unity in Europe. There are borders being built, Schengen is dead; look at the Eastern European countries, they're simply not – the Eastern European and Central European countries are reorienting towards China! The 16+1 this is the Central and East European Countries, they have extensive infrastructure cooperation with China. China is building up the port in Piraeus port in Greece; they're building a fast railway between Budapest and Belgrade, and many other projects.

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

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

I went back to China in '96, after 25 years; already then it was breathtaking. But if you look, the Chinese economic model which has transformed 700 million people from extreme poverty to a decent living standard; and China is now committed to develop the interior region as part of their building of the New Silk Road, to eliminate poverty from China totally by the year 2020, and there are only 4 % left in poverty right now.

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

The German 'Mittelstand' is still producing, I think, the third largest number of patents in the world. It is their natural interest to find cooperation not only in a bilateral cooperation, but in investments in third countries. It would be in the *best interest* of Germany – if Germany is freaked out about the refugees, which really has meant a complete destabilization of the country, why is Germany not cooperating, with Russia, with China, India, Iran, in the reconstruction of the Middle East? I think, now that the

Syrian government has started to rebuild Aleppo, at least building the hospitals, the schools, the Schiller Institute had proposed already in 2012 a comprehensive proposal for the development of the entire Middle East, from Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the Caucasus to the Gulf States, and it would be in the absolute self-interest because – sure you have to destroy ISIS and the terrorists with military means. But then you have to create conditions where young people in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, have a reason to become doctors, scientists, teachers, so that they have a future, that that way you drive out terrorism forever!

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

The same for Africa. The only minister in Germany who is reasonable is the Development Minister Gerd Müller, because he travels all the time to Africa and he says there will be the need for many millions of jobs for the young people of Africa in the next years; if we don't have them to create these jobs, many, many millions of people will flee from hunger and war and epidemics.

So would it not be in the self-interest that all the European nations join hands *with* the Chinese Silk Road initiative, and help to reconstruct and build up the economies of southwest Asia and Africa? I think that that mission would also really help to overcome the disunity of Europe, because you will not solve that problem by looking at your navel; but you will solve that problem by a joint mission for the greater good of mankind.

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

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

Eventually man arrived. Man first settled at the oceans and the rivers; then with the help of infrastructure, man developed the interior regions of the continents; and we are now with the World Land-Bridge picture – go back to the first image – this

will be, when it is built, the completion of that phase of the evolution of mankind, by simply bringing infrastructure into all landlocked areas of the world, and you will have – with the help of new methods to create water, with modern technologies,

create new, fresh water. For example, if you have peaceful nuclear energy you can desalinate huge amounts of ocean water; through the ionization of moisture in the atmosphere you can create new waters to solve the problem of desertification.

Right

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

But this is not the end: Mankind is not an Earth-bound species. Mankind is the only species which is capable of creative discovery, and the collaboration of all nations for space exploration and space research is the next phase of our evolution. Now China has a very ambitious space program.

They already landed the Yutu rover in 2014. Next year, they will go to the far side of the Moon, and eventually bring back helium-3 from the far side of the Moon, which will be an important fuel for

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

So we're looking at a completely new phase of civilization, and the far side of the Moon is very important because will not have the disturbances of cosmic radiation, as you have on the Earth-facing side of the Moon; the Sun and the Earth – this far side is shielded from a lot of this radiation so it will be possible to put up much better telescopes, you will be able to look into Solar System, into the Galaxy, into other galaxies much, much farther than so far.

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

And we know very, very little! But man is the only species which *can* know! No donkey will ever know about the great galaxies or – no dog will ever be able to breed rabbits to have better breakfast. They all like better breakfast, but

they don't know how to do it. Man is capable of overcoming every limitation, and the mind of man is a physical force in the Universe. We're not outside of the Universe, but what our mind invents or discovers, is part of the Universe. And that is a very exciting thing.

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

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

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

And so, the first economic platform will be simply to leave the planet Earth and to go into orbit; the second economic platform of space research will be to have an industrial base on the Moon and to eventually start to produce raw materials from

space. Because you will, as this continues, not always transport materials from the Earth for your space travel, but once you have fusion as a propulsion fuel where the speed will become much larger, you will be able to take materials from asteroids, from other planets, for your production and your requirements in space. And then longer space travel between planets as the third platform, which is already visible.

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

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

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

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

Beethoven, Verdi, Schubert, Schumann; Chinese Classical music, Indian poetry. You have this coming Saturday in New York, a

beautiful event on style of civilizations, of cultures, where we will have a Chinese professor talking about literati painting.

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

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

And so the future of civilization will be a dialogue between Plato, Schiller, Confucius, Tagore, and many other great poets, scientists of the past. So, if you give every child access to these things, which is also in reach, I can see that we will have

a new era, a new civilization of mankind. And I would invite all of you to not just look at it, but be part of it.

[applause]

**Det afgørende punkt er, at
menneskehedens
fælles interesse er dens**

fremskridt. LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 13. januar, 2017; Leder

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

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

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

For at indlede vores første del, kan vi referere til et indslag på LaRouchePAC's webside i dag. Titlen er, »The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia« (indholdet er dækket i Tom Gillesbergs indledning til

narrativ, at det skulle være russerne, der kører en eller anden enorm indflydelses-kampagne for at forsøge at intervenere i og influere de amerikanske valg, så begynder det at se ud som om, at den virkelig misdæder her, var briterne.

