

»Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme« (DANSK) Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale ved Schiller Instituttet/EIR's seminar i København, 12. dec., 2016.

Jeg mener, at vi bør være meget glade, for hvis dette alt sammen går den rigtige vej; og det er for en stor del vores personlige forpligtelse at hjælpe, og jeg beder jer alle sammen om ikke at være passive tilskuere, men gå med i Schiller Instituttet for at være med til at implementere disse visioner og disse ideer, for så vil vi blive meget heldige med, at vi i vores levetid kan leve det nye paradigme. Og det nye paradigme vil blive første gang, menneskets værdighed vil blive virkeliggjort, og jeg mener, at det er en meget, meget vigtig mission, som vi alle bør vedtage.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

(Efterfølgende spørgsmål og svar, engelsk udskrift: [Klik her.](#))

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets

medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Det var den bedste tid, Det var den værste tid – Find dem, der ønsker at gøre det gode

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 13. december, 2016 – Friedrich Schiller talte om dem, der søger sandheden gennem skønhed. Percy Shelley talte om de revolutionære tidspunkter i historien, hvor almindelige mennesker bliver i stand til at forstå dybe sandheder om menneske og natur.

Vi befinder os ved et sådant tidspunkt. Terrorismen jages på flugt; kineserne og russerne bygger storslåede projekter i hele verden, og Vestens befolkninger, den ene efter den anden, demonstrerer ved valgstederne, at de ikke længere vil tolerere det økonomiske forfald, de evindelige krige for at fremkalde »regimeskifte«, og heller ikke det døende Imperiums trussel om krig med Rusland og Kina.

Alligevel forsøger det miskrediterede og kasserede lederskab af det gamle paradigme, idet de lader som om, at de stadig har deres mistede magt, at fremprovokere en verdenskrig. Graden af rent hysteri er i sandhed forbløffende. Hvis man skulle tro Obama, eller Angela Merkel, eller det britiske lederskab, så er nedkæmpelsen af al-Qaeda i Aleppo et katastrofalt folkemord; præsidentvalget i USA blev frastjålet Obamas klon Hillary Clinton af Vladimir Putin; Putin gør nu klar til at stjæle det tyske valg, og den globale opvarmning vil ødelægge verden, med mindre vi sætter en stoppe for, at mennesket gør fremskridt.

Dette er latterligt, men det er ikke noget at grine ad. Husk,

at *EIR* i juni måned rapporterede, at NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg til pressen sagde, »Et alvorligt cyber-angreb kan klassificeres som en sag for Alliancen. Så kan og må NATO reagere. Hvordan vil afhænge af, hvor alvorligt angrebet er« – dvs., at NATO kunne respondere til et hacker-angreb med konventionelle våben, eller atomvåben, under NATO's artikel V.

Når man hører disse neokonservative imperieherrers svanesang, så bør man huske på Joseph Goebbels' »store løgn«: »Hvis man fortæller en løgn, der er stor nok, og bliver ved med at gentage den, vil folk sluttelig tro på den. Løgneren kan kun opretholdes så længe, som Staten kan skærme befolkningen fra de politiske, økonomiske og/eller militære konsekvenser af løgneren.«

Vi har en million gange fået at vide, at man »ved«, at russerne hackede Vestens computere for at underminere vestligt »demokrati« og få Donald Trump valgt. Trump gør absolut ret i at spørge, hvordan nogen kan tro på sådan noget nonsens, efter at de selv samme, korrupte elementer i efterretningssamfundet forsikrede os om, at Saddam Hussein havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, og de dernæst udløste det Helvede af folkemord, der har fundet sted i de seneste tretten år i Mellemøsten; og de forsikrede ligeledes den amerikanske Kongres om, at National Security Agency, NSA, ikke udførte nogen masseovervågning af USA's borgere sådan, som James Clapper gjorde det før Edward Snowdens afsløringer – den selvsamme James Clapper, som Obama nu har beordret til at »undersøge« russernes »omstyrtelse« af den amerikanske valgproces.

Der er ingen tvivl om, at et voksende antal mennesker i hele den vestlige verden – både blandt politiske ledere og almindelige borgere – er ved at erkende det gamle paradigmes ondskab og, konfronteret med ondskab, vælger at gøre det gode. Verden gennemgår en fornyelse gennem processen med den Nye Silkevej, som Kina har lanceret, med samarbejdet med den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, ASEAN, BRIKS, SCO – med over 100

nationer i hele Eurasien, Afrika og Mellem- og Sydamerika, der alle ønsker at skabe en fremtid for deres nationer, og for verden som helhed. Amerika og EU er ikke udelukket fra denne proces – de er med fuldt overlæg i færd med selv at isolere sig og nægter således deres egne befolkninger retten til at tage del i dette revolutionære, nye paradigme for udvikling af vor planet, og vort univers.

Find de mennesker, der ønsker at gøre det gode, sagde Lyndon LaRouche sine medarbejdere i dag. Det bliver i stigende grad lettere at skelne mellem dem, der ønsker at bevare det døende Imperiums magt, om det så fører til Helvede, og så dem, der ønsker at være med til at skabe en værdig, kreativ og fremgangsrig fremtid for hele menneskeheden.

(Note: Ordlyden i titlen stammer fra indledningen til Charles Dickens' roman, To Byer (A Tale of Two Cities): 'Det var den bedste tid, det var den værste tid; det var visdommens tid, og det var tåbelighedens tid; det var troens epoke, det var vantroens epoke; det var Lysets tid, det var Mørkets tid; det var håbets forår, det var fortvivlelsens vinter; alt lå foran os, og intet lå foran os; vi var alle direkte på vej til Himlen, og vi var alle direkte på den modsatte vej – kort sagt, det var en tid, der var så lig den nuværende periode, at nogle af dennes mest højtråbende autoriteter insisterede på, at den, på godt og ondt, kun skulle modtages med en superlativ sammenligning.')

Titelbillede: Statue af Friedrich Schiller og Johann Wolfgang Goethe i Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, CA. □

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på Schiller Instituttets og EIR's seminar i København: Donald Trump og det nye internationale paradigme. ENGELSK udskrift af tale samt Spørgsmål og Svar

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet

i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale, der varer omkring 1 time og 20 minutter, kan høres ovenover eller her:

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

—

English: Introductory article

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on 'Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm'

COPENHAGEN, Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS) – Today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche

was the special guest speaker at a Schiller Institute/{EIR} seminar in Copenhagen entitled, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Eight diplomats from six countries attended, including two ambassadors. There were nations from Western Europe, Southwest Asia, Western and Eastern Asia, and Africa. In addition, there were around 30 Schiller Institute members and contacts, as well as a few representatives of various Danish and international institutions.

The event was opened by the presentation of a Chinese love song performed by Feride Istogu Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Afterwards, Tom Gillesberg, the chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark, introduced Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, describing her historical role in bringing about the New Silk Road policy.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's very inspiring, in-depth speech began with the revolution against globalization represented by the Brexit, the Trump election, and the Italian No vote. She gave an evaluation of the potential represented by some of the statements and appointments Trump has made so far, and then proceeded with a detailed discussion of the two conflicting paradigms in the world today. Zepp-LaRouche then uplifted the audience with the beautiful ideas of space scientist Krafft Ehricke and Renaissance philosopher Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. She concluded with an appeal to those present not to act as spectators on the stage of history, but engage in the battle for the new paradigm with us.

Her speech, about 80 minutes long, may be heard above, or at: https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

Zepp-LaRouche's speech and discussion had a profound effect on all present.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Discussion:

(There is no video or audio of the discussion period, only this transcript.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

(To facilitate free discussion, the questioners are not identified, and the questions are summarized. The answers are complete.)

Question: Can we be optimistic about Trump's presidency, because he is skeptical about climate change, is for trade war with China and Mexico, opposes the free trade deals, and has called for tearing up the nuclear deal with Iran.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I said earlier that the potentialities for change are there, but it depends, to a very large extent, upon us – what we do. When Trump got elected, my first response was, this is what I call the 'dog pull-tail, let-go feeling.' What I mean by that is that when you pull the tail of a dog, which you should never do, naturally, and you let go, the pain stops. When you pull, there is pain, and when you stop pulling, the pain goes away.

So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWIII, and that was really the primary point, because if Hillary Clinton would have been elected – unfortunately, Hillary Clinton, when she was in the Obama administration, transformed from being a relatively OK person, she was never great, but in 2008, she was relatively decent, compared to what she became, because she capitulated to Obama, and when she made this terrible statement, for example, in Libya, about the murder of Gaddafi, "We came, we saw, and he died." This is

barbarism.

Her behavior in the Ben Ghazi case. There were so many things where she became worse than Obama, almost. So the immediate thing was that that big danger, that she would have continued the policies of Bush and Obama, in the confrontation with Russia and China, that that was stopped is, already, for the survival of civilization, the most important step.

Now, on these other points. Naturally, there is climate change. There is no question about it. But the question is, what is the cause of it? And the Schiller Institute had several conferences where we invited extremely important scientists who presented, beyond a doubt, that if you look at the last 500 million years in the history of the Earth, you have a continuous cycle of ice ages, of warming periods, of small ice ages, and the man-made component of climate change is absolutely negligible. It's a big fraud, for example, it's a big business. To sell CO2 omission quotas, is like selling indulgences in the Middle Ages.

Obviously, there are climate changes, and some countries which have low coasts are very much affected, but then you have to adapt to these climate changes with modern technology, and you cannot solve the problem by going to electric cars, or going to decarbonization of the world economy. This is a big fraud, and I am not saying that Trump is saying this for all the right reasons, but the idea to impose measures implied with the "great transformation" Schellnhuber is talking about – I mean these people do not want development.

We have been on this case for the last – as a matter of fact, we, the LaRouche movement, had a conception about the development of the world really starting at the end of the sixties.

I joined Mr. LaRouche because I went to China, Africa, other Asian countries, and I saw the horrible, horrible underdevelopment. So I came back from this trip, and I said, 'I have to become political, because I want to change this.' I could give you a long, long story of the many observations, because I went with a cargo ship, and when you go to these

countries with a cargo ship, you get a quite different idea than if you go on a 5-star cruise, and hotels. You see how the poverty affects people in their real lives. And I came back, and I looked at all the political movements, and I saw that LaRouche was the only one who said, 'We have to have Third World development. We have to have technology transfer. We have to alleviate this poverty.'

And we had a positive conception already in the seventies, and therefore, when the Club of Rome appeared, we immediately said, 'This is a fraud.' Because the Club of Rome said, 'There are limits to growth. We have reached equilibrium. Until the year 1972, you could develop, but now, we have reached equilibrium, and we have to have sustainable development. We have to have appropriate technology.' These notions did not exist before, because before, you had the idea of a UN Development Decade, where each decade, you would overcome the underdevelopment by qualitative jumps. And when we recognized this propaganda by the Club of Rome, we immediately said, 'This is a complete fraud,' and the people who wrote the book "Limits to Growth," Meadows and Forrester ...

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

A: I would like to give you written documentation afterwards of the studies that were made by these geologists, which are, without question, the explanation of climate change is not man-made. The anthropogenic aspect of it is so miniscule. Climate change has to do with the position of the solar system in the galaxy, which goes in cycles around a certain axis, and you can see that over 500 million years, the data confirms that you have these wide changes. Greenland is called Greenland, because it was green. There used to be vineyards. You had ice ages which completely covered the Earth, and the reason why I went into this longer history, is to show how the environmentalist movement was created with the attempt to keep development down, and climate change is just another expression of the same effort.

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO2 emission trade, you

have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing, because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, "Against the Stream," is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

The question is, 'What is the source of wealth?' Is the source of wealth cheap labor, to buy cheap raw materials, produce cheaply, and sell expensive? Is that the cause of wealth? No. The only cause of wealth is the increase in the creativity of labor power. And a good government is, therefore, investing the maximum amount into education, into sponsoring the creativity of youth, of labor, and the more people in the labor force, by percentage, are engineers, scientists, the more productive the economy becomes.

And the free trade system, of which NAFTA is just one example, did exactly the opposite. China, which was part of this in the beginning – the reason why China today has so many environmental problems, like smog, like a large amount of groundwater being contaminated, is the result of the fact that China, in the beginning of its industrialization, accepted being a cheap labor production place for the U.S. and for Europe. When I was in China, even in 1971, I visited some factories which were horrible. They were absolutely horrible. The working conditions were terrible, the labor force, which produced electrical devices for radios, it was horrible. They worked for 18 hours. No health system. It was just terrible. And that is how China developed in the first phase.

But then China, with Deng Xiaoping, started to recognize that that is the wrong way. So China is now on a completely different track. They are putting the maximum emphasis on science and technology, the increase of excellence. Last year, they produced 1 million scientists. That's double of what the U.S. produced. Obviously China is a larger country, but still. What will finally be decisive is the number of people who are creative. And that is why China, right now, has the best education system, because they have understood that the source of wealth is not raw materials. Is not trade conditions. It is the creativity of their own people. And that it a good thing. If we go to a system where we have a certain amount of protectionism, to protect the development of the domestic market, it is a good thing.

There is no danger of cutting [countries off from one another], because all of these infrastructure projects are connectivity. The world will be more connected than ever before. But this whole myth of free trade is really a very bad thing. It has been coined by the people who profit from it. That's why the world is in the condition it is right now, where the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. The middle class is being destroyed all over the world. And I would really like to communicate with you so that we can deepen this dialogue.

On the Iran thing, I don't think he will break it, but that is my hope. I don't know.

So, I'm not saying he's a – as I said, Baron von Knigge would get a heart attack when he hears Trump's speeches, but the world was in such a grip of evil, satanic evil, that it is a good thing that there is a break, and the unfortunate thing, is that Europe is still in this grip.

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know

what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

So, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of the Europeans who react this way to the defeat of Hillary, are obeying another power in their head, and that power I call The British Empire, which is still in place, and it dominates Europe, and that is why they feel – I was asking myself, how come all of these politicians are so arrogant towards the new president of the U.S.? Because they were the boot-lickers of Washington until yesterday, and they would immediately do everything Washington would say and do, so I asked myself, 'Where is this sudden self-assertedness coming from?' And the only explanation I came up with, was to say, they must have an idea that there is another power which is more powerful than Trump, otherwise, they wouldn't have this sudden arrogance.

And it is the British, because you will see tomorrow, because tomorrow, there will be a federal press conference in Berlin, where a number of people will present their contribution to the German chairmanship of the G-20, which will take place in July in Hamburg. This will be Joachim Schellnhuber, the head of the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change), this is the scientific advisory organization advising the German government. He put out this paper about 'the great transformation,' which we wrote about. You can look in the archive. He is the head of the idea of a decarbonization of the world economy.

Now, if you decarbonize the world economy, without having fusion, that would be one thing, to have fusion power in place. Then you can talk about getting rid of fossil fuels, but without having fusion, and being against nuclear energy, fission, it means that you will reduce the world's population to 1 billion or less, because there is a direct correlation between the energy-flux-density, and the number of people you can maintain. Schellnhuber said that the carrying capacity of the Earth is maximum 1 billion people. He didn't say that he wants to do with the 6 billion who are already there. If he would be consequent, he should hop away from this planet.

And they will announce a sinister plan, to try to use the fact that many countries have environmental problems, to sneak in their anti-development programs. People should not be naïve, because not everybody thinks that population growth is a good thing. There are many people who think that each human being is a parasite, destroying nature. That is the image of man which many people have. The greenies, for example.

We look at it in a different way. We think that the more people you have, the greater longevity you can have, division of labor, and a modern scientific society needs many people with a long life span. Because if you are in the Third World, and you die, and you have an average life expectancy of 40 years, or less, you cannot have scientists, because the production of a scientist takes 30-35 years, and if people then die right away, then you can't have a modern society.

So the more creative people you have, the better. Each human being is an incredible addition, because we are creative.

Tom Gillesberg: Schellnhuber, for his services, was appointed Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE), and for him, he personally has said, that the highpoint of his existence was that the British Queen, personally, gave him the Order of the British Empire, for his efforts to reduce the possibility for mankind's survival, you could say, so it is connected with what you said.

Q: This is the best speech I have ever heard in my life.

Is this a second American Revolution, and will the Federal Reserve, which is privately owned, be closed down, and will money be created for the benefit of all people, and not just the private Fed?

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system

for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

It's the same idea that Friedrich Schiller had in Wilhelm Tell. This is a play he wrote, which takes place in Switzerland. There, the Hapsburg oligarch is also trampling on the rights of the Swiss people, then they unite with the Rütli Oath. There is this beautiful formulation which says, 'When the rights of people are trampled upon, they have the right to reach out to the stars, and take from the stars those rights which are eternally embedded in these stars. (I am not saying it as beautifully as Schiller does.)

If you compare these two texts, the Declaration of Independence, and the Rütli Oath from Schiller's play, they are almost identical, and it's very clear that Schiller was inspired by the American Revolution when he wrote that play, because in his plays, there are many ideas which resonate with the American Revolution, and he actually wanted to immigrate, at one point, to America.

So I think that if Trump turns out to be another fraudster, which we don't know yet, I think that this process of revolt will continue, because I only mentioned some elements.

I could mention that there are many countries now in realignment. for example, the Philippines, Duterte. This was supposed to be the playground for the conflict with China in the South China Sea. Now Duterte sent his Defense Secretary, Lorenzana, to Russia and China, to buy weapon systems from Russia and China, and to establish a friendship with China, and he said, 'The Philippines is no longer the colony of the U.S.'

Then you have Japan, which was the junior partner of the U.S. in the Pacific. Abe went to Sochi, meeting with Putin. In three days from now, Putin will go to Japan to have a state visit. They are talking about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan.

All of these are new alignments. There is a shift in the

strategic situation, and I don't think that that shift can be reversed.

Q: About Russia hacking the U.S. election. Why doesn't the U.S. have anti-hacking measures? Can you explain that?

A: I cannot explain that, for the same reason that I cannot explain why the NSA is surveilling everyone, all their phones, their communications, worldwide. They can observe all of these things, but they don't know about terrorism. They don't know about drug trafficking. They don't know about money laundering. Either their system is not so good, or they are looking in the wrong direction. I can't answer your question.

Q: Will the result of the Brexit be positive for Europe, to enable continental Europe to become stronger, and to improve cooperation with the eastern parts of Europe?

A: I think that the EU is not functioning, and I think it is not just the Brexit. The "No" in Italy is a reflection of the same dynamic. Now you have Gentiloni, the new prime minister, and they will probably go for new elections. Right now, in the polls, you have the 5 Star Party leading. If they win, and form the new government, they have already said that they would leave the EU, and leave the Euro, and, in a certain sense, it is not functioning.

The reason I was against the introduction of the Euro from the beginning, was because we said that it cannot function. You cannot have a European currency union in something which is not an optimal economic space. You cannot put advanced industry together with an agrarian country, with completely different tax laws, pension laws, and you don't want a political union, because Europe is not a people. You don't have a European people. I don't know what the Danes are saying. I don't know what is in the Danish newspapers. The people of Slovenia have no inkling of what is happening in Alsace-Lorraine, and so forth, and so on. You don't have a European people. Esperanto doesn't function. You have 28 nations, 28 histories, 28 cultures.

That doesn't mean that you can't work together. I think that the idea of Charles de Gaulle to work together as an alliance

between perfectly sovereign fatherlands, that is a correct idea. And all these fatherlands can adopt a joint mission, like to develop Africa, or other things.

I just think that this European Union is not going to stay forever.

Q: (followup) Will it be easier for Germany and France to promote this development, as the leading countries?

A: Everybody says that Germany is the biggest beneficiary of globalization, the EU, and the Euro, but that's not really true, because, if you look at it more closely, then you can say that since the introduction of the Euro, the domestic market of Germany has completely stagnated. And the number of people who became poorer has increased.

Q: (followup) What about regarding the dialogue with Russia.

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

I do not think that this EU bureaucracy is capable of reform, because by their self-understanding, they are the local pro-consuls of this empire, and I think that it would be much better if Germany, France, and other countries have individual relations. And I don't think that – this whole idea that you need a European Empire to compete with Russia and China and other emerging countries – The EU, by definition, is an empire. They have said it themselves. Robert Cooper, who has some kind of advisory function [currently serving as EU Special Advisor with regard to Myanmar], he said that the EU is the fastest expanding empire in history. It's a bad idea.

And the Russians for – I noticed this since the beginning of the year 2000, that the Russians did not make a difference anymore between the EU and NATO. They said that it's the same thing. And it is the same thing.

Q: You said that the One Belt, One Road was stripped of commercial interests from the Chinese side, as opposed to the IMF, World Bank. On what basis do you say that it is less interest-driven than the Bretton Woods institutions?

A: Well, because, the question is not that I'm saying that China is perfect. I'm not saying that. But when you look at anything, you have to look at the vector of development, is it

going upward, or is it going downward? And from that standpoint, I had the advantage that I was in China in 1971, which was in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. This was so different than China today.

The Cultural Revolution was horrible for the people. The Red Guards would take people out of their homes, put them in jail, send them to the countryside, and people were distraught.

And now, people in China are happy. If you talk to students, or to young people, they are optimistic. They say, 'Oh. I will do this in the future. I have these plans.' I talked to a group of students in Lanzhou two years ago, and they said, 'We will go to Africa. We will develop Africa.' I have never heard a German student say this. Yeah, when I was a student, but that's a long time ago.

I think that it is very worthwhile to read the speeches of Xi Jinping. There is a book, "The Governance of China," but that only has about 60 speeches, and there are many, many more. For example, you should read the speeches he gave when he went to France, to Germany, and to India.

For example, when he went to India, he made a speech which was really incredible, because he said that he loved Indian culture from his early youth, and then he gave so many examples of the high points of Indian culture, the Gupta period, the Upanishads, the Vedic writings, Rabindranath Tagore, many predicates which prove that he really knows what he is talking about. He is not just one of these politicians who have a PR advisor about how to make nice bubbles in your speeches, but you could really see that he means it. And the same for Germany. He came to Germany and he emphasized Schubert and Heine, things which I also appreciate about Germany, and he did the same thing in France.

And I don't think that the Chinese leadership would agree with me when I say this, but I think that they are less communist than Confucians. They probably would not admit that, because they are officially the Communist Party, and that's OK, but, I come from Trier, and Trier is the birthplace of Karl Marx, so I have studied Karl Marx, and I think that they are still

socialist, or communist, or whatever, but they always said that they are communist with Chinese characteristics, and these Chinese characteristics are Confucianism.

And the Confucian idea of man is lifelong learning, lifelong perfection, that everyone should be a Jinzi, a wise man, a noble man, and Confucius said, if the government is bad, then the Jinzi, these wise people, should replace the government. Also the idea that you have to have an harmonious development, starting with the family, continuing in the nation, and then, larger, among the nations.

China is the only country that has not made wars of aggression, colonial wars, in its 5,000 years of history. It was invaded many times, the Opium War, and things like that, but China is not an aggressive nation, at all.

And if you look at what they are doing in practice, the IMF and the World Bank have prevented Third World development, and China is going from one country to the next, building science cities, helping with space cooperation, bringing in developing countries in the most advanced areas of science, in order to not prevent their development. I think this is a completely different approach.

I think that the Chinese have come up with a new model of government, which I have not seen in any place in Europe, the U.S. ever, and it's a model which is overcoming geopolitics, which is, if you say, 'I have a win-win for cooperation. Everybody can join.' Then, if everyone joins, then you have overcome geopolitics.

And geopolitics is the one thing that caused two world wars, and in the age of thermonuclear weapons, we cannot have geopolitics anymore. So I think that these are very important differences.

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey

democracy,' and do nothing.

Q: Statement about Chinese infrastructure projects in Morocco. Both are winners, as opposed to projects 20 years ago run by other countries. The Chinese there have learned Arabic. The projects have greatly reduced the travel time. They have a different perspective than the French, and Europeans had.

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

A: I would just say that people should not just believe, or not believe, what I am saying, but take an active attitude to try to find out what the truth is, for themselves. Because the world is not helped by replacing one ideology by another. The only way you can be certain, is that you become a truth-seeking person yourself. Because the whole question about what went wrong, is that people forgot what it is to be an honest truth-seeking person, taking the truth not as something you reach finally, but something you always improve.

Schiller had this beautiful writing about universal history, where he said that the philosophical mind is the first one to take his own system apart, to put it together more perfectly again.

I think that that quality – and, also, we had two days ago in Berlin, a very important event, which was also about the dialogue of cultures, and every – we had a very important presentation, which you can soon see on our webpage, where we had a double bass player who spoke about the importance of Wilhelm Furtwängler as a conductor, and he gave some musical examples, and he compared the performances of Furtwängler with some modern conductors, and the difference is so unbelievable. The music of Furtwängler is transparent. It is beautiful. It is absolutely overwhelmingly uplifting, and many of the other conductors are just playing along, with no respect for what the composition is.

And he really described, with many quotes from Furtwängler, that what is needed is this inner quality of truthfulness. That you don't fake it, because if you're not truthful – for example, you cannot recite poetry, if you're not truthful. You cannot sing beautifully, if you're not truthful. Sure, you can

sing brilliantly, you can do all kinds of tricks, and it impresses people, but to really produce art, you have to be truthful. You have to try to understand the poetical idea, the musical idea. You have to step back with your ego behind what the composer or the poet wrote. And that's what is wrong with modern theater. In Regietheater, they just say, 'I don't care what Schiller wrote, or what Shakespeare wrote. I just make my modern interpretation. I put Harley Davidson's into Shakespeare, and it doesn't matter.' And that is not art.

And I think the question is, 'What do you do with your life?' That is really the question. Are you becoming a creative person, devoted to that with your life, you contribute to enable mankind to move on a little step further, and become better.

Or, are you just eating three tons of caviar, and have 3,000 Porsches. And then, when you die, they write on your gravestone, 'He/she ate three tons of caviar, and had 3,000 Porsches,' and that was it.

No, you should try to be an honest person, trying to make human society better with what you do. And, once you do that, you become happy. Then you are free. This inner freedom, is what you should try to find. And that is the only way that we will win that battle. It's not Trump. It is, can we get enough people to be innerly free.

And then we win.

End of discussion

Et frit Aleppo

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 12. december, 2016 – I dag erklærede den syriske hær officielt sejren over terroristerne i Aleppo. Dette sker efter terroristernes fire år lange besættelse af byen; men det sker herved 24 dage efter, at den syriske

regering, med russisk støtte, lovede at generobre byen fuldstændigt. De handlede imod hele oppositionen forøvet af London, Paris, Washington og Saudi-Arabien, der støttede »moderate« oprørere på jorden og førte løgne- og chikanekampagner i De forenede Nationer i New York.

SANA, den syriske regerings nyhedstjeneste, sender i aften en video, hvor præsident Bashar al-Assad ønsker syriske tropper tillykke ved deres stillinger i Aleppo. Prisen for denne sejr for principper har været forfærdelige lidelser og tab af liv, men sejren er godt og grundigt vundet. Folk fejrer den nu.

✘ Vi må nu tænke på nødvendigheden af en Marshallplan for området – de '5 søers plan', eller »Fønix«-plan, for en genopbygning af Syrien og hele området, som Hussein Askary og Ulf Sandmark har udviklet, og som Schiller Instituttet har promoveret.

I sidste uge, den 8. dec., midt i de sidste dages kampe om Aleppo, var Kinas særlige udsending til Syrien, Xie Xiaoyan, i Damaskus for at drøfte humanitære hjælpeoperationer, såvel som også andre planer om hjælp til den krigshærgede nation. I mellemtiden, i New York i sidste uge, stod Kina sammen med Rusland og andre nationer om at modsætte sig de svigagtige resolutioner om våbenstilstand og hjælp til Aleppo, der, i et forsøg på at opretholde kampen om Aleppo, var blevet foreslået af aksen bestående af Det Hvide Hus, London, Saudi-Arabien og Frankrig.

I USA foregår der en hysterisk kampagne imod Rusland og præsident Putin, hvor man bruger løgner om, at russiske, statslige hackere skulle have grebet ind i de amerikanske valg, og også, at det var til fordel for Donald Trump. Dette kommer efter rapporter i medierne i sidste uge om, at CIA er i besiddelse af »hemmelige« beviser for, at Rusland begår disse

kriminelle handlinger og er blevet en farlig modstander. Putin er den stærke mand, der udøver trusler, han er en krigsforbryder i Syrien, osv.

Efter at Lyndon LaRouche i dag blev briefet om situationen, bestilte han en kronologi (se nedenfor), der går tilbage til juli 2016, over denne løgnekampagne, og hvor WikiLeaks publicerede e-mails, der afslørede det aftalte spil mellem Hillary Clintons kampagne og det Demokratiske Partis Nationalkomite, om at favorisere Clinton og lægge forhindringer i vejen for Bernie Sanders. Daværende formand for Demokraternes Nationalkomite, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, måtte træde tilbage før Demokraternes partikonvent. Siden da – og især efter at have tabt præsidentvalget – har Obama- og Clinton-flokken bestræbt sig endnu mere på at aflede opmærksomheden fra den folkelige afvisning af deres mange forbrydelser, ved at fokusere på en svigagtig dæmonisering af Rusland og Putin.

Måden, dette skal forstås på, sagde LaRouche, er den, at dette er et britisk svindelnummer, en bestræbelse fra Dronningens side for at beskytte Obama og forhindre muligheden for, at Londons og Wall Streets politik skrottes. De aktuelle 'aggressiv hund'-angreb mod Rusland bør ses i denne globale sammenhæng – med sammenbruddet af det mislykkede system i USA under Bush og Obama, og af selve Det britiske Imperium, og ligeledes i sammenhæng med de brud, der nu kommer fra Europa, og nu, gennembruddet i Aleppo. Vores kamp er en kamp for principper.

Supplerende materiale (engelsk):

Chronology: The 'Blame Russia' Operation for Election Interference Is a British Fraud

Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS)–The current hysteria to blame Russia for hacking and interfering in U.S. elections is no civic vigilance,

but a classic British fraud operation, for the Queen to protect her Obama and avert the dumping of his failed London/Wall Street policies. It should be seen in the widest international context, of the collapse of the U.S. economic and political system, as well as the potential break-away from this collapse by populations around the world, from the Philippines, to Italy, to Bulgaria, to Moldova, to the U.S., to the Brexit voters, and more.

The chronology below shows the beginnings of the fraud, with the July 2016 Clinton campaign charges against Russia, made after leaks showed that the Democratic National Committee was secretly acting in Hillary's favor against Bernie Sanders, her principal Democratic opponent. Next, the Obama Administration itself jumped in to make accusations against Russia, as voters started lining up against Clinton. Then, after the electorate went for Trump, Obama formally called for an investigation of Russian involvement. Now there are calls for delaying the Electoral College vote altogether, and even for a re-election, plus denunciations of Russian President Vladimir Putin for hijacking the election.

– Spring, 2016 –

JUNE. The Democratic National Committee said that two hacker groups had invaded its IT systems. The assertion was then later made by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the Obama

Administration

that the hacking, and subsequent release of emails, was "consistent with" Russian tactics, while not denying the illegal activity that had been exposed by the release.

– Summer, 2016 –

JULY. Before the Democratic Party Convention began, WikiLeaks posted some 20,000 emails from the DNC showing it was favoring Hillary Clinton, and prejudiced against her primary opponent Bernie Sanders, a breach of their own rules of impartiality.

The

DNC Chairman, Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, was forced to resign

just before the convention due to the exposure. Julian Assange,

head of WikiLeaks, denied that Wiki had hacked the emails, but said that they came from a leaker.

– Autumn, 2016 –

OCT. 7. The Obama Administration formally accused Russia of conducting cyber attacks aimed at the elections. A statement was

issued by James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence, and

Jeh Johnson, Department of Homeland Security, saying that, "We believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities." Such "belief," and never evidence or proof, has remained the basis of all charges. The activities referred to

were hacking attempts against state election systems. Clapper and

Johnson, while not blaming the Russian government specifically,

asserted that the patterns of "scanning and probing" could be

traced in many cases to servers operated by a Russian company.

A careful review of the Clapper-Johnson statement, however, made clear that there was no unanimous consensus among the U.S.

intelligence agencies that there was adequate proof to accuse the

Russians of being behind the alleged hacking. In fact, by October, according to a Dec. 12, 2016, *Washington Post* account,

quoting FBI officials, the Bureau had greatly scaled back its five-month long probe of Russian interference and ties to the Trump campaign, due to lack of sufficient evidence.

OCT. 8. The Russian Foreign Ministry responded that the hacking

accusations lacked any proof, and were intended for the purpose

of inciting, "unprecedented anti-Russian hysteria." Dep. Foreign

Minister Sergei Ryabkov, on the Ministry website, denounced the

U.S. statements as "dirty tricks."

NOVEMBER. During October through Nov. 6, WikiLeaks released several batches from a trove of over 50,000 emails, from the private email account of Clinton's campaign manager, John Podesta. Again, WikiLeaks spokesmen stated that they did not receive the documents from hackers, but obtained them from whistleblowers inside the United States.

– Winter, 2016 –

DEC. 9. The *Washington Post* and *New York Times* reported that the CIA knew that Russia was behind hacking during the elections.