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

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

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

Ross: Lad os springe direkte til ét af de store spørgsmål, vi hører så meget om i medierne i øjeblikket – spørgsmålet om den angivelige russiske hacking af de amerikanske valg. Jeres gruppe, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, udstedte en pressemeddelelse den 12. december, der sagde, at

alle beviser pegede på en læk snarere end et hack. Siden da er to rapporter kommet frem; en fra DHS (Department of Homeland Security) og en, der hovedsagligt er forfattet af ODNI, Director of National Intelligence, og som siger, at her er beviset. Vi ved, Rusland gjorde det. Det var tvivlsomt, hvor brugbar denne rapport var. Og for et par dage siden var du så medforfatter af en kronik i *Baltimore Sun* sammen med William Binney, hvor du gentog dit standpunkt; at alle beviser peger på, at dette er en læk snarere end et hack, og under alle omstændigheder er der ikke blevet fremlagt nogen beviser for, at det skulle være et hack. Hvorfor har du dette standpunkt?

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

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

sagde det samme, men der var ingen, der kom igennem til de etablerede medier.

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

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

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

Hvad gjorde præsidenten så? Han slog ned på sanktioner; han smed 35 diplomater ud. Alt sammen ud fra hvis udsagn? John Brennans. Hvordan fik så *New York Times* al denne information? John Brennan. Det ved vi, fordi *Wall Street Journal* blev lidt sur over det, og de siger, »Ja, det er John Brennan, der taler med de andre fyre; han taler ikke med *Wall Street Journal*.« Hvad har vi så? Vi har en præsident, der tager en chance på lemfældigt grundlag og forårsager en endnu større fare, mere aggressiv kritik, flere spændinger i vore relationer med Rusland. På baggrund af hvad? Lad mig sige det sådan; jeg vil måske sige det sådan: Jeg sad og så på nogle YouTube-klip; og jeg faldt over et af Christiane Amanpour, der sendte fra London. Hun er i færd med at interviewe Lukyanov, en af de

russiske gurer. Hun siger, »Hr. Lukyanov [imiterer Amanpours stemme] De siger, at der absolut *ingen* beviser er, *ingen*, siger De. Jamen, når der ikke findes beviser, hvorfor har USA's præsident så smidt sanktioner på Rusland?«

Ross: Den er god.

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

(Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet):

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

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast January 13, 2017

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

My

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

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

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

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

Rachel Brown, joining us from Boston, Massachusetts.

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

will obviously be interrelated, but they will feature first a

clip from a feature interview that our friend and colleague Jason

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

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

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

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

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

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

will be our three part show from this evening.

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

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

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

Not Russia"; and this goes directly to the intelligence that we're getting clarity on today. That the ones who are in fact interfering in US politics, are not the Russian intelligence services, but rather, directly, British intelligence. The 35-page – I guess you could call it dodgy dossier – on Trump's supposed connections with Russia that was cited by CNN earlier this week in a news story; and then published or leaked by BuzzFeed. This is now being exposed as being authored by a

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

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

With that said as a matter of introduction, I'd like to play

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

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

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

ROSS: So, let's jump right into one of the big issues that

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

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

Bush, Cheney, and the others all said, "Oh, it was a terrible mistake." It was not a mistake; it was out and out fraud. When we saw that happening, we formed a little group – there were five of us in the beginning – and we started publishing. We published three memoranda before the war, warning the President. Our first one was on the day of Colin Powell's

speech – the 5th of February, 2003 – and we gave him a C- for content. And we warned the President, "The intelligence is being manipulated and you really should widen the circle of your advisors," we said at the end, "beyond those who are clearly bent on a war for which we see no compelling reason, and from which, we believe the unintended consequences are likely to be catastrophic." We take no delight in the fact that we happened to be right on that; there were a couple of other people saying that, but nobody got into the mainstream media.

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

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

Now, it boggles the mind, Jason, it boggles the mind.

But NSA traces {all emails on this planet}. If they go abroad, they have cooperating agencies and cooperating governments. Not only six, they have about 13 of them. If they go through the United States, they get them; if they come from outside, they get them all. And they can trace them; they have these little trace mechanisms at various points in the network. So, they know where each and every email originates and where it ends up.

Now, add to that the ironclad coverage they have of

the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lukyanov, [imitating Amanpour's voice] you say there's {zero} evidence, you say {zero}. Well, if there's zero evidence, why is

it that the President of the United States has slapped sanctions on Russia?"

ROSS: That's good.

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

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

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

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

MICHAEL STEGER: In all of this discussion, apparently some people are not pulling back over so-called "Trump's ties to Russia." What this whole situation now makes clear, is that the entire attack on the Trump campaign and the President-elect's policy towards Russia, has been the target explicitly of British

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

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

against Libya; the false intelligence of Tony Blair on the Iraq war, which Ray McGovern was just referring to.

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

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

They're also attempting to disrupt what could be a very important – as I think we'll see from Helga Zepp LaRouche's clip – relationship between the U.S., China, and Russia, on an economic policy; and, as we know it to be very important that we'll get to later as well, a fundamental change in U.S. financial policy. This British nexus is targeting the Trump campaign and targeting this entire change in U.S. policy. This

is

British imperial tactics. This is what they do; they are at the

source of it. If there's going to be a Congressional investigation of any foreign nations' or foreign agents' involvement to manipulate U.S. democracy, I think first and foremost, it has to be the United Kingdom.

RACHEL BRINKLEY: The fact that on page 15 of these 35 pages,

it attacks LaRouche by name, saying that there were Trump factions travelling to meet with Putin factions, as part of this

alliance in the summer of 2016. They cite LaRouche directly in this report as having representatives that went to Russia as part of this discussion; which did not happen. As this was authored by the British, this is just the British Empire freaked

out about LaRouche's policies taking over, and the potential of a

United States/Russia/China alliance, especially the Russia/U.S. cooperation.

I think it is notable that if you have the United States,

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

OGDEN: That's exactly what Helga LaRouche presented at this

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

a cross-section of the entire planet, including seven

ambassadors. She delivers her analysis of what we've really seen behind this showdown, as we've been discussing, of the British and American intelligence establishment vs. the incoming President-elect. She highlights, towards the end of these excerpted remarks – and again, this is only an excerpt, in bits and pieces – the whole speech contains a lot more substance in terms of what you just said, Rachel.