Naming no sources, nor facts, the *Post* wrote, "The CIA has concluded in a secret assessment that Russia intervened in the

2016 election to help Donald Trump win the presidency ... according to officials briefed on the matter."

The London *Guardian* reports the same line full-blast. However, the *Guardian* itself quoted an expert debunking this. ZeroHedge reproduced a *Guardian* article, featuring a British diplomat (friend of Assange) who has met and knows the leaker of the DNC emails. Those who know the leaker know, says the diplomat, that the emails were leaked, not hacked, and the leaker is not Russian but American.

From the *Guardian* piece: "Assange has previously said the DNC leaks were not linked to Russia. A second senior official cited by the *Washington Post* conceded that intelligence agencies did not have specific proof that the Kremlin was directing the hackers, who were said to be one step removed from the Russian government.

"Craig Murray, the former UK ambassador to Uzbekistan, who is a close associate of Assange, called the CIA claims 'bullshit,' adding: 'They are absolutely making it up.

"`I know who leaked them,' Murray said. 'I've met the person,

who leaked them, and they are certainly not Russian, and it's an insider. It's a leak, not a hack; the two are different things.

"`If what the CIA is saying is true, and the CIA's statement refers to people who are known to be linked to the Russian state, they would have arrested someone if it was someone inside the United States.

"`America has not been shy about arresting

whistleblowers

and it's not been shy about extraditing hackers. They plainly have no knowledge whatsoever,' said Murray."

DEC. 9. Obama ordered a review of Russia's involvement in hacking to rig elections, going back to 2008.

DEC. 9. Nancy Pelosi, House Minority Leader, issued a statement, saying, "Any Administration should be deeply troubled by Russia's attempt to tamper with our elections."

DEC. 9. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC), to CNN, "I'm going after Russia in every way we can go after Russia...they're one of the most destabilizing influences on the world stage. I think they did interfere with our election, and I want Putin to personally pay a price."

DEC. 10. Sen. Lindsey Graham issued a stream of tweets that Russia "is trying to break the backs of democracies—and democratic movements—all over the world." He wrote, "Don't have to be Sherlock Holmes to figure out what Russia is up to—they're trying to undermine democracies all over the world."

DEC. 10. Reporter Glenn Greenwald, on Intercept: "There is still no evidence for any of these [CIA] claims. What we have instead are assertions, disseminated by anonymous people, completely unaccompanied by any evidence, let alone proof... Anonymous claims leaked to the newspapers about what the CIA believes do not constitute proof, and certainly do not constitute reliable evidence that substitutes for actual evidence that can be

received. Have we not learned this lesson yet?"

DEC. 11. Four Senators issued a joint statement calling for an investigation of Russia's involvement in election interference.

Democrats Charles Schumer (NY) and Jack Reed (RI); and Republicans John McCain (R-AZ) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC).

DEC. 12. Ten electors in the Electoral College (from six states

and the District of Columbia) released an open letter to Director

of National Intelligence James Clapper, asking for confirmation

of whether Russia interfered in the 2016 elections, as a condition for the electors to formally cast ballots in the Electoral College when it meets Dec. 19 in respective states.

This initiative is endorsed by the Hillary Clinton campaign.

The

electors' letter says they, "require to know from the intelligence community whether there are ongoing investigations

into ties between Donald Trump, his campaign or associates, and

Russian government interference in the election, the scope of those investigations, how far those investigations may have reached, and who was involved in those investigations." A

leader

of this ploy is Christine Pelosi, daughter of Nancy Pelosi.

DEC. 12. John Podesta, on behalf of defeated and conceded candidate Hillary Clinton's "campaign," of which he was manager,

requested that the CIA or "intelligence community" give a briefing to the Electors at the Electoral College meeting, before

they cast their votes. Clearly aimed to have an official executive agency intervene to tamper with the Electors' votes.

Politico: "In his statement released on Monday [Dec. 12], Podesta said 'The bipartisan electors' letter raises very grave issues involving our national security,' and added that electors have a solemn responsibility under the Constitution and we support their efforts to have their questions addressed...'

The statement describes how 'we' continually protested that the Russians were doing it, indicating Podesta is speaking here for Clinton's campaign. 'We now know that the CIA has determined Russia's interference in our elections was for the purpose of electing Donald Trump. This should distress every American.'"

The "bipartisan electors" refers to the 10 led by Nancy Pelosi's daughter.

If done, this would be the most serious such executive interference in elections since Andrew Johnson requested that the Army help him convene a Congressional session including southern slave owner "Congressmen" whose entry Congress had rejected.

**Ingen tid til selvtilfredshed
– Briternes,**

saudiernes og Obamas terrorapparat vil fortsætte hæmningsløst, indtil det destrueres

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 11. december, 2016 – ISIS er på flugt fra de syriske og russiske styrker; det ene valg efter det andet (Brexit, Filippinerne, USA, Frankrig, Italien, Sydkorea) viser, at befolkningerne føler afsky for det britisk/amerikanske bankimperiums økonomiske diktatur og forsøget på at indlede krige med Rusland og Kina; Kina og Rusland opbygger partnerskaber med over 100 nationer for at samarbejde om store udviklingsprojekter for at skabe moderne nationer og eliminere fattigdom, som Kina næsten har opnået.

Alt dette giver grund til optimisme. Men, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i dag, så må vi ikke blive selvtilfredse. Det sårede dyr, som er Det britiske Imperium og dets marionet-neokonservative, der især omfatter Obama, i USA, vil ikke sky noget middel for at ødelægge fremvæksten af dette nye paradigme, især i USA. I takt med, at ISIS er i færd med at blive besejret i Syrien, går de saudiskskabte terrorister bersærk internationalt med morderiske selvmordsangreb, der blot i løbet af de seneste dage har dræbt over hundrede mennesker og såret mange andre, i Egypten, Tyrkiet, Yemen og Nigeria. Obama og fraktioner i CIA kommer med vilde påstande om, at de ikke tabte valget i USA, men at det var Putin, der stjal det! Det får på en måde 1940'ernes og '50'ernes Harry Truman/Joe McCarthy-heksejagt på kommunister til at ligne en barneleg, og Obama har krævet, at James Clapper, direktør for den Nationale Efterretningstjeneste, leder et team, der skal undersøge det såkaldte russiske valg-tyveri til fordel for Trump.

Husk på, at det var Clapper, der for den amerikanske Kongres svor på, at der ikke fandt nogen masseovervågning af amerikanske borgere fra efterretningsvæsenets side sted – en løgn, der var en vigtig årsag til, at Edward Snowden besluttede at afsløre, at det var præcist, hvad de gjorde, og mere til, i hele verden. Set i dette lys var det rigtigt af Donald Trump at afvise denne fraktion af efterretningssamfundets »latterlige« påstand om russisk indgriben (andre fraktioner tilbageviser løgningen), og at minde os om, at dette var de samme mennesker, der lancerede ødelæggelsen af Mellemøsten ved hjælp af den overlagte løgn om Saddam Husseins angivelige masseødelæggelsesvåben, selv, da FN's team i Irak rapporterede, at disse ikke eksisterede.

På den anden side, så må optimisme ikke blive til selvtilfredshed. Trump er en ukendt størrelse. Alt imens han har omgivet sig med ledende generaler, der har udtrykt stærk opposition mod Obamas risikable militæreventyr i Mellemøsten og ønsker at samarbejde med Rusland om at knuse terrorist-svøben, og ligeledes, at han har krævet en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, så er Trump samtidig omgivet af Goldman Sachs-folk, der har anført udplyndringen af ikke alene USA, men af en stor del af verden, på vegne af finansimperiet i London og New York. Hvilken politik, der vil lede USA og Vesten i de kommende måneder, vil blive afgjort af den grad af mod og beslutsomhed, som mønstres af den amerikanske og europæiske befolkning, der vil gå videre end til at »smide disse uduelige karle ud« og kræve et ægte, nyt paradigme – som vil erstatte City of Londons og Wall Streets herrevælde med Glass-Steagall og Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love samtidig med et krav om, at USA og Europa går med i den Nye Silkevej og samarbejder *med* Kina og Rusland, snarere end at true med krig *mod* dem.

(Se LaRouchePAC-video om LaRouches Fire Love, med fuldt dansk udskrift)

Spørgsmålet om et potentielt Nyt Paradigme, baseret på udvikling snarere end geopolitik, var på programmet i denne

uge i Shanghai ved et forum, der var sponsoreret af Shanghai Institut for Internationale Studier og Forskningsinstituttet for Dialog mellem Civilisationer (DOC), hvor man forbereder samarbejde mellem den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union (EAEU), der er lanceret af Rusland, og Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, lanceret af Kina. Som stifter af DOC, dr. Vladimir Yakunin, formulerede det som et spørgsmål, der skal løses: »Hvordan sikrer vi os, at den samtidige udvikling af disse forskellige vækstcentre fører til synergi, og ikke konflikt? Det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte og den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union kunne blive det, der viser vejen.«

Foto: Syrisk militæroperation for at befri de sydlige distrikter af det østlige Aleppo. (30. nov.) (twitter.com/AlalamChannel)

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 8. december 2016:

Slaget om Aleppo;

Trump udnævner Xi Jinpings

ven

som ambassadør til Kina

Lyd:

Syrien står umiddelbart foran befrielse

– Vil Det britiske Imperiums terrorist-instrument blive ødelagt for altid?

✘ Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt holder Pearl Harbor-talen den 8. december, 1941, til en særlig indkaldt Kongressamling.

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 7. december, 2016 – På 75-års dagen den 7. dec., 1941 – »en dag, som vil blive husket som en skændselsdag«, som FDR erklærede – breder et lignende chok sig i De forenede Stater, og i verden, med Det britiske Imperium, der står over for sin mulige, endelige død. Politisk, økonomisk og strategisk vakler Imperiet, med Olympens bjerg, der smuldrer under dets fødder.

På den politiske side har den italienske befolknings overvældende afvisning af den EU-dikterede folkeafstemning, der skulle overgive magten til Bruxelles-bureaukraterne, som handler på vegne af bankerne i City of London, føjet yderligere et slag til Brexit, Trumps valgsejr, Fillons valgsejr i Frankrig, Dutertes valgsejr i Filippinerne og den allesteds nærværende fornemmelse af, at den britiske »globalisering« af hele verden under bankierernes kontrol er ved at være forbi.

På den økonomiske side bliver det i stigende grad erkendt, at

den hektiske bestræbelse for at holde de europæiske banker oven vande gennem mere kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), mere bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindsud) og mere bail-out (statslig bankredning) – de samme, mislykkede bestræbelser, som Bush og Obama har brugt i USA – skal dække over ødelæggelsen af folks levebrød, hvor produktiv beskæftigelse og selve produktiviteten bliver lukket ned for at redde spekulanterne. Og så virker det ikke engang, for at redde bankerne!

På den strategiske side, så er krigene for »regimeskifte«, som Bush, Blair, Cameron og Obama har ført i hele Mellemøsten, og som har overgivet land efter land til bestialske terroristbander, ved at blive nedkæmpet på Syriens slagmarker. Aleppo er næsten blevet befriet fra al-Qaeda og ISIS, disse, de britiske og saudiske monarkiers skabelser. Som oberst Pat Lang (pens.) bemærkede på sin blog, *Sic Semper Tyrannis:[1]* »Det, der er sket i borgerkrigens heksekedel, er, at en ny magt er opstået i Levanten. En ny, syrisk, arabisk hær eksisterer nu, takket være russisk uddannelse, udstyr og rådgivning.«

Som en yderligere konsolidering af denne afvisning af britisk imperiepolitik, erklærede Donald Trump i går aftes i North Carolina med sin hidtil stærkeste formulering:

»Vi vil ophøre med at fare rundt for at vælte udenlandske regimer, som vi intet ved om; som vi ikke bør være indblandet i. Denne destruktive cyklus med intervention og kaos må omsider være slut ... Vi søger harmoni og god vilje mellem verdens nationer.«

✘ EIR's rapport 'Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen' på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk

Grundlaget for denne harmoni er blevet fremlagt i detaljer i EIR's Specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, som nu cirkulerer i hele verden på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk. I løbet af den forgangne uge fortalte to politiske ledere fra Kina, Patrick Ho, tidligere Hong Kong-indenrigssekretær, og viceudenrigsminister Fu Ying fra Beijing, et amerikansk publikum i Washington og New York, at den nyvalgte præsident Trump har mulighed for at bringe Kina og USA sammen omkring global opbygning af nationer, ved at tilslutte sig Xi Jinpings Silkevejsprojekter, Bælt-og-Vej-programmet, og ved at tage imod det stående tilbud fra præsident Xi om samarbejde, som Obama havde afvist til fordel for militær konfrontation med både Kina og Rusland.

Trump har gjort det ekstremt klart, at han vil arbejde sammen med præsident Putin omkring bekæmpelse af terrorisme, samt inden for andre, endnu ikke afgjorte områder. I dag foretog han endnu en positiv gestus over for Beijing ved at udnævne guvernøren for Iowa, Terry Branstad, som den næste ambassadør til Kina. Branstad er en nær, personlig ven til præsident Xi Jinping, et venskab, der stammer fra Xis mange besøg til Iowa i årenes løb.

☒ LaRouches Fire Love

For virkelig at bringe Amerika ind i en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og Kina, må det transatlantiske banksystems bankerot løses, helst før der indtræffer en ukontrollabel sammenbrudskrise. Dette kræver den omgående genindførelse af Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov og afskrivning af boblen med værdiløse derivater, der er i færd med at drive realøkonomien ad Helvede til. I dag er aktivist-teams fra hele USA's østkyst i Washington, hvor de giver de sædvanligvis totalt idéforladte kongresmedlemmer deres marchordrer om at tilslutte sig den nu på globalt plan gærende revolution, der er i færd med at bringe en afslutning på Det britiske Imperiums finansdiktatur gennem Glass-Steagall og statslig kredit, der, efter Hamiltons principper, dirigeres til opbygning af industri, landbrug, infrastruktur og satsning på fusionskraft og udforskning af rummet. Magten til og

muligheden for at gøre dette ligger i dette øjeblik i vore hænder, et øjeblik, der ligeledes vil »huskes som en skændsel«, hvis vi mislykkes. Som i 1941, har alle patrioter i deres respektive nationer, og alle borgere i verden, muligheden for at ændre historiens gang til det bedre, ved at tilslutte sig denne historiske, internationale kamp for at skabe en civilisation, der er i overensstemmelse med alle menneskers værdighed.

Foto: SAA Tigerstyrker og civile i Aleppo, Syrien, 7. december, 2016.

[1] Sic semper tyrannis er latin og betyder 'således altid for tyranner'. Det blev foreslået af George Manson ved Virginia Konventionen i 1776 og henviste til Marcus Junius Brutus' udtalelse ved mordet på Julius Cæsar. Det bliver undertiden fejltolket som »Død over tyranner«. (*wiki*)

Rusland nedlægger veto mod FN's Sikkerhedsråds resolution om Syrien

5. dec., 2016 – Her til eftermiddag nedlagde Rusland veto mod et udkast til en resolution om Syrien, som CNN i en tidligere rapport havde påstået, havde til hensigt at gøre det muligt for humanitær hjælp at blive sendt ind i den tilbageværende, belejrede del af Aleppo. Udkastet til resolutionen, som var blevet fremsat af Spanien, New Zealand og Egypten, foreslår en ugelang våbenstilstand, som kunne forlænges med yderligere perioder à syv dage; den kræver, at alle parter i konflikten

tillader omgående og sikker humanitær adgang til hele Aleppo for FN og dets partnere.

Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov angreb kraftigt initiativet under en pressekonference i Moskva her til morgen, for at være en provokation, der tilsigter at underminere forhandlinger om spørgsmålet mellem Moskva og Washington.

»I betragtning af den måde, hvorpå tidligere pauser er forløbet, så er vi ikke i tvivl om, at 10-dages pausen for de militante kæmpere af de ekstremistiske grupper vil blive brugt til at omgruppere og genvinde styrke, og vil derfor forhindre befrielsen af det østlige Aleppo«, sagde Lavrov.

Lavrov rapporterede dernæst, at amerikanske og russiske eksperter siden 3. dec. har arbejdet med problemet med jihadisternes tilbagetrækning fra det østlige Aleppo. Ifølge den plan, de har arbejdet på, vil arrangementet med en våbenstilstand ikke træde i kraft, før man har en aftale om ruterne og datoerne for de militante kæmperes tilbagetrækning, sagde Lavrov. Han udtrykte sit håb om, at det russisk-amerikanske samarbejde om disse spørgsmål vil bære frugt, og at byen bliver ryddet for militante kæmpere. Rusland vil behandle militante kæmpere, der nægter at forlade det østlige Aleppo, som terrorister, og vil støtte den syriske regerings indsats for at bekæmpe dem, sagde han.

Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry på sin side sagde i går til Saban Forum på Brookings Institution i Washington, at en politisk løsning på konflikten i Syrien stadig er mulig, og at forhandlinger med oppositionen i Aleppo fortsætter. Men efter Kerrys mening vil en politisk løsning for Syrien imidlertid stadig kræve en »overgang«, hvor præsident Bashar al-Assad fjernes fra magten.

Foto: Ruslands FN-ambassadør Vitaly Churkin nedlægger veto mod en tidligere resolution om Syrien, 8. oktober 2016.

Rusland leverer nødhjælp til syrere hver dag; briterne er ingen steder at se

3. dec., 2016 – Det Russiske Forsoningscenter på den russiske flybase i Latakia, Syrien, rapporterede den 2. dec., at russiske militærstyrker i Syrien har leveret 5 tons humanitær nødhjælp, inkl. 4 tons til det netop befriede Hananu-distrikt i Aleppo og 1 ton til et område i provinsen Damaskus og tilføjede, at punkter med varme måltider og fornødenheder fortsætter deres arbejde for civile, som flygter fra dele af Aleppo, der kontrolleres af diverse væbnede grupperinger.

På grund af disse leverancer og russernes generelle præstationer i denne henseende, angreb det russiske forsvarsministeriums talsmand, generalmajor Igor Konashenkov, den britiske regering for konstant at tale op ad væggen og ned ad stolper om behovet for at få humanitær hjælp ind i Aleppo, men ikke selv foretage sig noget. »På baggrund af russiskfobi har Storbritanniens regering mistet sin evne til objektivt at vurdere situationen i Syrien, inklusive i Aleppo«, sagde Konashenkov her til morgen. Det russiske og syriske militær, sagde Konashenkov, har leveret humanitær hjælp hver dag til de civile, der er flygtet fra de jihadi-kontrollerede områder af byen, i løbet af den seneste militærkampagne. »I alle årene med krig i Syrien har UK ikke leveret så meget som ét gram mel, en eneste pille eller et tæppe for at hjælpe de civile«, sagde Konashenkov. »Hvis den britiske regering virkelig ønsker at sende humanitær hjælp til indbyggerne i de østlige områder (af Aleppo), så foreligger alle betingelserne for det – bare

fortæl os, hvor den i øjeblikket sidder fast. Hvis der ikke findes nogen britisk humanitær hjælp til Aleppo, så lad være med at blande jer i andres hjælpeindsats«, konkluderede han.

Konashenkov responderede her til anklager, der kom fra Downing Street, og som rapporteredes af *Daily Mail* tidligere på ugen, om, at Rusland standsede strømmen af hjælp ind i Aleppo. En talskvinde for premierminister Theresa May sagde til reportere ved 10 Downing Street, at russerne blokerede for leverancen af humanitær hjælp ved at nægte at gå med til standsning af fjendtligheder og ved at blokere resolutioner i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, der krævede, at der kom hjælp ind i Aleppo og en afslutning på bombardementet af Aleppo.

Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov fyrede i mellemtiden løs på et britisk aktiv, Syriske Menneskerettighedsobservatører, og på de tal for civile tab, som organisationen udbreder. »Med hensyn til humanitære organisationers data om antallet af dræbte civile i Aleppo, så er vi altid opmærksomme på sådanne rapporter, og vi vurderer dem også, for de fleste rapporter, der fremkalder ramaskrig over situationen i byen, er baseret på den information, der leveres af den såkaldte organisation Syriske Menneskerettighedsobservatører, som er en enmandsorganisation, der har base et eller andet sted i London i en toværelses lejlighed«, sagde han under en fælles pressekonference den 2. dec. i Rom med den italienske udenrigsminister Paolo Gentiloni. »Alle ved det, men fortsætter ikke desto mindre med at citere observatørerne som en pålidelig kilde til information.«

Rusland, sagde han, gør meget ud af at lindre menneskelig lidelse. »Verdenssamfundet bør imidlertid ikke alene kere sig om situationen i Aleppo, men også om situationen i det irakiske Mosul, i Yemen og i andre konfliktområder.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: EU's Plan B for Syrien vil ikke virke uden Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet

5. dec., 2016 – Ifølge Londonavisen *The Times* har Federica Mogherini, EU's højeste repræsentant for udenrigsanliggender og sikkerhedspolitik, fremlagt en »Plan B« for Syrien, hvor Assad-regeringen ville forblive ved magten og blive tilbudt finansiel hjælp til gengæld for, at oprørsstyrker får lov til at forblive ved magten i visse regioner, rapporterer RT i dag.

Selv om kun få detaljer er tilgængelige, især mht. den omtalte overgang, så vides det, at Mogherini fremlagde dette forslag for to uger siden under et møde med syriske oppositionsledere. Baggrunden for diskussionen er visheden om, at den syriske hær snart vil overtage den fulde kontrol over Aleppo, baseret på sine militære successer.

Der foreligger ingen specifikationer mht. det beløb, som EU er villig til at tilbyde, men, som Schiller Instituttets Helga Zepp-LaRouche påpegede i dag, så vil udelukkende kun en plan for at inkorporere Syrien i den Nye Silkevej og lanceringen af en Marshallplan for at genopbygge landet – og som ville involvere Rusland, Kina og USA – have mulighed for at virke. General Michael Flynn, som af Trump er udnævnt til national sikkerhedsrådgiver, har krævet en sådan Marshallplan for Syrien.

RT bemærker, at *Times'* rapport om EU-planen ikke nævner præsident Bashar al-Assads fremtid, hvilket er et skifte i forhold til Vestens krav om, at enhver løsning på konflikten

må inkludere hans afgang. Bruxelles skal efter sigende være villig til at lade ham forblive ved magten, men med den bestemmelse, at der bliver en decentralisering af magten i Syriens provinser – politisk decentralisering – hvilket, iflg. *Times*, ville gøre det muligt for de såkaldte moderate oprørsstyrker at blive integreret i lokale sikkerhedsstyrker.

Times-rapporten erklærer også, at EU er villig til at betale Damaskus, hvis det vil føre til en reduktion af den fortsatte strøm af syriske flygtninge ind i den Europæiske Union, hvilket, fremfører rapporten, bidrager til valg-kaosset og er i færd med at »ødelægge Europas politiske struktur«.

Foto: EU's højeste repræsentant for udenrigspolitiske anliggender og sikkerhedspolitik, Federico Mogherini.

Italien: Har Putin gjort det igen?

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. december, 2016 – I modsætning til det hysteri, der stadig fortsætter i USA, så er der ingen, der påstår, at Rusland riggede stemmeboksene til Italiens overvældende sejr i en folkeafstemning, der ellers ville have overgivet deres love, domstole og lovgivende magt til den Europæiske Union. Men den, der promoverede en sådan folkeafstemning, den italienske premierminister Renzi, blev alligevel grundigt slået og træder nu tilbage.

Som den russiske præsident Putin samme dag bemærkede i et interview til Tv, »Vi lever nu i en anden tid ... Den globale balance er gradvist i færd med at skifte.« Obama har igen tabt; endnu en leder, som han havde overøst med ros, har erkendt sit nederlag til det »nye paradigme«.

Det nye paradigme afviser det gamle – der sluttelig drejede sig om britisk finansimperialisme – som var det paradigme, Obama har tjent: Det drejede sig om at ofre økonomier til globale finansmarkeder og globale finansinstitutioner; om at ofre industrier for traktater om »frihandel«; om at fjerne uønskede, »diktatoriske« regeringer gennem permanent krigsførelse. Ironisk nok var det de britiske vælgere, der startede den til alle lande nu spredende afvisning af dette »globaliseringsparadigme«.

Som eksempel for dette nye paradigme står de næsten 70 nye, store infrastrukturprojekter, hvor Kina er involveret i finansieringen og opførelsen, i Eurasiens, Afrikas og Sydamerikas nationer – og, potentielt set, også i Nordamerika, når Obama først er af vejen.

Det nye paradigme kunne meget snart komme til udtryk gennem den måde, hvorpå Putin er i færd med at gennemtvinge en løsning på forsøget på at gennemtvinge regimeskift i Syrien; og gennem Kinas fremstød for udvikling med den Nye Silkevej, der også forlænges ind i Mellemøsten. Selve den Europæiske Union har bøjet sig for denne »skiftende balance« og fremlagde i dag en Plan B, hvor det vil være med til at finansiere genopbygningen af Syrien og opgive kravet om Bashar al-Assads tilbagetræden.

Valget af Donald Trump udgør en åbning i kampen for dette nye paradigme i USA – han blev valgt gennem en afvisning af den gamle globaliseringspolitik, og har visse mål til fælles med det nye paradigme. x

Men håbet om dette nye paradigme, der besjæler hele Amerika og Europa, ligger i kampagnen for Lyndon LaRouches »**Fire Økonomiske Love til USA's redning**«, som diskuteres i LaRouchePAC National Policy Committee fra 5. dec. Følg diskussionen her:
<https://larouchepac.com/20161205/larouchepac-policy-committee-show>

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Russisk minerydningshold og felthospital på vej til Aleppo

Den 1. december, 2016 – Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium annoncerede i går, at et russisk minerydningshold var på vej til Syrien for at være med til at rydde de nyligt befriede distrikter af Aleppo for miner og lureminer, som jihadierne har efterladt.

»I dag tager en avanceret afdeling fra de russiske bevæbnede styrkers internationale anti-mine-center af sted for at desarmere ikke-eksploderet ammunition i Aleppo«, sagde generalløjtnant Sergei Rudskov, chefen for den russiske generalstabs hovedafdeling for operationer, i går under en briefing. »I alt vil flere end 200 soldater og 47 enheder med

kamp- og specialudstyr være involveret i minerydningsaktiviteterne i Aleppo.« TASS minder i sin rapport om Rudkovs meddelelse om, at, efter befrielsen af Palmyra fra ISIS sidste marts, desarmerede russiske minerydningshold 17.500 eksplosive enheder i løbet af 45 dage, som samtidig ryddede 2.500 bygninger.


Samtidig hermed meddelte Forsvarsministeriet ligeledes, at transportfly læsset med hospitalsudstyr og mandskab var lettet fra Rusland for at yde lægehjælp til civile i Aleppo, i overensstemmelse med den ordre, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin udstedte dagen før.

»Personale fra det Russiske Forsvarsministeriums særlige afdeling for lægehjælp, et felthospital, særligt udstyr og lægeudstyr er taget til Syrien med fly«, sagde Forsvarsministeriet. »Når de er ankommet, vil russisk lægefagligt personale begynde at yde lægehjælp til civile og flygtninge nær Aleppo.«

Mens den russiske regering således var i gang med at mobilisere resurser for at komme civilbefolkningen i Aleppo til hjælp, forsøgte de uhyggelige skår og rester af Obamas/briternes apparat at sprænge ting i luften i FN's Sikkerhedsråd i går, i et desperat forsøg på at omstøde den syriske hærs nylige sejr i Aleppo. Under et hastemøde, der var indkaldt af den franske udenrigsminister Jean-Marc Ayrault, brugte den amerikanske, franske og britiske FN-ambassadør rapportererne fra FN-folk om situationen i Syrien til aggressivt at fordømme den russiske og syriske regering for angiveligt at have udløst en massakre på talløse civile. Vitaly Churkin, Ruslands FN-ambassadør, svarede hertil, at tiden nu måske var inde til »at afholde en omfattende diskussion mht. Mellempøsten og Nordafrika og arrangere en debat om spørgsmålet, 'De katastrofale konsekvenser af at ødelægge statsskabet i områdets lande, som følge af udefrakommende indblanding'«

Skiftet til det nye paradigme er virkeligheden

– Propaganda for lokale interesser er farligt

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. november, 2016 – I denne uge kom  delegationer fra Manhattan og flere stater i det østlige USA til Washington, D.C., for personligt at inddrage kongresmedlemmer i nødvendigheden af at tage skridt til at genindføre Glass-Steagall og gennemføre LaRouches »Fire Love«, for at håndtere den aktuelle, strategiske krise. Dette politiske initiativ – sammen med pres på kongressen over hele landet – kommer på et tidspunkt med nonstop mediefiksering på nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps seneste og eventuelle udnævnelser til regeringsposter. 'Hvem er de?... Hvor dårlige er de?', osv. Mediernes spærreild, og selv selve udnævnelserne, tjener til at forvirre og demobilisere enhver, der lytter.

Det er vigtigt at modstå alle sådanne, »bottom-up« karakteriseringer, der fremhæver lokale interesser, af det, der foregår. Der er intet lokalt her: »Trump«-valgoverraskelser finder sted i hele verden, og flere vil finde sted i de kommende uger. Vælgere over hele verden afviser nu hele »globaliseringsæraen« til fordel for et nyt paradigme, der fortsat er under udformning. EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, understregede dagen efter præsidentvalgene, at valget af Trump ikke var en »lokal« begivenhed. Afvisningen af Hillary Clinton gik længere end til et spørgsmål om selve personen; den var en del af et globalt, dynamisk skifte. LaRouche manede i dag til forsigtighed: »Det er farligt at gøre det muligt for dette [forvirringen som

følge af lokalt fokus] at opstå. Man må frigøre sig fra det. Det ødelægger ens evne til at tænke og løse problemer.«

Undgå derfor vrede over enkeltpersoner; tænk på det mulige.

Dette er virkeligheden. Der er en dynamik i gang på internationalt plan, for et nyt paradigme for hele menneskeheden, og som er legemliggjort i den eurasiske Nye Silkevej. Præsident Vladimir Putin og præsident Xi Jinping leverer et stærkt lederskab for vejen frem, en vej, som i årtier er blevet fremlagt af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

I dag holdt Putin en tale i Moskva fra dette udsigtspunkt. Han talte om den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, »der sammenkobles med Kinas projekt for det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, som vil gøre det muligt for os at bygge et eurasisk partnerskab«. Han talte i anledning af det andet, årlige »Primakov Readings International Forum« i Moskva, for at mindes eftermælet af Jevgenij Primakovs lederskab. Putin sagde: »Hr. Primakov var ligeledes af den mening, at det ville være meget vanskeligt at håndtere nutidens store udfordringer på tilfredsstillende vis uden et seriøst partnerskab mellem Rusland og USA. Ulykkeligvis er de russisk-amerikanske relationer blevet meget forværret i løbet af de seneste år, men dette er ikke vores skyld. Nu, hvor valgkampen er ovre i USA, og en ny præsident snart vil indtage Det Hvide Hus, håber vi, at dette vil skabe en mulighed for at forbedre disse relationer, der er så vigtige, ikke alene for vore to folkeslag, men også for at sikre international stabilitet og sikkerhed ... «

Ideen om nye relationer runger over hele Latinamerika, efter Xis seks dages rundrejse i forbindelse med APEC-topmødet tidligere på måneden. Den mexicanske seniordiplomat Sergio Ley har krævet, at Mexico nu »diversificerer« sine relationer inden for udenrigshandel og ikke længere har 80 % af sin handel, der finder sted med USA. Han sagde, at der nu finder »en ekstraordinær dialog på højeste niveau« sted mellem Mexico og Kina.

I opposition til dette aktive, nye paradigme for internationale, gensidigt gavnlige relationer, kommer de sidste, fortvivlede bestræbelser fra geopolitikkens afdankede repræsentanter, på at forårsage mere skade og død. Især Frankrig, Storbritannien og Obama-administrationen mobiliserer imod Rusland over Syrien. I dag meddelte Frankrig, at det vil være vært for et møde den 10. december, som vil omfatte ledere fra UK, USA, Tyskland, Italien, Saudi-Arabien og andre, om, hvordan man skal modsætte sig »den totale krigs tankegang«, som de hævder, Rusland og Syrien forfølger.

Virkeligheden er den, at den syriske regering i Aleppo med held driver terroristerne tilbage; og Rusland er i færd med at mobilisere støtte og nødhjælpsforsyninger – inklusive felthospitaler – til de tusinder af mennesker, der nu er befriet og nødlidende.

Foto: Udsigt over Capitol fra toppen af Washington-monumentet.

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:

USA: General Michael Flynn kræver Marshallplan for MENA- område

24. nov., 2016 – General Michael Flynn, som nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump for nylig udnævnte til national sikkerhedsrådgiver, blev den 20. nov. interviewet af CNN's Fareed Zakaria. General Flynn fremlagde et magtfuldt krav om en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten og Nordafrika (MENA) og nævnte den succesfulde Marshallplan for Europa ved slutningen af Anden Verdenskrig. Han fremførte, at befolkningstilvæksten i MENA-området og spredningen af radikal jihadisme kun kan imødegås gennem et langsigtet perspektiv for økonomisk vækst, og at Marshallplanen tilbyder det bedste eksempel på, hvordan man skal gå frem mod denne trussel.