The motivation behind ending this confrontational policy towards Russia and towards China, is that if Russia, China, and the United States were to join, in a grand alliance, around what is now a concrete policy initiative coming out of China – the One Belt, One Road, or New Silk Road project – to bring development to the interior of not only Eurasia, but also Africa and the North and South America landmass, and were to reorganize our relations around what's now being called the "win-win" paradigm among nations – then everything is possible. She explores a lot of these questions in the {full} speech, which will be available in video form in just a few hours.

In what you're about to hear, she touches on what must be done, both strategically and economically, to shape the policy of this incoming new Presidency. I apologize for the quality of the audio. It was not the best audio recording, but again, in just a few hours, we will have the full video that will be available. This is just a taste:

HELGA ZEPP LAROUCHE (Audio excerpt): ... Let me start

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

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

The fact that Hillary did not win the election was
{extremely} important for the maintenance of world peace. And
I
think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the
fact
that he said ... that he will normalize the relationship between
the United States and Russia, is, in my view {the most
important
step}. Because if the relationship between the United States
and
Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I
think
there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world. And

if
that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world
peace
is in extreme danger.

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

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

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

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many

cyber

experts, in Europe but also in the United States, already said that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an insider

leak giving this information out, which is more and more likely,

and there's absolutely {zero} proof that it was Russian hacking.

Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is what was

the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved that

Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie Sanders!

That is not being talked about any more....

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the neoliberal system of globalization which has violated the interests of the majority of the people, especially in the "rust

belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so arrogant

that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states which

were formerly industrialized. You have to see that the United States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western media

in Europe, is in a state of economic collapse....

[T]here is one indicator which shows if a society is doing

good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first time

for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney

and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism,

drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment.

There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who

are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given

up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a

terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

So the vote, therefore, the narrative, was that the reason

why Hillary was voted out because she was being perceived as the

direct continuation of these 16 years, and so the attempt to change that narrative by saying it was "Russian hacking" is pretty obvious....

I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to

be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about.... But there are other interesting elements, for example:

Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion

into the renewal of the infrastructure in the United States. That

is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs

repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in

North Carolina, that he would implement the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and {only} if you have a Glass-Steagall law

in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure....

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

Right now, we must have the most urgent mobilization; there are no excuses for delay from {any} elected representative for an immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall. We have now launched and are in the midst of a national mobilization; we've talked about this on previous broadcasts. But as you can see on the screen right now, we're circulating a petition which is collecting signatures; it needs to more rapidly accrue signatures. But it's accessible at lpac.co/trumpsotu; and

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

Now, we did have a day of action in Washington this
week.
The Congress is now officially back in session; they've been
sworn in and business is underway. There was participation
from
many states up and down the East Coast in person.
Representatives coming in from Virginia, from Maryland, from
Pennsylvania, from Connecticut, from New Jersey, from New
York.
But there was also a lot of other participation from across
the
country in terms of pressure being put on representatives to
meet
with members of the LaRouche PAC. There was a unique
representative from the Manhattan Project, Mr. John Sigerson,

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

But, let's discuss a little bit more broadly what Helga LaRouche brought up at the end of that discussion; that Glass-Steagall is only the first step, and there's a much more far-reaching and profound approach to a revolution in the economic policy of the United States that's necessary and which has been framed by Mr. LaRouche.

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

We have officially, you might say, entered into a Dark Age; a mini-Dark Age has begun in the United States. Now, this can be reversed. But the level of drug addiction has more than tripled under Obama's Presidency; the level of opiate addiction, the abuse of drugs like marijuana has skyrocketed under an Obama-supported legalization campaign. Which is of course, backed by the same drug cartels which are providing the financial backing to the banking institutions. This was Obama's program. You've seen a massive level of homicides and crime and murder rates escalating in severely impoverished areas, including Obama's so-called "own neighborhood" of the South Side of

Chicago. This level of breakdown has never been seen in the history of the United States; and it is only characteristic of societies which are beginning to utterly break down. Long-term survival is not even a question; what's at immediate risk for an increasing majority of Americans is short-term survival. That's what you see when you have decreasing life expectancy rates, increasing numbers of people are dying faster and faster; largely from things like alcohol addiction, drug addiction, diseases related to despair, suicide and so on.

That's where Glass-Steagall comes in; and this is what really has to be captured. And why it's not simply Glass-Steagall, but the full Four Laws. I think Megan and Rachel can say more, because we're currently working on a project to make this clear. But the role of fusion and the space program really captivate the fourth law in what direction our country has to take to reawaken a sense of optimism, a sense of development within the American culture. To break out, not just of disrepair – breaking down of bridges, bad roads – we all know the bad roads and highways, especially on the East Coast. But that's not what we have to emerge from. Building better roads isn't escaping from the clutches of a Dark Age; something greater has to capture the real spirit of human identity and creativity.

Now, this is why it's so important to identify this global phenomenon; because the steps of the Four Laws: Glass-Steagall immediately; shut down this Wall Street banking cartel and

basically a drug operation. The second is the public credit of a national banking system, which Paul Gallagher elaborated last night; we could say more on. To consolidate, aggregate the US debt that exists, as well as other financial resources towards the most important projects of development for the country; the most advanced levels of infrastructure, or the broader physical platform of industry and production. And of course most importantly, the fusion and space program.

This phenomenon globally is just somewhat breathtaking; and Mrs. LaRouche touches on it directly. The Transaqua project in Africa is something that we've been promoting for decades; this is something which begins to take the sub-Saharan area of Africa from the great lakes near the eastern part of Africa towards West Africa and Nigeria, up into the southern border of the Sahara Desert. It begins to look at how we use major infrastructure projects of water transportation, the refilling of Lake Chad, and the development of this central African area. There's also a major rail line, which is not initiated – it's been inaugurated; it's now running from Ethiopia to the coastline of Djibouti. This rail line is one of the key continental rail passages that the Schiller Institute and {EIR} have been fighting for, for decades; to begin to integrate the full potential of Africa's people and its resources and its industrial capacities into an integrated economic breakthrough. A real shift in the productivity and lifestyle and scientific potential of Africa. Those things are now unfolding; these are coming from largely

Chinese investments, Chinese engineering companies are directly onboard.

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

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

projects.

But there are major development orientations taking place that are gripping mankind. There was an offer today, apparently, in

the {Hindu Times} in India from a Chinese journalist, which said

"Will Donald Trump Participate in the Silk Road Conference in China?" I think that really is the potential which we've got today.

So, the Glass-Steagall fight, this question of the United

States deciding that we're going to build our nation again, we're

going to shut down this Wall Street racket and take on this kind

of potential; that's really what has to be ignited. And there's

no reason Donald Trump should not take that up at the inauguration and the State of the Union.

BRINKLEY: Right! And on this question of the murder policy

of Obama, there's an attempt now to cover it up and make him the

cute President and Joe Biden getting an award. No, this is flat-out murder, and if this mass movement across the world is properly educated, it won't be stopped.

So, there was discussion recently around infrastructure, as

Helga brought up, from Trump. It's still not to the level of LaRouche's conception of infrastructure. For example, here's

what Speaker Paul Ryan said about infrastructure: "In the spring

budget, we believe we will be able to address the infrastructure

issue." The chairman of the Republican study committee, Mark Walker, says "I don't know that we've settled on \$1 trillion.

If it's \$1 trillion in infrastructure, that is something we'd have to say, 'There's a portion of this that we're not comfortable with and come back to the table.'|" And then Sam Graves, the head of the Transportation Subcommittee, says "We just simply can't afford it," adding that "It can't all be done through public-private partnerships as the President-elect is talking about."

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

So, you have the concept of how to travel on an

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

Then he says, "Now, the prospect of the combined effect of magnetic levitation mass transport systems and rail, which will connect the principal continents of the world, would render most ocean transport of freight technologically obsolete; because the

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

Next, he says, "Changes such as those, illustrate a general principle which will be expressed in certain nearby Solar System locations. Now, we're going to go to the next step, such as our Moon and Mars, when they will have come to be considered later, as within the bounds of our presently still-young, new century's plausible instances of work and habitation. Typical problems to be overcome for the purpose of human transport and dwelling in nearby solar space, and later beyond, must look to such future developments already foreseeable for later in the present century. We should then recognize that the development of basic economic infrastructure had always been a needed creation of

what

is required as a habitable development of a synthetic, rather than a presumably natural, environment for the enhancement or even the possibility of human life and practice at some time in the existence of our human species."

So, he's bring up, one, this long-term conception; he says

later, three generations – 75 years – should be our orientation

for space. We have the questions of habitation and transport as

fundamental challenges; and this is the idea of the next phase.

But in general, also this last question of synthetic versus natural; that these various new modes of habitation and travel were based off of new discoveries that created a whole new platform of existence, of habitation, of travel, where mankind could reach through these advances. And those were all creations

of the human mind in the likeness of the Creator. Infrastructure

is not just making a bridge or something to get from here to there; it's the question of a new advancement, of a new principle

that is applied throughout your entire society. So, it's not an

add-on to your economic policy as Paul Ryan was saying.

"We'll

get to that; we'll figure out how to fit it in the budget."

It's

the beginning of your notion of economy.

MEGAN BEETS: Yeah Rachel, I think what you just put forward

here from Mr. LaRouche's overview and what you were just saying,

it's a way of thinking that most Americans have forgotten about.

People have lost touch with the kind of big thinking about long

sweeps of human history, and I think that that way of thinking

—

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

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

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

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

improving agriculture, for example.

I just think that what you're bringing up here really is the

crucial point; that our common interest as mankind is man's progress. That right now dictates that we can't accept anything

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

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

and eventual colonization of Mars. That would really be a beautiful renaissance expression of the American people working with the rest of the world towards the uplifting of humanity toward our real, true potential.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, we are going to continue the discussion of the substance – this was, I think, crucial Rachel; because it's exactly what you're saying. This insight into the real meaning of something which has become banalized – infrastructure; that's the key to all of economic science. If humanity is going to make the shift into the next phase of our global existence as a species, it's only going to be possible if we have a flourishing of this kind of philosophical understanding of the science behind real, true economics. It's a critical ingredient of the ability of humanity to move forward. So, I think we're going to continue this; and there are a lot of interrelated works that Mr. LaRouche authored over the last several years which explore this concept of the real meaning of infrastructure, the idea of the economic platform, and the role that Hamiltonian credit should play in facilitating all of that.

So, that said, that's the crucial insight and understanding that you need to fight with us right now for the necessary policy revolution here in the United States. This all revolves around the initiation of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws. Michael went through them, but it's Glass-Steagall, number one. We

need

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

now and the inauguration, you need to have the daily marching orders and the daily updates. This is a very fast moving situation, as you can see from the intelligence situation that we

presented at the beginning of this show. Then after that, in the

critical first days of the new Presidency, as things change

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

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

NYHEDSORIENTERING JANUAR 2017:

Farvel til krigens paradigme?

Hvad vi skal gøre – nu!

I USA, i lighed med Danmark og andre lande, er der nogle helt afgørende ting, der må gennemføres, som Lyndon LaRouche har fremført som fire nødvendige love, der må implementeres omgående.