Læs også: Schiller Instituttets Specialrapport: **Et økonomisk mirakel for Sydeuropa, Middelhavsområdet og det afrikanske kontinent.**

Ingen tid at spille: Vedtag Glass-Steagall, og tag til Månen

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast,


25. november, 2016


Jason Ross: Diskussionen i aften finder sted to en halv uge efter præsidentvalget i USA den 8. nov. Siden da har vi set en hvirvelvind af spekulationer over udnævnelser til regeringsposter, inkl. nogle udnævnelser til poster i Trump-administrationen. Vi har også set betydningsfulde, internationale nyheder, såsom APEC-topmødet, der fandt sted i sidste weekend; topmødet i Asien-Stillehavsområdets Økonomiske Samarbejde (APEC), der meget betydningsfuldt inkluderede den filippinske præsident Duterte og den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping blandt de mange tilstedeværende ledere. På denne konference understregede Duterte igen, at Filippinerne ikke længere anser sig selv for at være en amerikansk koloni; og landet forfølger en uafhængig politik, rent økonomisk, med Kina, der således er et modtræk til at skabe konflikt i f.eks. det Sydkinesiske Hav. Præsident Xi var på rundrejse i Mellem- og Sydamerika samtidig med, at han rejste til APEC-topmødet.

Så ved siden af Peru – som var værtsland for topmødet – besøgte han også Chile og Ecuador, hvor han blandt andet talte om den bi-oceaniske korridor, en plan for en jernbaneforbindelse mellem Sydamerikas to omkringliggende have, Stillehavet og Atlanterhavet, og om at etablere videnskabsbyer. Han blev hyldet af præsident Correa i Ecuador, der betragtede Xi Jinpings besøg som den mest betydningsfulde begivenhed, der nogen sinde havde fundet sted i Ecuadors historie, baseret på det potentiale, som dette tilbød denne nation.

Dette Nye Paradigme, der i øjeblikket ledes politisk og økonomisk af Rusland og Kina, kommer som et resultat af LaRouche-bevægelsens og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange organisering; der er således nu et Nyt Paradigme, der fører en stadig større del af verden i en meget positiv retning. Vores job i øjeblikket er ikke at få de hotteste nyheder om, hvad Trumps udnævnelser bliver, osv. Det er at forme amerikanske politik, som vi med held gjorde det med at gennemtvinge en underkendelse af Obamas veto af Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorer af Terrorisme (JASTA). Og som vi nu står klar til at gøre, med at få Kongressen – under denne overgangsperiode, 'lamme and'-perioden – til at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, det nødvendige første skridt for en økonomisk genrejsning. Glass-Steagall er den lov, som Franklin Roosevelt fik vedtaget, og som skabte 60+ år med stabil, kedelig, stabil, produktiv bankvirksomhed i USA; snarere end den form for spillevirksomhed, vi nu ser.

Lad med vise dette kort [Fig. 1] for blot at vise lidt af den succes, som vi har set med det kinesiske program.

Programmet med nationerne i Ét bælte, én vej [OBOR], der  inkluderer både – der er to komponenter i Kinas projekt i denne henseende; det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, med nationerne vist i blå farve, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej i orange farve. Tilsammen refererer Kina til dette på kinesisk som initiativet med »Ét bælte, én vej«; på engelsk ofte blot

kaldt initiativet for Bæltet og Vejen. Med hensyn til det potentiale, som dette har, er her blot nogle af tallene: 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer i Kina, alle bygget inden for det seneste årti – mere end i resten af verden tilsammen; et titals milliarder af dollars i direkte investering i nationerne i området; en forøgelse af kontrakter om tjenesteydelser på over 33 % i løbet af blot ét år langs Bæltet og Vejen; Kinas Eksport/Importbank har udestående engagementer i flere end 1000 projekter og har for ganske nylig underskrevet aftaler om omkring 500 nye projekter i nationerne langs Bæltet og Vejen. Kina er i færd med at  udbygge 150.000 stipendier, som tilbyder uddannelse til 500.000 eksperter til uddannelse i Kina; har etableret 500 Konfucius-institutter i hele verden; har initieret flere end et dusin økonomiske samarbejdszoner; frihandelsaftaler, og er i øjeblikket engageret i flere end 40 energiprojekter – inklusive omkring 20, der lige er blevet etableret i år i Bæltet og Vejens nationer.

Hvordan kan vi så blive en del af dette? I magasinet *Chronicles* udgave fra 21. nov. er der et forslag fra Edward Lozansky og Jim Jatrus. Lozansky er præsident for det Amerikanske Universitet i Moskva. De skrev en artikel med titlen, »The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for

Security, Prosperity, and Peace« (De tre store: Amerika, Rusland og Kina må gå sammen om sikkerhed, velstand og fred). To uddrag: De indleder deres artikel, »Med Donald Trumps sejr over Hillary Clinton får vi måske aldrig at vide, hvor tæt Amerika og hele menneskeheden kom på atomkrig«. Med en beskrivelse af verdenssituationen afslutter de med et forslag: »Præsident Donald Trump kan rette tidligere amerikanske præsidenters fejl. Snarere end modstandere kan Rusland og Kina blive Amerikas vigtigste partnere, og som er, er vi overbevist om, rede til at respondere positivt. Tiden er inde for Trump og Amerika til at tage initiativet til samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina hen imod en tryk, fremgangsrig og fredelig

fremtid. Et Trump-Putin-Xi 'Store Tre-topmøde' bør være en prioritet for den nye, amerikanske præsidents første 100 dage.«

Jeg vil nu bede Jeff Steinberg om at fylde verdensbilledet ud og forklare vore seere, hvilke flanker, hvilke håndtag, hvilke vægtstænger vi har for at ændre USA's politik på dette tidspunkt?

Jeffrey Steinberg (efterretningsredaktør, EIR): Det er indledningsvist meget vigtigt at indse, at vi befinder os i en periode med forandring. Vi ved visse ting om konsekvenserne af det amerikanske præsidentvalg og andre nationale valg den 8. nov. Jeg mener, at Lozansky og Jatruss gjorde en fundamental pointe meget klart: Der forelå en meget alvorlig fare, baseret på Hillary Clintons kampagneretorik, baseret på politikker, der blev stadigt mere aggressivt forfulgt af præsident Barack Obama mod slutningen af hans otte år i embedet; at vi havde kurs mod den værste krise mellem USA og Rusland, som vi nogen sinde har oplevet – måske endda værre end Cubakrisen i 1962. Så Hillary Clintons nederlag er virkelig afslutningen af præsidentskaberne Bush' og Obamas 16 år lange tyranni. Hvor hurtigt, vi kan vende politikken omkring under det nye Trump-præsidentskab, og i hvilken retning, udnævnelserne til hans administration vil gå, er alt sammen ukendte faktorer; vi har ingen vished om dem.

Det, vi ved, er, at især i kølvandet på APEC-topmødet, der netop er afsluttet i sidste uge i Lima, Peru, og som dernæst efterfulgtes af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings statsbesøg til Peru og dernæst til Chile, og forud for topmødet var han i Ecuador; og vi ved, at der er en enorm mulighed derude for USA, under et Trump-præsidentskab, for netop at gå med i det, der altid har ligget på bordet som en åben invitation til USA; nemlig, at USA kan tilslutte sig projektet om Verdenslandbroen. For, uden et USA er det meget vanskeligt at opfatte dette som en Verdenslandbro, hvilket er det, verden virkelig har brug for lige nu. Der har været meget indledende

telefondiskussioner mellem nyvalgte præsident Trump og den russiske præsident Putin; de synes at være blevet enige om at have et personligt topmøde hurtigt efter tiltrædelsen – som finder sted den 20. januar. Det er ligeledes tanken, at præsident Trump, efter tiltrædelsen, også ret hurtigt skal mødes med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping. Jeg mener, at Lozansky-Jatrus-ideen om et trilateralt møde ville være ekstraordinært værdifuldt. Det er vigtigt at huske på, at, i 1944, var det præsident Franklin Roosevelts kurs i sine handlinger for at etablere De forenede Nationer – hvilket skete i 1945 – at inkludere både Sovjetunionen og Kina i FN's Sikkerhedsråds fem permanente nationer. Husk på, at Roosevelt forstod, at der var imperiepolitikker, der stadig var kernen i Det britiske Imperium med Churchill, og på lignende måde med Frankrig. Så ideen med at have Rusland – dengang Sovjetunionen – og Kina i dette permanente Sikkerhedsråds kernegruppe, reflekterede den kendsgerning, at Roosevelt dengang så udsigten til denne form for et alliancesystem hen over Eurasien. Jeg mener, at der er en historisk baggrund, for netop denne form for russisk-kinesiske samarbejde, at se hen til her. I de seneste 15 år har det været en hjørnesteen i Lyndon LaRouches globale politik med et USA-Rusland-Kina-Indien-samarbejde, især omkring videnskabelige programmer; især udforskning af rummet, som basis for global fred og udvikling. Så disse ideer er fremlagt.

Den 20. november sagde general Michael Flynn, kort tid efter, at han var blevet udnævnt af nyvalgte præsident Trump som national sikkerhedsrådgiver, i et interview med Fareed Zakhari på CNN, at, efter hans mening, var den eneste måde at håndtere problemerne med den jihadistiske terrortrussel i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika på længere sigt at have et globalt samarbejde omkring en Marshallplan – han brugte udtrykkeligt dette udtryk. Han sagde, hvis man ser på, hvad Europa var i stand til at præstere i kølvandet på Anden Verdenskrigs ødelæggelser, og den rolle, som Marshallplanen spillede; det var ikke det hele, men det var et vigtigt element i den

økonomiske genrejsning efter krigen. Et perspektiv af denne art er virkelig den vindende strategi for at håndtere befolkningstilvæksten og spredningen af den saudisksponsorerede jihadisme i hele Mellemøsten/Nordafrika-området. Det går også ind i Sydvestasien.

Der findes altså enorme potentialer; de er i vid udstrækning foreløbigt ikke realiseret med hensyn til den forandring, der kommer med den ny administration. Men, som du sagde, Jason [Ross], så er der ingen grund til at vente til januar. Den nyvalgte præsident Trump krævede udtrykkeligt, i en tale i Charlotte, North Carolina, en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Det er i begge de to store politiske partiers valgplatform for dette års valg; både Demokraterne og Republikanerne har vedtaget det. Det var en Trump-delegeret til GOP [Grand Old Party – det Republikanske Parti] komiteen for politisk strategi, der introducerede Glass-Steagall. Der er senatorerne Elizabeth Warren, og vigtigere endnu, Bernie Sanders, som siger, at de er villige til at række over midtergangen og arbejde sammen med Donald Trump, hvis samarbejdsspørgsmålene inkluderer og virkelig begynder med Glass-Steagall. Så dette er noget, der ikke behøver at vente til januar og tiltrædelsen og den nye Kongres. Der er fremstillet lovforslag for Glass-Steagall i både Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet. Et af forslagene i Huset har en ordlyd, der er identisk med Senatsforslaget. Som vi så det med vedtagelsen af underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet, hvis lederskabet i Kongressen giver grønt lys, kan Glass-Steagall bringes til debat i begge huse og vedtages inden for få timer. Underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet tog to timer om morgenen i USA's Senat, og to en halv time eller så om eftermiddagen i Huset. Det opnåede man på en enkelt dag i Kongressen. Så der er ingen som helst grund til, at vi ikke omgående kan gennemføre det – i bogstavelig forstand i næste uge, når Kongressen atter samles efter Thanksgiving-ferien; og den vil sidde i de næste fire uger. Der er intet til hinder for, at vi kan få Glass-Steagall tilbage som landets lov før juleferien, så vi har det på plads

til den nye administration; og tiden er rent ud sagt af afgørende betydning. Vi ved ikke, i betragtning af situationen med Deutsche Bank, med Royal Bank of Scotland, med de største, amerikanske for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-banker, der sidder på derivater til \$252 billion. Det er 30 % mere end det var på tidspunktet for krakket i 2008. Det sidder på toppen af et meget tvivlsomt kapitalgrundlag på \$14 billion; i virkeligheden er det sandsynligvis meget mindre end det, for nogle af de værdipapirer, som bliver talt med som kapitalreserver, er grundlæggende set illikvide og kan ikke – selv i nødstilfælde – gøres likvide.

Så vi kunne altså vågne i morgen, eller mandag morgen, eller midt i næste uge, og finde, at hele det transatlantiske banksystem er nedsmeltet. Så Glass-Steagall er altså et presserende hastespørgsmål; og det forudsætter dernæst de andre hovedelementer i LaRouches Fire Love. Det er et kreditsystem; investering i store infrastrukturprojekter; og en genoplivning af de mest avancerede, videnskabelige programmer, inklusive en storstilet tilbagevenden til rummet og det internationale arbejde for endelig at opnå det fulde gennembrud inden for fusion. Alle disse ting er på bordet, men igen, så er der ingen garantier; intet er blot tilnærmelsesvis sikkert mht., hvad det næste, der vil ske, bliver. Vi kan ånde lidt op, fordi faren for krig med Rusland og Kina er blevet meget reduceret; og der er en masse potentiale. Der er en masse af den form for overgang som fra Jimmy Carter til Ronald Reagan i luften som et potentiale; men intet af det er endnu fuldt ud realiseret. Folk må indse, at dette er et tidspunkt med store muligheder. Det vil blive et krav fra befolkningen under det rette lederskab, der er orienteret mod de rette politikker, der virkelig kan gribe muligheden. Hvis vi venter til januar eller februar næste år, hvem ved så, hvilke slags sabotageoperationer, man vil køre?

Man kan gå ind på Craigs Liste og finde dækgrupper for George Soros, såsom MoveOn.org og blacklivesmatter.org, der tilbyder

\$1500 om ugen for, at folk render rundt som idioter og protesterer imod resultatet af valget. Der er en hel del usikkerhed med hensyn til, hvad der foregår, samtidig med, at der er store muligheder. Vi må sikre os, at vi tager lederskabet mht. at gribe øjeblikket.

Ovenstående er første del af det Internationale Webcast; det engelske udskrift af hele webcastet følger her:

**MAKE THE MOST OF THE OPENNESS IN POLICY NOW,
TO INSURE A NEW PARADIGM FOR THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE THE INAUGURATION**

**LaRouche PAC International Webcast, Saturday, November 26,
2016**

JASON ROSS: Hi there! Today is November 25, 2016; and you're joining us for our regular webcast here from larouchepac.com. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host today.

I'm joined in the studio by Ben Deniston, my colleague here at LaRouche PAC; and via video by Jeff Steinberg of *Executive Intelligence Review*.

This discussion is taking place 2.5 weeks after the November 8, 2016 Presidential election in the United States. Since then, we've seen a whirlwind of speculation about Cabinet appointments, including some Cabinet appointments for the Trump administration. We've also seen some significant international news, such as the APEC summit which occurred last weekend; the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit that included very significantly new Philippines' President Duterte and Chinese Xi Jinping among the

many leaders who were there. At this conference, Duterte again emphasized that the Philippines no longer considers itself to be a US colony; and is pursuing an independent policy economically with China, countering the attempts to create conflict, for example, in the South China Sea. President Xi Jinping went on a tour of Latin America while he was at the APEC summit. So in addition to Peru – which hosted the event – he also visited Chile and Ecuador; where he spoke, among other things, about the bioceanic corridor, a plan for a rail link between the Pacific and Atlantic sides of South America; about setting up science cities. He was greeted by President Correa in Ecuador, who considered Xi Jinping's trip the most significant event to occur in Ecuador's history; based on the potential that it offered that nation.

So, this New Paradigm, being led politically and economically at present by Russia and by China, comes as a result of decades of organizing by the LaRouche Movement, by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche; such that there is now a New Paradigm taking an increasingly larger portion of the world in a very positive direction. Our job at present isn't to get the hottest news on what Trump's appointments will be, etc. It is to shape US policy; as we successfully did in forcing an override against Obama's veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. And as we stand poised to do now with getting the Congress – during this lame duck session – to implement Glass-Steagall, the

necessary first step for an economic recovery. Glass-Steagall is the law that Franklin Roosevelt had put in place that created 60+ years of stable, boring, stable productive banking in the United States; rather than the kind of gambling that we see now.

Let me pull up this chart [Fig. 1] just to show a bit of this success that we've seen along the Chinese economic program.