1) Der skal indføres en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, men under den overskrift er der mange andre ting, der må ske. Man må gå igennem bankernes og finansverdenens aktiviteter i lighed med det, man gjorde i USA, da Roosevelt blev indsat som præsident, så man får rensset op og får adskilt tingene i legitime finansielle aktiviteter, der er vigtige for realøkonomien, og så spekulation, som skal helt ud af de normale banker. Man vil så få nogle mindre almindelige banker, som man kan hjælpe, hvis de får problemer, mens alle de andre spekulative aktiviteter ikke får lov til at belaste staten og skatteyderne, når de får problemer pga. fejlslagne spekulationer. Derefter skal der

2) skabes kredit til investeringer. Staten må gå ind og regulere det ovenfra og i den udstrækning, det er nødvendigt, med statslige kreditter sikre, at der bliver foretaget de nødvendige investeringer i samfundet og dets produktive aktiviteter. Det skal bl.a. udmønte sig i

3) store infrastrukturprojekter, der kan opgradere hele økonomien. Man kan bare seke til de enorme investeringer, Kina har foretaget siden 2008, hvor Kina har brugt over 1000 mia. dollars om året på infrastruktur og i dag har verdens

største og bedste netværk af højhastighedstog. Programmet for Den Nye Silkevej er da også centreret om opbygning af grundlæggende infrastruktur, ikke blot i Kina, men i stadig større dele af verden. Når det gælder Danmark, har vi et forældet jernbanenet, der skal fornyes i form af et nationalt magnettognet eller højhastighedstognet i forbindelse med bygningen af en Kattegatbro. Vi skal så hurtigt som muligt have bygget den faste forbindelse over Femern Bælt og en Helsingør/Helsingborg-forbindelse. Der er masser af motorveje og andre projekter, der bare venter på at blive bygget. Der er så meget, der skal bygges, at vi kommer til at planlægge, hvordan vi kan få nok kvalificeret arbejdskraft og byggekapaletitet for at kunne få alle de mange projekter realiseret. Alle disse projekter er nødvendige som en del af at løfte den danske økonomi op på et højere produktivitetsniveau, og samtidig skal vi have langt mere gang i forskning og udvikling.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Ansigt til ansigt med det ukendte

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 12. januar, 2017 – Ingen mennesker i USA kan undgå at mærke den anstrengte atmosfære af forventning, der gennemtrænger disse første dage af året 2017. På den ene eller anden måde er Bush/Obama-tyranniets seneste seksten, blodige års vante sandheder ved at være forbi; vi står alle ansigt til ansigt med det ukendte. Omkring denne udvikling, og sættende betingelserne for den, er en

fuldstændig ny, revolutionær situation på hele det internationale plan, som det store flertal af amerikanere ikke har den fjerneste idé om.

Samtidig er nogle af vore lavereplacerede lakajer for Det britiske Imperium, i takt med, at dagen for indsættelse af den nye præsident nærmer sig (20. januar), hvide i ansigtet af frygt. Vil de miste nogle af deres privilegier? Hvad vil der ske med dem? De synes at være ved at gå fra forstanden med deres skrigeri om stadig mere vilde fupnumre imod den nyvalgte præsident. I stedet for denne galskab skulle de hellere se til, at de »fortryder, angrer og gør godt igen«, som patriotten Andrew J. Bacevich skrev 9. jan. i en artikel.

I mellemtiden håber det, af de store nyhedsmedier ignorerede, og derfor ukendte af dem, der læser disse, store flertal af amerikanere, der har måttet bide i græsset i seksten år og længere, at de omsider kommer på en bedre kost.

Men vi står alle, uden undtagelse, og stirrer ind i ansigtet på det ukendte og uforudsete – det uventede. Og de, der først lander på deres fødder igen, parat til at handle, så det skaber resultat, vil starte ud med en stor fordel. Vi må være disse første. Det bliver ganske bestemt ikke de ynkelige lakajer i pressen, eller bureaukraterne uden samvittighed, og som i øjeblikket (men ikke ret meget længere) står i spidsen for »efterretningstjenesterne«.

Og derfor er der ingen, der ved, hvad de skal gøre. Hvordan kan vi undgå et overhængende kollaps af finanssystemet? Hvordan kan vi få en reel, økonomisk genrejsning? Hvordan passer vi ind i det globale system? Hvor er menneskeheden på vej hen? Kun de af os, der har kæmpet for at gøre Lyndon LaRouches opdagelser til vore egne, kender blot de første skridt til besvarelse af disse presserende spørgsmål.

Det er af disse grunde, at alle lige pludselig lytter til os. De kræver at forstå LaRouches Fire Love – for hvem ellers har

svaret? Uden afgørende input fra Lyndon LaRouche, vil vi ikke blive i stand til at komme ud af dette rod. Og læren af gårsdagens LaRouchePAC-mission til Capitol Hill går endnu videre end til en ny modtagelighed for genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, og især for LaRouches Fire Love, efter Hamiltons principper. Den går videre end det, til at omfatte det enorme indtryk, som dér blev skabt, af Schiller Instituttets musikdirektør John Sigerson, med sin briefing om højtideligheden den 7. jan. ved Tåremindesmærket i Bayonne, New Jersey, hvor Schiller Instituttets New York Borgerkor deltog. Dette repræsenterede sjælen i Manhattan-projektet, et af Lyndon LaRouches seneste store bidrag til at redde USA, og menneskeslægten.

Og I har endnu ikke set det halve af det!

Britisk efterretningstjeneste snubler over sine egne løgne

Den britiske efterretningstjenestes rolle i at køre den svingagtige kampagne for at male Donald Trump som en farlig agent til Rusland og Vladimir Putin, der angiveligt er i gang med at undergrave amerikansk frihed og demokrati, er gået det bekendte »ét skridt for vidt«. Husker I hærens chefrådgiver Joseph Welch i McCarthys høringer om USA's hær i 1954 (senator Joseph McCarthy indledte undersøgelser af angivelig kommunistisk aktivitet i hæren), mod slutningen af Truman/McCarthys antikommunistiske heksejagter? Da McCarthy angreb en ung jurist i Welch's advokatfirma for at være kommunist, fordi han havde været i Advokaternes Laug, svarede Welch: Nu er De gået for vidt. Har De trods alt ingen anstændighed i livet? Har De ingen anstændighed tilbage?«

Denne ordveksling gjorde det grundlæggende set af med denne del af den beskidte, britiske operation for at sønderrive arven efter Franklin Roosevelt i Amerika – selv om andre britiske operationer fortsatte i andre former frem til i dag.