Along the One Belt, One Road nations which includes both the – there's two components to China's project on this; the Silk Road

economic belt, which you see the nations in blue, and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road in orange. Together, China refers to

this in Chinese as the "One Belt, One Road" initiative; in English, often just the Belt and Road initiative. As far as the

potential that this holds, these are just some of the figures: 20,000 km of high-speed rail in China, all built within the last

decade – more than the rest of the world combined; tens of billions of dollars of direct investment into nations of the region; an increase in services contracts of over 33% in just one

year along the One Belt, One Road; the Export/Import Bank of China has outstanding involvement in over 1000 projects, and just

recently has signed up about 500 new projects along the Belt and

Road nations. China is extending 150,000 scholarships offering

training for 500,000 for professionals for training in China; has

set up 500 Confucius institutes around the world, has

initiated
over a dozen economic cooperation zones; free trade
agreements,
and is engaged currently in over 40 energy projects –
including
about 20 that were just set up this year among One Belt, One
Road
nations.

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a
proposal was
made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by
Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Lozansky is the President of
the
American University in Moscow. They wrote an article called,
"The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for
Security, Prosperity, and Peace". Two excerpts. They open
their
article, "With the defeat of Hillary Clinton by Donald Trump,
we
may never know how close America and all mankind came to
nuclear
war." In describing the world situation, they end with a
proposal: "President Donald Trump can correct the mistakes of
past U.S. presidents. Rather than adversaries Russia and China
can become America's essential partners and are, we are
convinced, ready to respond positively. It's time for Trump
and
America to take the initiative for U.S.-Russia-China
cooperation
towards a secure, prosperous, and peaceful future. A
Trump-Putin-Xi 'Big Three Summit' should be a priority for the
new U.S. President's first 100 days."

So, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to fill out the
world
picture, and detail for our viewers what are the flanks, what
are
the handles, the levers that we have for shifting US policy at

this time?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. For starters, it's very important to realize that we're in a period of significant flux.

There are certain things that we know about the consequences of

the US Presidential elections and other Federal elections on November 8th. And I think Lozansky and Jatrus made one very fundamental point quite clearly: That there was a very grave danger based on the campaign rhetoric of Hillary Clinton, based

on the policies that were pursued even ever more aggressively towards the end of his eight years in office by President Barack

Obama; that we were headed for the worst crisis between the United States and Russia that we ever experienced – worse perhaps even than the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. So, the defeat of Hillary Clinton really is the end of the 16-year tyranny of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. How rapidly we can

turn the policies around under the new Trump Presidency, where the Cabinet appointments are going to go, these are all unknowns;

they're not certain to us.

So, we do know that particularly in the aftermath of the

APEC summit meeting that just concluded last week in Lima, Peru,

which was then followed by state visits by Chinese President Xi

Jinping to Peru and then to Chile afterwards; and prior to the summit, he was in Ecuador. We know that there's a tremendous opportunity out there for the United States, under a Trump Presidency, to precisely join in what has always been on the table as an open invitation to the United States; namely, for the

United States to join in the World Land-Bridge project. Because without the United States, it's very difficult to conceive of this as a World Land-Bridge; which is really what the world requires right now. There have been very preliminary phone discussions between President-elect Trump and Russian President Putin; they seem to have reached an agreement that they will have a face-to-face summit meeting soon after the inauguration – which is January 20th. The idea, similarly, is for President Trump, once he's inaugurated, to also meet quite soon with Chinese President Xi Jinping. I think the Lozansky-Jatrus idea of a trilateral meeting would be extraordinarily valuable. I think it's important to remember that in 1944, the orientation of President Franklin Roosevelt in the move to establish the United Nations – which happened in 1945 – was to include both the Soviet Union and China among the permanent five nations of the UN Security Council. Remember, Roosevelt understood that there were imperial policies that were still at the core of the British Empire with Churchill, and similarly with France. So, the idea of having Russia – the Soviet Union at the time – and China in this permanent Security Council core grouping, reflected the fact that Roosevelt at that time saw the prospect of that kind of an alliance system across Eurasia. So, I think that's there's an historical basis to look to here for exactly this kind of Russia-China cooperation. For the last 15 years, a cornerstone of Lyndon LaRouche's of global policy has been a

US-Russia-China-India cooperation, particularly on scientific programs; especially space exploration, as the basis for global peace and development. So, those ideas are out there.

On November 20th, soon after he was named by President-elect Trump to be the National Security Advisor, General Michael Flynn, in an interview with Fareed Zakhari on CNN, said that in his view, the only way to deal with the long-term problem of the jihadist, terrorist threat in the Middle East and North Africa, was for there to be a global cooperation on a Marshall Plan – he used that term explicitly. He said, if you look at what Europe was able to accomplish in the aftermath of the devastation of World War II, and the role that the Marshall Plan played; it was not the whole thing, but it was an important element of the postwar recovery. That kind of perspective is really the winning strategy for dealing with the population growth and this spread of Saudi-sponsored jihadism throughout the Middle East-North Africa region. It extends into Southeast Asia as well.

So, there are great potentialities; they are largely as yet unrealized in terms of the change coming with the new administration. But I think, Jason, as you correctly said, there is no reason to wait for January. President-elect Trump, in a major campaign speech in Charlotte, North Carolina, explicitly called for reinstating Glass-Steagall. It's in the platforms of both major political parties from this year's elections; the Democrats and the Republicans both adopted it. It was a Trump

delegate to the policy committee of the GOP who introduced the Glass-Steagall. You've got Senators Elizabeth Warren, and more importantly, Senator Bernie Sanders, saying that they're prepared to reach across the aisle and work with Donald Trump if the issues for collaboration include and really start with Glass-Steagall. So, this is something that does not have to wait for January and the inauguration and the new Congress. There are Glass-Steagall bills in both the House and the Senate. One of the House bills has the identical language as the Senate bill. As we saw with the JASTA veto override vote, if the Congressional leadership gives the green lights, then Glass-Steagall can be brought to the floor of both houses and can be debated and voted within a matter of hours. The override of JASTA took two hours in the morning for the US Senate, and two and a half or so hours in the afternoon for the House. It was accomplished in one legislative day. So, there's no reason whatsoever that we can't move immediately – literally next week when Congress is back in session after Thanksgiving; and they're there for three weeks. There's no reason that we should not have Glass-Steagall back as the law of the land before the Christmas recess. So that we hit the ground running with the new administration; and frankly, time is of the essence. We don't know, given the situation with Deutsche Bank, with Royal Bank of Scotland, the largest US too-big-to-fail banks are sitting on \$252 trillion in

derivatives. That's 30% more than it was at the time of the 2008 crash. That's on top of a very questionable capital base of \$14 trillion; the reality is that it's probably much less than that, because some of the assets that are allowed to be counted as the capital reserves, are basically illiquid and can't be – even on an emergency basis – made liquid.

So, we could wake up tomorrow morning, or Monday morning, or the middle of next week, and find that the entire trans-Atlantic banking system has blown out. So, Glass-Steagall is an urgent, immediate issue; and it then begs the other three key elements of LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws. Which is a credit system; investment in major infrastructure projects; and a revival of the most advanced scientific programs, including a major return to space and the work internationally to finally achieve the full breakthrough on fusion. All of these things are on the table, but again, there are no guarantees, there's nothing that's even remotely certain about what's going to come next. We can breathe a little easier because danger of war with Russia, with China is greatly reduced; and there's a lot of potentiality. There's a lot of the kind of transition from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan in the air as a potential; but none of it is fully realized yet.

So, people are going to have to realize this is a moment of

great

opportunity. It's going to be an outpouring of the population under the right kind of leadership, directed at the right policies, that can really seize the opportunity. If we wait until January or February of next year, who knows what kind of sabotage operations are going to be run?

You can go on Craig's List and find George Soros front groups, like MoveOn.org and blacklivesmatter.org, offering \$1500

a week for people to run around like idiots, protesting against

the outcome of the election. There's a great deal of uncertainty,

in terms of what's going on, at the same time that there's great

opportunity. We've got to make sure that we take the lead in seizing the moment.

ROSS: Great! Thanks! In terms of the long-term outlook of where

we're going to go, what our policy should be, a major aspect of

this goes beyond legislation that affects us only here on Earth.

A major component, in fact the fourth component of the Four Laws

of Mr. LaRouche, the last one being the fusion driver crash program, is connected with our existence beyond the planet, also

out in space. Ben wrote an article that's going to be in the upcoming issue of the *Hamiltonian* about what a U.S. space policy ought to be, and about the really long-term goals that we

have to have, and why this is important and essential. So, could

you tell us about that, Ben?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Gladly! As viewers are aware, this has been an ongoing subject of discussion. Mr. LaRouche, as Jason is saying, has put a major, major focus on, as a critical part of the needed recovery program and the future of mankind. In this article we tried to elevate people's thinking about space, especially in the context of so many years and administrations and decades of just zero-growth policies.

One thing that's being discussed now, which is interesting and useful, is how much NASA has been hijacked for this global warming crap. A lot of NASA's budget has been redirected to "Earth sciences." Not all Earth sciences are bad. There's a lot of interesting science to learn about the Earth. But Earth sciences is often a front to push this fraud of some man-made global warming crisis. So, there's some discussion about NASA being redirected away from wasting their time on this phony, phony, fake crisis, which is not something we need to be concerned about, and redirecting back to exploration. Surprise, surprise. The Moon has come back now as a central subject of the discussion. Anybody who had any sense would realize that once Obama was out, this crazy asteroid mission [The Asteroid Impact and Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission] would likely be tossed aside. Anybody who is serious would recognize that the Moon is the next place to get back to.

As Jeff was referencing, there's a lot of discussion, a lot of openness. From our work and discussions with Mr. LaRouche, I think it's critical to really raise the level of discussion to the right basis. We can have exciting missions, we can have

inspiring missions, but the question to ask is: are we going to have a program where the investments are going to be the basis for creating a whole new level of activity, that will allow us to do orders of magnitude more than we were able to do prior to that investment? Is this going to create what Mr. LaRouche had once defined as a "physical-economic platform?" Is this going to create an entirely new platform of activity, of potential – of infrastructure, of energy-flux density of technologies – which comes together to support a qualitatively new level of potential activity for mankind?

That is the issue we want to put on the table right now.

This goes directly to the vision of Krafft Ehrlicke, the early space pioneer who worked very closely with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the '80s, who was one of the leading space visionaries, who had outlined in great detail the initial basis of mankind expanding to really becoming a Solar System species.

I'm going to get back to his work in a minute. Mr. LaRouche's concept of the "platform" is really critical. He introduced this, I think it was around the year 2010, 2009, something like that.

He was coming up against a real lack of understanding of the significance of what "infrastructure" really means, in its true scientific sense. Unfortunately, this has become somewhat of a buzzword that a lot of people throw out there. "We need to rebuild our infrastructure" has become a kind of a hot campaign-trail word to use to get some support.

The real understanding of what qualitative revolutions

in

infrastructure systems mean for mankind's continual creative progress is not connected to the way most people use that term.

Mr. LaRouche defined the very profound and critical assessment of

looking at the development of human civilization in these stages

of platforms. He said, go back to thousands of years ago, when the dominant cultures were trans-oceanic maritime cultures.

What

you began to see, with the development of inland waterways, inland river systems – he had put a big point on what

Charlemagne was doing during his reign in central Europe in developing these canal systems and river systems – was a

qualitative revolution above what had existed prior, with these

trans-oceanic civilizations: the development of these inland waterways. That defined a new platform of activity that supported

a qualitative leap in what civilization was able to accomplish.

The next leap came with the development of rail systems,

railroads, especially trans-continental railroads, typified by what Lincoln had spearheaded with the trans-continental railroad

across America. With these rail systems, with the new technologies of steam engines powering these rail systems, the higher energy-flux density of coal-powered steam engines, this enabled mankind to begin to develop the interior regions of the

continent, in completely new ways, and defined a totally new relationship of mankind, of civilization, to the environment

around him. It defined a qualitative increase in mankind's "potential relative population density," as LaRouche had

developed that metric for understanding the science of

economic

growth. It made things that were at one point incredibly expensive or challenging or risky, become just day-to-day regular activities.

I think back to the early phases of these frontier explorations of the American Continent. You go back to the Lewis and Clark Expeditions, where to travel from the east coast across the entire mainland of the continent to the west coast required someone like the leading skilled frontiersmen, and a very dangerous, very challenging mission, which was a very brave undertaking for a handful of people to actually be able to accomplish that. Some decades later, with the rail system, with the infrastructure of this railroad platform, any family could do this. With your young children, you could hop on the rail line and get across the country. Any entrepreneur could come out and take advantage of the development of new territories that were completely inaccessible before. It was a complete transformation in our most fundamental ability to exist on the planet in these different territories.

Now what does this have to do with space? This is how we should be thinking about space exploration, space development—things that we view today as incredibly expensive, difficult, dangerous missions. We should be thinking now what kind of investments can we make to ensure that those then become regular, day-to-day even, activities that we can support very easily. What will it take to create a Solar System

physical-economic platform that will enable mankind to do much more, much easier, than we can today? That's the metric we want

to set. That's the measuring rod we want to utilize, to determine

what kind of space program, what kind of policy we need today.

In breaking this down, this might not include everything,

but in some of our work in the Basement with our discussions on

this subject, I think we can really, very usefully look at three

categories of activity – three categories of infrastructure and

technologies – which define the basis, you could say the pillars, of a Solar System platform, of an ability to qualitatively expand mankind's ability to access the Solar System

in completely new ways, to make things we currently view as singular flagship missions, [into] just regular, easy activities

that we can do, orders of magnitude more of than we can now.

What we want to look at are these three categories of activity:

(1) Access to space. What's our ability to get from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit? Initial basic access to space.

(2) Travelling in space. Getting around the Solar System. Getting from one planetary body to the next.

(3) Developing resources. Developing the capabilities to utilize the resources available to us throughout the Solar System, not having to take everything with us everywhere we go, but be able

to develop the wealth that's available out there; to utilize it on site and transport it around, even bringing stuff back to Earth that we can't necessarily get from Earth.

If you look at these three pillars, these three categories together, and if you make qualitative breakthroughs in each of these together, this really comes together to define a new platform of activity, a new standard that will enable the kind of leap that will transition us from viewing space as a Lewis and Clark style expedition, to a trans-continental railroad style relationship to the Solar System.

I just want to take a couple minutes and go through just some sense of what areas we can see breakthroughs in each of these categories. Go to the first slide we have displayed. [Fig.

1] It has been said that getting from Earth's surface to low Earth orbit, is half-way to anywhere in the Solar System. In a certain sense that's very true. If you have a sense of the scales, that might sound very, very strange, because, just in terms of distance, low Earth orbit [begins] about 160 km, about 100 miles, up above your head. If you want to travel to the Moon, you're talking about hundreds of thousands of miles. If you want to travel to another planet, you're talking about millions of miles.

It's a little funny to think that the first 100 miles, compared to hundreds of thousands or millions, is actually half of the trip. But if you look at the energy requirements and what it takes to actually start from just being on the Earth's

surface

and getting into orbit, that is the case. It is a tremendous amount of energy requirement to get from Earth's surface up into

Earth orbit.

The graphic here displays this, in terms of travel from

Earth's surface to different planetary bodies, measured in the standard terms used for Solar System travel, which is your change

in speed. To get into Earth orbit requires not just going up 100

miles, but actually changing your speed, from your current velocity sitting here on the Earth, to something that will allow

you to stay in orbit. If you want to change orbits, or travel around, you can measure that, in terms of changes in velocity.

So that happens to be the metric here; but you can see the lowest

dark blue bar on each of these graphics shows that literally far

more than half of the requirement is just getting from Earth's surface to Earth orbit.

ROSS: So, this is half of the speed that you're getting;

this doesn't mean half of the energy, or half of the fuel, or anything like that.

DENISTON: Yeah. Once you start to include that, it would

be even more energy requirements; because you've got to lift your

fuel that you're going to use for the different travels into orbit with you. It definitely gets a little more detailed if you

want to get into it, but this is literally the change in speed

requirements to get into Earth orbit and then to leave Earth orbit is very significant.

So, there's improvements being made in rocket systems to get up more efficiently, but there are new technologies that are just sitting there on the horizon; they've been sitting there for decades, frankly, that would dramatically lower the cost, lower the requirements, and the point is, dramatically increase the accessibility of space to mankind. One technology that has been discussed for a long time is space planes. Here in the graphic you can see a relatively recent article covering studies in China on interest in China to develop what some people call single-stage-to-orbit space planes. So, you can get on a plane on a runway – it's probably going to be a little bit longer than your standard runway for airplane travel – and you can ride a single space plane from the runway all the way up into Earth orbit. A lot of this depends upon much more advanced engine designs that can utilize the oxygen in the atmosphere at higher speeds and at higher altitudes to continue to provide thrust. But these things could dramatically lower the cost, the energy requirements of getting people and payloads up into Earth orbit; far more than a lot of the discussion about these reusable rockets and some of the developments going on in improving rocket systems to get from Earth's surface into Earth orbit.