I går konfronterede Donald Trump vor tids »Joseph McCarthy'er« i det amerikanske pressekorps, og i det amerikanske efterretningssamfund, samtidig med, at det afsløredes, at denne beskidte operation lige fra begyndelsen er blevet styret af den britiske efterretningstjeneste. Et 35 sider langt dokument, som websiden BuzzFeed har offentliggjort, og som CNN dernæst har fremmet, aftenen før Trumps pressekonference, og 10 dage før hans indsættelse, er fuldt af hysteriske påstande, der med lethed kan bevises at være fabrikerede løgne. Ikke alene siger disse påstande, at Trump arbejdede hånd i hånd med Putin for at hacke Demokraternes Nationalkomite og John Podestas (Hillary Clintons kampagneleder) e-mails, og dernæst spredte de hackede e-mails via Wikileaks, men de påstår også, at Trump blev afpresset af Putin med videoer af Trump, der boltrer sig med prostituerede i Rusland, og endda urinerer på en hotelseng, som Barack Obama havde sovet i.

I sin pressekonference naglede Trump den forræderiske kendsgerning i denne operation. Hvis denne platte rapport var blevet offentliggjort af efterretningstjenesterne, sagde han, »ville det være en enorm plet på deres generalieblad, hvis de rent faktisk gjorde det ... Jeg synes, det var en skændsel ... en skændsel, at efterretningstjenesterne tillod sådanne informationer, der viste sig at være så forkerte og falske, at komme frem. Jeg synes, det er en skændsel, og jeg siger, at det er noget, nazi-Tyskland ville have gjort, og også gjorde. Jeg synes, det er en skændsel, at information, der var forkert og falsk og aldrig fandt sted, blev offentliggjort.« Da CNN krævede retten til at respondere til Trumps fordømmelse af deres deltagelse i fupnummeret, afskar Trump dem med: »Ikke jer. Jeres organisation er forfærdelig.«

Men Trump identificerede imidlertid ikke ophavsmændene til

løgnene – de britiske efterretningstjenester. Materialet er så tydeligt falsk, at *New York Times*, der har været i centrum for kampagnen for at miskreditere Trump som et russisk aktiv, erkendte, at »Topefterretningsfolks beslutning om at give præsidenten, den nyvalgte præsident og den såkaldte Ottebande – Republikanske og Demokratiske ledere i Kongressen og efterretningsudvalgene – materiale, som de vidste ikke var bekræftet og var ærekrænkende, var ekstremt usædvanlig. Den tidligere britiske efterretningsofficer, der indsamlede materialet om hr. Trump, anses for at være en kompetent og pålidelig operatør med udstrakte erfaringer i Rusland, sagde amerikanske regeringsfolk. Men han videreformidlede det, han hørte fra russiske informanter og andre, og det, de fortalte ham, er endnu ikke blevet undersøgt af den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste.«

Faktisk rapporterede *New York Times* den 6. jan., at den officielle rapport, der i sidste uge blev offentliggjort af amerikanske efterretningstjenester, og som anklagede Putin for at undergrave det amerikanske valg, også kom fra britisk efterretningstjeneste, der »advarede om, at Moskva havde hacket sig ind i Demokraternes Nationalkomites computerservere, og havde givet deres amerikanske modparter besked«.

Men dette er præcis, hvad Lyndon LaRouche i mange, mange år har rapporteret, med hensyn til amerikansk efterretningstjenestes underdanighed over for Det britiske Imperium; især under Bush og Obama. Det var til syvende og sidst briterne, der trak USA ind i krig med Irak, baseret på Tony Blairs »udmajede« efterretningsrapporter om Saddam Husseins ikkeeksisterende masseødelæggelsesvåben; ind i en krig mod Libyen, baseret på britisk efterretningstjenestes løgne om Gaddafi og de al-Qaeda-tilknyttede, libyske »frihedskæmpere«; og de igangværende krige mod Syrien og Yemen, baseret på løgne fra de samme, britisk-saudiske netværk, der støtter terrorister i hele Sydvestasien, med det

formål at gennemtvinge »regimeskift« mod sekulære regeringer.

I går sagde Trump, at, »hvis Putin synes om Trump, ved I så hvad? Det kaldes en fordel, ikke en ulempe«, og beskrev den presserende nødvendighed i at samarbejde om at nedkæmpe terrorisme. Det samme er tilfældet med venskab med Kina og Xi Jinpings Nye Silkevejsinitiativer i hele verden, og som Trump ligeledes må tilslutte sig, som kernen i USA's udenrigspolitik.

I går var et team på flere end 20 medlemmer af LaRouche Politiske Aktionskomite på Capitol Hill, hvor de mobiliserede Kongressen til omgående at vedtage Glass-Steagall og i særdeleshed krævede, at både Demokrater og Republikanere holdt Trump fast på sit løfte under kampagnen om at implementere Glass-Steagall og omdirigere statskredit til at genopbygge den industrielle og landbrugsmæssige infrastruktur, samt genoprette nationens forfølgelse af en opnåelse af fusionskraft, udforskning af rummet og de fremskudte grænseområder for menneskelig viden. Intet mindre end dette kan sætte verden tilbage på en kurs, der er i overensstemmelse med menneskelig værdighed.

Foto: Et luftfoto af Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ), Regeringens Kommunikationshovedkvarter, i Cheltenham, Gloucestershire. GCHQ er en af tre efterretningstjenester i Storbritannien, med fokus på kommunikations-efterretninger, tilsvarende det amerikanske NSA. [GCHQ/Open Government License]

RADIO SCHILLER den 9. januar

2017:

**USA efterretningsrapport har
ingen beviser om russisk
hacking af valget//
Obamas militære provokationer**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 20. december 2016:

**Briterne og Obama forsøger
at sætte verden i brand
inden Trump tager over**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

RADIO SCHILLER den 5. december 2016: Nu har Italien sagt "Nej": Den globale transformation fortsætter

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Ligesom Knud den Store kan oligarkerne heller ikke standse tidevandet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 29. november, 2016 – De revolutionære forandringer, der fejer hen over de vestlige nationer, fremprovokerer hysteri blandt de afdankede, miskrediterede nationale ledere i Europa og USA. Brexit, valgnederlaget for Obamas og Hillarys plan for krig med Rusland og Kina, Filippinernes oprør mod Obama, og den ene europæiske nation efter den anden, der afviser de anti-russiske sanktioner og dæmoniseringen af Putin – disse ting og mere endnu repræsenterer en erkendelse i hele Vesten af, at deres lederskab har været kontrolleret af finansoligarker og krigsgale neokonservative, som ikke længere kan tolereres. Imperiet er i færd med at smuldre – men 'the Lords' vil gå til yderligheder, selv til atomkrig, for at redde Imperiet, med mindre de erstattes, før det kommer dertil.

Det kommer ikke som nogen overraskelse, at briterne rejser sig til forsvar for Imperiet på den mest åbenlyse og frastødende facon. Tony Blair har, efter at Englands egen Chilcot-undersøgelse har afsløret hans ulovlige aggressionskrig i Irak, baseret på løgne, meddelt, at han vender tilbage til politik for at redde sin døende race. En amerikansk officer, der skriver på oberst Pat Langs Sic Semper Tyrannus-blog, indfanger måske ironien bedst: »Jeg bemærker også, at, i UK har Tony Blair lettet på sit kistelåg og hjemsøger atter Londons gader med den hensigt at omstøde Brexit. Ser vi et mønster her? Internationale eliter, der ikke er tilfredse med bønder på begge sider af Atlanten, der gør oprør?«

På onsdag vil det britiske parlament debattere Tony Blairs forbrydelser, en debat, som har gjort Blair-tilhængere i Labour-partiet hektiske over den yderligere afsløring af deres medskyldighed i ødelæggelsen af Sydvestasien og Europa.

Ligeledes fra UK ser tidligere, konservative regeringsminister Ken Clark hen til den ynkværdige Angela Merkel som det sidste 'store hvide håb' for Det britiske Imperium: Merkel er, skriver han, nu, da USA er blevet »tabt« til Trump, »den eneste politiker, for hvem det lykkes at holde traditionen med vestligt, liberalt demokrati i live«. Hvis det, der er sket med Vesten, skal være »vestligt, liberalt demokrati«, så er folk tydeligvis parat til at dumpe det.

Dette hysteri går så langt som til den uddøende races respons på det nederlag for terrorisme, der finder sted i Aleppo. I takt med, at Rusland og Syrien tilsammen demonstrerer, at terrorisme rent faktisk kan besejres og befolkningen befries fra barbari, reagerer de vestlige medier med rædsel og insisterer på, at Rusland og Syrien er problemet, og ikke terroristerne. Frankrig har, under det til undergang dømte Hollande-regime, endda indkaldt til et hastemøde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, for at fordømme Syrien.

Men tidevandet kan ikke standses. Bag bølgen af fornuftig

tankegang i Vesten ligger der en voksende erkendelse af, at Rusland og Kina har indført et nyt paradigme, baseret på win-win-samarbejde omkring den fysiske udvikling af nationer og områder i hele verden. På alle kontinenter afholdes der konferencer om den Nye Silkevej, som Xi Jinping har igangsat, og som analyserer den eksisterende og potentielle infrastrukturudvikling, der forbinder nationer gennem fælles fremskridt og gennem at udveksle og være fælles om de bedste og mest kreative traditioner i deres respektive kulturer.

LaRouche-organisationen har initieret og ført kampagne for disse ideer i et halvt århundrede. Nogle mennesker godtager det pessimistiske og løgagtige synspunkt, at en relativt lille organisation ikke kan have været ansvarlig for sådanne globale forandringer – men disse mennesker forstår ikke den kraft til at ændre historiens gang, som ideer er i besiddelse af, og som er langt større end »forbindelser« til folk ved magten.[1] Sandheden afsløres gennem historiens lange buer, og verden oplever nu den tordnende lyd fra en historisk tidevandsbølge. Hvilken retning, den efterfølgende opvågningen vil tage, afhænger af kraften i kreativiteten og den klassiske kultur, som verdens befolkning, og især USA's befolkning, vedtager.

Som Friedrich Schiller, frihedens digter, skrev: »Menneskeværdet er i dine hænder lagt; dets vogter vær. Med dig det synker, med dig det løftes.«

»Knud irecttesætter sine hoffolk ved bølgerne«, af Alphonse-Marie-Adolphe de Neuville.

[1] »Lad alle mænd vide, hvor tom og værdiløs kongers magt er. For der er ingen anden, der er navnet værdigt, end Gud, som himmel, jord og hav adlyder.«

Således skal ifølge legenden Knud den Store have sagt, da han, for at modbevise sine smigrende Hofmænds udtalelse om, at han var »så mægtig, at han kunne befale havets bølger at trække

sig tilbage«, fik sin trone båret ud til havets kyst og siddende på den befalede bølgerne at trække sig tilbage, da tidevandet kom ind. Hvad de naturligvis ikke gjorde.