ROSS: This is a technology that was in LaRouche's "Woman on

Mars" video from the 1980s, right? It talked about beginning with an airplane, and then turning into a rocket. The big benefit being that you can use the oxygen in the atmosphere instead of carrying it with you, is that right? Is that what makes this more effective?

DENISTON: Yeah, absolutely. These rocket systems have to carry the oxygen as part of the rocket to combust to provide the thrust. These are more innovative engine designs – air-breathing engines that can use the oxygen in the atmosphere. As you said, this has been researched in the United States with different scramjet designs. Yeah, Mr. LaRouche featured some of this, which he had developed I think in some close discussion with some Italian colleagues at the time in his collaboration with the Fusion Energy Foundation; and had made it a major part of his "Woman on Mars" mission.

But this is being developed; this is live. Again, you're seeing clear interest in China; there's interest in the United States; there's a company in the United Kingdom that's developing very interesting engine designs that can utilize these capabilities. If you want to take it a step further, another thing that's been discussed is using vacuum tube maglev technologies to launch from Earth orbit into space. This might be a little more frontier and not quite as around the corner as these space planes; but this is the kind of stuff that we should be thinking about. Again, the point is, completely

revolutionizing mankind's access to low-Earth orbit and then to the Solar System. So, this is the first major hurdle. If you get some solid infrastructure developments that can enable mankind to overcome this hurdle more easily, you're creating the basis for a much broader expansion of mankind's activity.

The next pillar, the next category is travel in space. And again, this is an issue that Mr. LaRouche has been campaigning on for decades. Space travel requires nuclear reactions; chemical fuel just doesn't have the energy density to provide quick and efficient access to the Solar System. We can get to the Moon; that's OK. It probably would be nice to get there a little bit quicker, but that's our next door neighbor in terms of the Solar System. If you want to get to Mars, you want to get around to other places in the Solar System, you've got to get to nuclear reactions. The heart of this is the fact that the energy density, the energy per mass of nuclear reactions is, on average, on the order of a million times greater than the energy per mass in chemical reactions; even as broad categories, setting aside the particular fuel you use in either case.

A million times is just a big number, but for one quick comparison, you take the fuel used for the Space Shuttle launch – those two solid rocket boosters on either side, the large tank in the middle filled with liquid fuel. You take the weight of all that fuel together, some of the most advanced chemical reactions we have for fuel for space launch; how much weight

of

nuclear fuel would it take to contain the same amount of energy?

You're talking about 10 pounds! One suitcase full of nuclear fuel contains the same amount of energy as all three fuel tanks

of the Space Shuttle. To be fair, you couldn't necessarily use

that fuel the same way to launch the Space Shuttle; you have to

have systems that can actually combust it and get thrust out of

it. It's not just the energy content as the only issue, but that

is the defining characteristic that makes nuclear reactions key

to getting around the Solar System; enabling things like travelling at constant acceleration. Instead of just initially

firing your thruster and basically floating on an orbit to get to

different planetary bodies – which is what's often proposed for

getting people to Mars; which would take on the order of six, seven, eight months to do. If you had nuclear reactions –

especially fusion reactions – you can be accelerating for half the trip, and decelerating the second half of the trip; you can

cut that time down to weeks or even days.

We were all excited that New Horizons got to Pluto.

Unfortunately, it didn't have the fuel in it and the engines to

slow down when it got there; which is too bad, because it spent

ten years getting there, and even just passing by in the course

of a couple of weeks, found amazing things. Imagine if it

actually got to stop and stay? If you had nuclear reactions, that the type of stuff you could be doing. If you had one-gravity acceleration, so you're constantly accelerating, providing the thrust that creates the equivalent of one Earth gravity for the crew on the space ship, it would literally take 16 days to get to Pluto. Compared to New Horizons taking ten years to get there; that's when the orbits are closest, but maybe a few more days in sub-optimal conditions.

You're talking about a complete revolution in our ability to efficiently get around the Solar System; travel to different planetary bodies; visit multiple locations. If you want to send people to Mars, this is the way to do it. If you want to send people out to other places, this is the way to do it. Even robotic missions; you want to get around and do way more exploration. There's so much we don't know about all these planets, about their moons; there's just so much to figure out. These are the kinds of systems that are going to create vast improvements in our ability to do it.

And again, the third category is developing the resources in space; developing the ability to utilize what's available to us on the Moon, on Mars, on different asteroids. This is something we don't really do at all, yet. So, you have to bring basically everything with you through that very costly energy-intensive first hurdle of getting from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit, through travelling the vast distances of space. This is just this very early pioneer style mode of activity. Whereas, if we're going to be serious about this, we need to develop the

capabilities to utilize the resources that are there; and eventually look to serious industrialization and development of advanced systems out in space, on-site at different planetary bodies. One critical driver to this whole thing that we've put a major focus on is the development of helium-3 from the Moon. Helium-3 being an absolutely unique, excellent fusion fuel; which is basically absent on Earth, but relatively abundant all over the lunar surface, and could be an excellent fuel for fusion propulsion in space and also to provide electricity energy back here on Earth. There's been years of serious study and designs and investigations of how to go to the Moon, develop the systems to process the regala[ph], extract the helium-3; and initiate real industrial-style processes; developments on the lunar surface. That's just one example. You want to get oxygen, hydrogen, metals; asteroids are also potentially very useful places to develop the resources. So, as a third category, the general idea of developing advanced capabilities to utilize and create what we need in different regions of the Solar System.

If you put this together and look at these things synergistically as integrated technologies, infrastructure systems, levels of energy flux density; as a whole they define for mankind a completely different relationship to the Solar System. The question is, are we making investments that are bringing us to that level? Can we say that the investments we're going to make in this next administration are going to be taking mankind in that direction, to be able to support these qualitatively higher levels of activity to the point where we can

honestly look back in a couple of generations and see the space activity going on now as equivalent to Lewis and Clark style explorations of the West; and have mankind have the capabilities to regularly visit many planetary bodies and do all we want around the Solar System? That's the vision that we need.

We were talking about this with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, and he again said, "Your starting point is Krafft Ehrlicke." And Krafft Ehrlicke's industrialization of the Moon really I think is the critical driver program that can get a lot of this going. As I said, we have helium-3 on the Moon; that puts fusion directly right there on the table. You're talking about developing industrial capabilities and mining capabilities on the Moon. If you're serious about doing this, you want to increase our access to space from the Earth's surface. So, it is excellent that we're seeing a lot of discussion about the Moon coming on the table again; but I think the issue is, are we going to pursue this Krafft Ehrlicke vision for a real industrial development? Although he might have used different terms in discussing it, he had exactly the same conception that Mr. LaRouche has: That this is the basis for mankind's much broader expanse. Really the essential nature of the type of qualitative changes that mankind goes through in his natural growth and development as a very unique species on this Earth and hopefully tomorrow in the Solar System.

As Jason mentioned, some of this is discussed in an article that's going to be released in the next issue of the *Hamiltonian*. This is an ongoing subject of discussion, but with the openness now, I really think it's critical we set the level of discussion on that basis.

ROSS: Mhmm; that's aiming pretty high, that's good. I think that's a really apt description that you got about comparing Lewis and Clark. It used to be a really difficult thing to cross the continent; now it isn't. Or think about the Silk Road. The ancient Silk Road. If you're trying to develop that region of the planet with camel caravans, and you contrast that with what China is able to do now with building rail networks and helping build them and road networks in these neighboring countries; you totally transform the relationship to that area. The old development of human settlements along coasts, along oceans or along rivers; and then by the chemical revolution, by the ability to have steam power – also canals earlier, but still connected to water; but with steam power, it made it possible to open up the interior of the continents. And with the potential for nuclear power, then the Solar System becomes something that's accessible to us in a meaningful or more regular way than an exotic, years-long, life-threatening trip. The other aspect, which you talked about is, if you look at what's going on with the New Paradigm in the world; what China's doing, with the way things are being reshaped politically also

around Russia. And then you look at the scientific advancements that are being made, where China's got a very top-line in the world super-conducting tokamak for fusion research. The major breakthroughs in terms of lunar exploration – that's China right now; China's going to be landing on the far side of the Moon; China had the first soft landing on the Moon in decades. This is really a potential. With their far side of the Moon landing, China will be able to take the first photographs of our universe in the very low radio range; it's never been done before. We'll have access to a whole new sense of sight about the universe around us.

So, I think it's very exciting. It's definitely much more thrilling than most of the discussion that takes place about this policy or that policy, when you think big like that.

DENISTON: Mr. LaRouche's platform concept is so key. People just don't have the idea of this type of qualitative leaps that are natural for mankind. People are so accustomed at this point to just slow, incremental progress if there's any progress at all. It's going to be a fight to get people to think on this level again.

ROSS: Yes! So much of what is considered to be progressive or useful is only nudging people toward being better savers or something; compared to the kinds of huge changes that are going to be needed. I think that's a very good image that we've

given
people. Let's end it with that. I think the thing to take
from
this also is that we have got a lot that we need to do; a lot
of
policies to put into place; and a wide open opportunity to
make
it happen right now. Including, as Jeff was emphasizing,
Glass-Steagall is absolutely doable during this session of
Congress; even before the inauguration of the next President
and
the next Congress in January. This is something we can do
right
now, next week, in this period.

The ability to understand this concept of the
platforms, of
the history of economic development of the United States, a
real
major aspect of economic science, comes through studying
Alexander Hamilton. So, if you have not been working through
Alexander Hamilton's reports, I urge you to get in touch with
—
if you're near one of our offices, one of our locations, to
join
us for these readings. Get a copy of these reports yourself.
The book, *Alexander Hamilton's Vision* contains all four of the
reports, along with Mr. LaRouche's Four New Laws to Save the
USA
Now. And you don't have to get into a fistfight at a Walmart
parking lot to pick it up, either.

Let's end it with that. Please sign up through our
website
if you haven't already, to find out how to get involved with
us.
Get our daily email, join us via the action center; let's be
in
touch, and let's make this happen right now. There is nothing

to
wait for; the situation is open. So, thank you for joining
us;
thank you to Ben and Jeff. Thank you for all the work that
you
have done and that you will do in the period immediately
ahead.

Bush ' og Obamas krigsforbrydelser afsløret – Trump bør erklære sig enig

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 22. november, 2016 – Den følgende erklæring fra den republikanske senator Richard H. Black, Virginias Senat, kom som respons til en advarsel fra kongresmedlem Ted Lieu (D-CA) om, at USA's støtte til og samarbejde med Saudi-Arabien i den kriminelle krig mod Yemen udsatte amerikansk militærpersonale for en risiko for at blive retsforfulgt for krigsforbrydelser. Senator Black er tidligere chef for Afdeling for Kriminallov ved Pentagons militære strafferet.

»Jeg er enig i kongresmedlem Lieus juridiske analyse. Jeg mener imidlertid, at denne sags mere praktiske aspekt er den juridiske afsløring af vore mest højtplacerede embedsfolk, der styrede vore militærfolks handlinger. Ifølge den præcedens,

der blev sat af den Amerikanske Krigsforbryderdomstol i sagen mod den japanske general [Tomoyuki] Yamashita efter Anden Verdenskrig, kan den øverstkommanderende retsforfølges for generelle, kriminelle handlinger, begået af den øverstkommanderendes underordnede. Dette gælder for handlinger, som han kendte til, eller burde have kendt til.

Amerika har i vid udstrækning ladet hånt om internationale normer for opførsel i sine aggressionskrige imod Serbien, Irak, Libyen, Syrien og nu Yemen. Visse handlinger fremstår som forbrydelser iht. international sædvanelov – såsom vores afvisning af at acceptere oberst Gaddafis overgivelse, da han tilbød at forlade Libyen. USA, Storbritannien og Frankrig skal have ført rådslagning, før de besluttede at ignorere hans tilbud om at abdicere, og fremmede i stedet mordet på ham.

Ved at lade hånt om fastlagte normer for opførsel i krigstid har USA i alvorlig grad undermineret sin moralske autoritet og formindsket sin magt over hele planeten. Alt imens jeg er tilhænger af et robust forsvar, så opnår vi intet ved at udkæmpe krige for at fremme globalisering – især ikke, når sådanne krige krænker Lov om Krig på Land.«

Præsident Donald Trump indikerer i stigende grad, at han er enig. Hans udnævnelse af general Michael Flynn (pens.) er en sådan indikation – general Flynn advarede som bekendt, da han var chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, Obama om, at hans tvivlsomme eventyr i Syrien, og også i Libyen, støttede etableringen af et »kalifat«, bestående af de mest ekstreme, saudiskstøttede, islamiske terrorister. General Flynn latterliggjorde også Obamas massive program for dronemord, der er så frydefuldt for dræber-præsidenten, som rent militært værende værre end unyttigt, idet hvert eneste drab »blot gjorde dem til martyrer og blot skabte en ny årsag til at bekæmpe os endnu hårdere«. Ligesom Trump er general Flynn fortaler for at arbejde sammen med Rusland for at forsvare den syriske stat og verden imod terrorister.

Mandag mødtes Trump også med kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI), med indikationer om, at hun kommer i betragtning som USA's ambassadør til FN. Gabbard, der er veteran fra Irakkrigen, har været en offentlig kritiker af Obamas evindelige krige og hans fiasko i bekæmpelse af terrorisme, til fordel for »regimeskift« imod sekulære regeringer. Sæt dette i modsætning til Obamas FN-ambassadør Samantha Power, der har tilsluttet sig de brølende dinosaurer ved i dag i FN at levere en tirade om, at hun ville »stille for retten« de syriske øverstbefalende, der har anført kontraterror-operationerne i deres land.

Verden befinder sig i en revolutionerende overgangsperiode. De europæiske ledere, der fulgte Obama og briternes diktater om at gennemføre sanktioner mod Rusland og forberede til krig, falder som fluer. Valget af François Fillon, en pro-russisk kandidat, i det franske Republikanske Partis primærvalg i denne uge, følger i kølvandet på valget af pro-russiske præsidenter i Bulgarien og Moldova i sidste uge. Samtidig hænger de europæiske banker, med Deutsche Bank og Royal Bank of Scotland i spidsen, i en tynd tråd og kunne bringe hele det vestlige banksystem til fald, hvad dag, det skal være – med mindre USA's Kongres kommer til fornuft og gennemfører Glass-Steagall nu, uden at vente til den nye, amerikanske regering tiltræder i januar.

Endnu mere afgørende er kampen for at genoprette kreativ tænkning i de vestlige nationer, efter årtiers intellektuel gift fra Hollywoods og rock-narko-sex-modkulturens vold og perversion. For tre år siden, på 50-års dagen for mordet på John F. Kennedy, præsenterede Schiller Instituttet, stiftet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, en mindekoncert for JFK med en opførelse af Mozarts Rekviem-messe i D-mol i Washington-området, som efterfulgtes af en gentagelse af koncerten i Holy Cross katedralen i Boston, hvor, 50 år tidligere, Richard Cardinal Cushing holdt en mindehøjtidelighed for JFK med en højtidelig pavemesse, missa solemnis rekviem, hvor det samme,

intense udtryk for klassisk skønhed var blevet præsenteret og fulgt på fjernsyn i hele verden. Det er netop skønhedens identifikation med sandhed, der er gået tabt i Vesten, og som må genoprettes for at bringe verden sammen for fred gennem fælles og samarbejdende udvikling.

Foto: Præsident Obama og førstedame Michelle Obama i Saudi-Arabien, 27. januar, 2015.

Succesfuld Yemen - demonstration i Stockholm med Schiller Instituttet

Schiller Instituttet var en af talerne ved en demonstration for at stoppe den hæslige krig imod Yemen, i en forenet front med en gruppe Yemen-aktivister og andre svenske organisationer fra venstrefløjen og fredsbevægelsen. Demonstrationens hovedtema var »Stop aggressionskrigen mod Yemen« og også »Stop hungersnøden i Yemen – Løft blokaden nu!«, »Ingen svenske våben til Yemens slagtere«, »Støtte til Saudi-Arabien er støtte til terrorisme«, »Anerkend Yemens nye regering!« og »Genopbyg Yemen!« Demonstrationen fandt sted uden for det svenske parlament, Riksdag, den 10. nov., 2016, dagen efter, at Stockholm blev lammet af en snestorm, med 30 cm snefald på én dag, hvilket er det største snefald i november i 100 år. Aktivisterne holdt ud og demonstrerede i fire timer, med bunkerne af sne, der hobede sig op ved vores demonstration, som eksotisk baggrund for fotografierne af demonstrationen.