Det franske valg ødelægger yderligere briternes og Obamas krigspolitik

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. november, 2016 – François Fillons overvældende valgsejr i søndagens franske primærvalg, til at være præsidentkandidat for Frankrigs Republikanske Parti, er et yderligere bevis på, at den menneskelige race ikke vil tolerere Barack Obamas fremstød for krig med Rusland. Ligesom Hillary Clinton førte Fillons modstander en kampagne mod Rusland, mens Fillon førte en kampagne for at arbejde sammen med Rusland om at nedkæmpe terroristerne i Syrien, om at afslutte de anti-russiske sanktioner og udvide det økonomiske samarbejde, og han vandt næsten to tredjedele af stemmerne.

Hillary Clinton, der kørte sin kampagne som en fortsættelse af Obamas krigshyl mod Rusland, forsøger nu desperat at give Putin skylden for sit nederlag! Det vanvittige i hendes påstand om, at Putin brugte at udsende »falske nyheder« og bedrive computerhacking for at stjæle det amerikanske valg, og som nu skaber overskrifter over hele USA, siger intet om Putin, men alt om tilstanden af mentalt sammenbrud hos krigspartiet i USA – de neokonservative i både det Republikanske og Demokratiske Parti, der samledes bag Hillary og blev slået af vælgerne, især af arbejdsstyrken på landet og i byerne.

I realiteten bidrog Putin faktisk til Obama/Hillary-

krigspartiets nederlag, men ikke hemmeligt eller under dække. Hans vedvarende krav om, at USA holder op med at sponsorere terrorister under dække af at bevæbne den »moderate opposition« i Syrien med henblik på at vælte den legitime regering, og hans opfordring til samarbejde om krigen mod terror, var med til at afsløre Obama og Hillary for det, de er.

På lignende vis blev Xi Jinpings gentagne opfordringer til USA om at tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevejsproces med global nationsopbygning afvist af både Obama og Hillary til fordel for militær konfrontation med Kina og afslørede således deres imperiesyn over for en befolkning, der i stigende grad beundrer den utrolige udviklingsproces, som Kina har igangsat, både internt i landet og internationalt.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der tidligere har stillet op til kanslerposten i Tyskland, sagde i dag, at, på trods af Fillons økonomiske politik i Thatcher-traditionen, så demonstrerer valget af ham den voksende afsky i Europa for det anti-russiske hysteri og faren for krig. Trumps åbne erklæring om, at han vil arbejde med Putin for at besejre terrorisme, fik taberen Obama til i denne måned at forsøge at salve Tysklands Angela Merkel til sin efterfølger, som »leder for den frie verden« i en kampagne imod Rusland. Men Merkel er nu lige så isoleret, som Obama var – ligesom Olympens falske guder, der udråber deres krav over verden, mens Olympens bjerg smuldrer under deres fødder.

Samme dag som det franske valg vandt schweizerne en solid sejr i en folkeafstemning, der var lanceret af den 'grønne' bevægelse mod kernekraft, for at lukke nationens kernekraftværker ned. Igen er budskabet til verden det, at den »nye, mørke tidsalders« mentalitet med afindustrialisering og permanente krige, ikke længere kan tolereres af menneskeslægten. Det er især et budskab til Merkel, der er imod kernekraft, om, at hendes tid er forbi.

Den vestlige verden oplever for tiden en revolutionær transformation. LaRouche-bevægelsen har i årevis tvunget befolkningen i USA og Europa, ofte imod dens vilje, til at se på det nye paradigmes nye lederskab, som kommer fra Rusland og Kina, og til at sammenligne det med den politik, der dikteres af London og Wall Street, og som økonomisk og kulturelt har ødelagt de transatlantiske nationer. Denne sandhed kan ikke længere undertrykkes. Lyndon LaRouche sagde i dag til sine medarbejdere: »Vi indtager en ledende position netop nu. Vi er ovenpå. Vi ved, hvad det er, vi gør, så lad os få en sejr.«

Foto: Daværende franske premierminister, hr. François Fillon, møder IAEA-generaldirektør Yukiya Amano & Chef de Cabinet, hr. Rafael Grossi, 2011. (Foto: IAEA Imagebank CC-SA)

RADIO SCHILLER den 28. november 2016: Ny dansk regering//Forsøg på at underminere Trump// Kinesisk og russisk teknologisk samarbejde med udviklingslande

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Britisk krigsparti flipper ud over valget af Trump

10. nov., 2016 – I London har skræmme kampagnen om valget af Donald Trump, og hvad det måtte betyde for NATO, nået irrationelle højder. Fire pensionerede, højtplacerede flådeofficerer advarer om, at, hvis Trump tager USA ud af NATO og/eller NATO-medlemmer ikke øger deres forsvarsbudget, vil Rusland invadere Østeuropa. Sir Michael Graydon, tidligere chef for Royal Air Force, sagde: »Hvis USA forlader NATO, ville det være absolut katastrofalt og præcis, hvad Vladimir Putin kunne tænke sig.« I dette tilfælde ville NATO ikke have tilstrækkelig troværdighed til at forsvare de baltiske stater. Den tidligere hærchef, general Lord Dannatt, advarede: »Vi har hørt Donald Trump true med alt muligt, og vi bør tage denne trussel alvorligt ... Hvis USA vender NATO ryggen, ophører NATO med at eksistere, nærmest pr. definition, og så ville vi blive nødt til at opfinde noget andet. I sammenhæng med Brexit er det latterligt.« General Richard Shirref, tidligere NATO-vicekommandør, lod sig ikke vælte af pinden. »Vi må håbe, at den retorik, vi hørte under kampagnen, hurtigt vil blive erstattet af en meget nøgtern og seriøs udtalelse om, at, hvis der er tale om, at et NATO-medlem angribes, så vil Trump uden tøven eller tvetydighed komme til landets forsvar«, sagde han. »Alt andet ville være virkeligt dårlige nyheder for NATO.«