Hovedparten bestod af 16 informationsborde med billeder fra ødelæggelsen, som saudierne bombardement og det forfærdeligt hungersnødræmte folk har forårsaget, men også billeder af de

hårdt ramte yemenitters 2 mio. mennesker store demonstration i hovedstaden Sana'a. Der blev uddelt flyvesedler og holdt taler på både arabisk og svensk. Blandt de ti talere tog Hussein Askary og Ulf Sandmark, begge fra Schiller Institutet, mikrofonen. Hussein holdt en bevægende tale om, hvorfor han demonstrerede. Han brugte et fiktivt eksempel, med en ung, yemenitisk pige ved navn Amal (Håb). Hun kunne om tyve år være udenrigsminister i Yemen og møde en svensk diplomat ved en fredskonference. Hussein spurgte, hvad hun ville sige om Sverige om 20 år, afhængigt af, hvad svenskerne gør i dag?

Hvad der var meget vigtigt i denne demonstration var, at den kunne afholdes sammen med en organisation for et venstrebladet, to organisationer for solidaritet med Syrien, en menneskerettighedsgruppe for læger og en svensk fredsorganisation.

To gange blev parlamentarikerne inviteret til demonstrationen, men ingen dukkede op. Men de kender med sikkerhed til den. Demonstrationen fandt sted fra daggry og til ud på natten, hvor fakler oplyste stedet på en meget dramatisk måde. En ny række taler blev holdt, og da demonstrationen skulle til at slutte, tog yemenitterne mikrofonen og holdt den ene tale efter den anden. Nationalsangen blev atter spillet, så vel som også yemenitiske sange. Sluttelig begyndte vi at danse de yemenitiske danse i sneen og brugte faklerne i stedet for de traditionelle yemenitiske knive.

Mange flyveblade blev uddelt, og folk stoppede hele dagen for at se skiltene og diskutere. Flere kontakter, der var blevet mobiliseret over de social medier, dukkede op.

Dokumentation:

Saudisk folkemord i Yemen truer 7 mio. mennesker med sultedøden

5. nov., 2016 – Ifølge saudisk tankegang er krigen i Yemen udelukkende houthiernes og den tidligere yemenitiske præsident Ali Abdullah Salehs ansvar, for at have nægtet at acceptere den »legitime« regering af Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi, der i øjeblikket er i eksil i Saudi-Arabien. Faktisk skriver en vis dr. Muhammad Yehya al-Faal, i en Goebbels-lignende klumme i *Saudi Gazette*: »Det [saudiske] Kongedømme og dets allierede, der danner koalitionen, elsker det yemenitiske folk og Yemen og har aldrig ønsket denne krig.«

Det, som saudisk »kærlighed« til Yemen betyder for det yemenitiske folk, blev klart forklaret den forgangne uge af folk fra FN's nødhjælpsprogram og FN's Fødevarerhjælp, som rapporterede, at 7,1 mio. yemenitter trues af hungersnød. »Yemen er kun ét skridt fra hungersnød«, sagde FN's nødhjælpschef Stephen O'Brien tidligere på ugen, rapporterer *VICE News*. Firs procent af Yemen har i øjeblikket behov for humanitærhjælp, og 19 af landets 22 distrikter har nået et kriseniveau af manglende sikkerhed for fødevarerforsyningen, iflg. FN's Fødevarerhjælp. På grund af lukning af lufthavnen i hovedstaden Sana'a, den saudiskledede koalitions blokade af grænserne og gentagne bombninger af gårde, brønde og landbruget, er forsyningerne af fødevarer svundet ind.

»Fejler nærede børn overstiger vore centres kapacitet«, sagde George Khoury, direktør for FN's afdeling for koordinering af humanitære anliggender i Yemen, til *VICE News*. »Alt imens de fjendtlige handlinger er én faktor i dødsfaldene og drabene, så er den største faktor ikke krig i Yemen. Folk dør i stilhed hver dag, pga. fejler næring.«

Fejler næring er i færd med at gøre befolkningen mere sårbar over for sygdomme, i et land, hvor sundhedsvæsenet, som det var, stort set er kollapsede. Verdenssundhedsorganisationen

mener, der er flere end 1.400 tilfælde af kolera i landet, siden et udbrud blev erklæret for tre uger siden. »Hvis det internationale samfund ikke griber ind nu, kunne vi stå med en stor, stor humanitær katastrofe«, sagde Khoury. »Den udfolder sig allerede her i Yemen.«

Info/historie:

Saudi Arabien lancerer massiv terrorbombardement af Yemen

Rapport fra LaRouchePAC, 26. marts, 2015.

Arven fra Bush-Obama slår til igen. Saudi-Arabien lancerer terrorbombardement imod det yemenitiske folk.

Et desperat Saudi-Arabien og allierede, der iflg. rapporter modtager logistisk støtte og efterretningsstøtte fra USA, lancerede et massivt luftbombardement af Yemens hovedstad, Sana'a, samt flere andre byer. Dusinvis af borgere og soldater er blevet dræbt. De 100 sortier af »Operation Firmness Storm« skete som reaktion på den massive sejr fra de nationale styrker under ledelse af Al-Houthis og deres Ansarullah bevæbnede grupper side, som det i løbet af få dage lykkedes at overtage landets sydlige del. De havde overtaget hovedstaden Sana'a i september, 2014.

Saudierne og deres allierede har udbredt løgne, der går ud på, at det, Ansarullah gjorde, var et »shi'a kup« imod præsident Abedrabbo Mansour Hadis legitime regering. Begge påstande er det pure løgn. Al-Houthier, der er Zeidi-shi'aer, reagerede sidste juni som en national styrke for at forene folket imod en korrump regering og Saudi-fabrikeret, politisk aftale, der holdt landet splittet og korrruptionen i live. Houthierne

støttes af ungdommen fra revolution af 2011 (og som ikke er shi'aer), af de tidligere væbnede styrker, der stadig er loyale over for den tidligere præsident Ali Abdullah Saleh (der ikke er shi'aer), af mange politiske partier (socialistiske og nationalistiske, der ikke er shi'aer), af mange sunni-stammer (der ikke er shi'aer) og af en stor gruppering af de sydyemenitiske »separatist«-bevægelser (der ikke er shi'aer). I løbet af få måneder lykkedes det Al-Houthierne og deres allierede at rense store dele af landet for al-Qaeda-terrorister, hvilket det ikke er lykkedes USA og dets allierede at gøre i løbet af mere end 10 år. De havde i de seneste dage truet med at fjerne al-Qaeda og ISIS totalt fra Sydyemen. De havde lanceret en national dialog mellem alle de ovenfor nævnte parter for at danne en national regering og reformere forfatningen.

Saudi-Arabien og de andre Golfstater, i samarbejde med Obama-administrationen og briterne, forsøgte igen at splitte nationen i sidste måned, hvor de trak deres ambassader ud af Sana'a og flyttede dem til Aden, hvor Hadi var flygtet til fra husarrest og hævdede at repræsentere en legitim regering. Hadis embedsperiode som præsident sluttede i februar 2014 og blev forlænget for et år, og han kan således ikke hævde at være præsident længere.

Nu, hvor Ansarullah og deres allierede har overtaget Aden den 25. marts, trådte saudierne til for at ødelægge den yemenitiske nation og fjerne ethvert håb om en national dialog. Et republikansk Yemen, med en religiøst tolerant kultur, har været Wahhabi al-Sauds værste mareridt, da de er forbundet af lange grænser og af historiske kontakter ind i Saudi-Arabien.

Det, der gjorde tingene mere komplicerede, var den iranske skjulte og åbenlyse støtte til Al-Houthierne, hvilket bekræftede for dem, der var udsat for den saudiske propaganda, at Al-Houthier var iranske/shi'itiske agenter. Saudierne og Golfstaterne har lagt pres på Egypten om at støtte anti-

Houthi-kampagnen, idet de har brugt Egyptens bekymring over passagen til den vitale Suezkanal fra Yemens Bab el-Mandib-stræde, når houthierne når frem til Taaz i det sydvestlige Yemen, hvilket de gjorde sidste tirsdag, den 24. marts. Uden en international og regional, egyptisk/iransk diplomatisk intervention, vil ikke alene Yemen, men hele den Arabiske Halvø stå i flammer. Shi'a-minoriteter i Saudi-Arabien og Bahrain kan mobiliseres til at destabilisere saudierne. Iran, den største såkaldte shi'a-magt i området, har været låst fast i diplomatiske forhandlinger med USA over atomprogrammet og ophævelse af sanktionerne. Saudierne har regnet med, at iranerne ikke ville intervenere direkte for ikke at sabotere deres chancer for succesrige forhandlinger før deadline den 31. marts. Dette kan vise sig at være en alvorlig fejlberedning.

Supplerende materiale:

Erklæring fra Sana'a.

Saudi-Arabiens angreb på det yemenitiske folk truer BRICS-planen for verdensfred.

Det, der skete i de tidlige morgentimer den 26. marts 2015, kun to dage før det planlagte Arabiske Topmøde i Sharm el-Sheik (Egypten), var en systematisk terrorhandling og en aggression imod det yemenitiske folk under mørkets vinger, der dræbte og lemlæstede ubevæbnede mennesker, kvinder, børn og ældre. Dette angreb støttes af en international alliance, der er hysterisk pga. kollapset af dets imperialistiske verdensorden, der er baseret på at suge blodet ud af, og udplyndre, andre nationers resurser, og på krænkelse af deres rettigheder.

Denne terrorhandling afslører tydeligvis en plan for systematiske, internationale krænkelser af menneskerettighederne hos folket på yemenitisk jord, og for udenlandske kræfters indgriben i en suveræn og fri nations anliggender. Forudgående fandt der mistænkelige og illegale træk sted i de internationale magtkorridorer for at beskytte ISIS og al-Qaeda og deres partnere. Denne operation »Firmness Storm« er den seneste af denne alliances konspiratoriske handlinger imod verdens fredssøgende nationer.

Det afslører klart falskheden i den såkaldte Riyadh-dialog, hvor der ikke er basis for dialog, og som endelig tog masken af gennem denne overlagte aggression for at føje den til de andre sår, der er tildelt det yemenitiske folk gennem deres forudgående planer. Disse allierede dækker over det faktum, at de er skaberne af terrorisme, og deres handlinger i dag føjer sig til den lange liste af saudiske forbrydelser, ikke blot som finansierer af terrorisme, men i realiteten som dem, der har patentet på terrorisme.

Dette kræver, at dette system opløses én gang for alle, for at skåne verden for dets ondskab. En kraftig fordømmelse må rettes mod dem, der støtter denne aggression, der tilsigter at holde dette system i live. Denne handling nedbryder alle saudiske påstande om, at Kongedømmet og dets allierede er dem, der bygger fred i verden. Dette er ikke blot en trussel mod områdets sikkerhed, men også mod BRIKS-systemet, fordi det vil slå bremserne i for Silkevejsprojektet ved porten til Yemen.

Barmhjertighed for martyrernes sjæle og heling til de sårede!

Hilsener til de modige kæmpere og modstandskræfter i Yemen og i hele verden!

En varm velkomst til de børn, der endnu ikke er født!

Jeg overgiver jer og mig selv i Allahs hænder.

26. marts, 2015.

Fouad al-Ghaffari.

Fouad al-Ghaffari er en tidligere diplomat, tidligere leder af kontoret for Ministeren for Menneskerettigheder 2012-2014, stifter af Gedar (en organisation for menneskerettigheder og civile samfundsinteresser). Han er også medunderskriver af Schiller Instituttets Appel for USA's og Europas tilslutning til BRIKS.

Bashar al-Assad: Trump kunne blive Syriens naturlige allierede, hvis han gør alvor af sit løfte om at nedkæmpe terrorisme

16. nov., 2016 – Den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assad sagde i går i et interview til Portugals RTP statslige Tv-station, at USA's nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump vil blive en »naturlig allieret«, hvis han gør alvor af sit løfte om at nedkæmpe »terrorister«, iflg. en iransk Tv-nyhedsrapportering samme dag, som rapporterede om Assad-interviewet.

Assad uddybede: »Vi kan ikke sige noget om, hvad han vil gøre, men hvis ... han vil bekæmpe terroristerne, vil vi selvfølgelig blive allierede, en naturlig allieret i denne henseende med russerne, med iranerne og med mange andre lande.«

Assad sagde, at han bød Trumps kampaneløfte velkomment, om,

at USA skulle fokusere mere på at bekæmpe Daesh (ISIS) terrorgruppen. Selv om Trumps kampagneløfte var lovende, spurgte Assad: »Kan han levere? Hvad med de udlignende kræfter i administrationen og massenyhedsmedierne, der var imod ham? Hvordan kan han håndtere dette?«

Assad tilføjede: »Det er derfor, vi er meget forsigtige med at vurdere ham, især, da han ikke tidligere har haft en politisk position.«

Nyheden rapporterede ligeledes, at, i et interview i marts måned, sagde Trump, at USA's »fremgangsmåde med at bekæmpe Assad og Daesh samtidigt var vanvid, idioti. Man kan ikke bekæmpe to mennesker, de bekæmper hinanden indbyrdes, og bekæmpe dem samtidigt. Man må vælge den ene eller den anden«.

Foto: Syriens præsident, Bashar al-Assad.

Trump skal efter sigende overveje en genoplivelse af Kerry/Lavrov-aftalen om Syrien

16. nov., 2016 – *Washington Times* rapporterede i går, at den nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump overvejer at genoplive planen om fælles militære operationer med Rusland imod al-Nusra-terrorgruppen. Udenrigsministrene for USA og Rusland, hhv. John Kerry og Sergej Lavrov, havde udarbejdet aftalen sidste september efter måneders forhandling, men den blev næsten

omgående saboteret af forsvarsminister Ash Carters Pentagon med bombardementet af syriske tropper i det østlige Syrien mindre end en uge efter, at aftalen trådte i kraft.

Pensionerede generalløjtnant Michael Flynn, tidligere chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) og Trumps nationale toprådgiver, råder efter sigende Trump til at satse på en ny æra for amerikansk-russisk, militært samarbejde.

»Vi var klar til at gå i gang, og vi kan blive klar til at gå i gang igen«, sagde en amerikansk embedsperson fra forsvaret.


En embedsperson fra Udenrigsministeriet sagde på denne baggrund, at »Obama-planen« (i realiteten Kerry/Lavrov-planen), der i september måned opfordrede til skabelsen af et Fælles Integrationscenter, med base i Genève og med personel bestående af russiske og amerikanske, militære embedsmænd, efter al sandsynlighed ville blive forelagt den tiltrædende administration. Udenrigsministeriet har rent faktisk mindst to gange i den forløbne uge bekræftet, at diskussioner mellem amerikanske og russiske officerer fortsat har fundet sted i Genève, på trods af selve aftalens fiasko. Embedspersonen understregede imidlertid over for *The Times*, at der ikke er nogen, der ved, om Trump og hans endnu ikke udnævnte, nationale sikkerhedsteam vil acceptere planen.

»Det er alt sammen spekulationer på nuværende tidspunkt«, sagde embedspersonen og tilføjede, at det ikke står klart, »om de vil bevare strategien, som den er, nappe lidt af den, revidere den eller fuldstændig skrotte den«.

Foto: John Kerry (venstre) og Sergej Lavrov, hhv. USA's og Ruslands udenrigsminister, udarbejdede i september måned en aftale om fælles militære operationer i Syrien til bekæmpelse af terroristerne.

Trump og Putin kan, og må, knuse terrorisme i Syrien – og globalt

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. november, 2016 – I kølvandet på Trumps produktive diskussioner over telefon med Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping i denne uge, og den politiske bortgang af Obamas (og Hillarys) krigsplaner, er der intet til hinder for, at disse tre, store nationer kan samarbejde om at knuse den britisk/saudisk-sponsorerede terrormaskine internationalt, med begyndelse i ISIS og al-Nusra i Syrien. »Der er ingen anden måde at gøre det på«, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. »Putin står i centrum for dette. Enhver hæmning af dette må forhindres.«

Den amerikanske befolkning er hastigt i færd med at indse, at det lange mareridt med økonomisk forfald, epidemien med narkotika og selvmord, evindelige krige og den ærefrygtindgydende trussel om atomkrig, endelig kunne være forbi. Otte år med Bush og Obama er ved at være slut. Det er stadig uklart, om Donald Trump vil lægge sin populisme til side til fordel for at gennemføre Glas-Steagall og knuse Wall Streets magt over USA's regering og økonomi – som han har lovet, han ville gøre. Det vil afhænge af, om det amerikanske folk mobiliserer sig selv til støtte for en løsning – og ikke blot en afvisning af de seneste otte års ondskab. Denne  løsning ligger nu foran dem, i form af **LaRouches Fire Love**: Glass-Steagall; en genindførelse af nationalbankvirksomhed; en afslutning af monetarisme til fordel for et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, til finansiering af infrastruktur inden for landbrug og industri, uddannelse og sundhedssektoren; og en genindførelse af videnskabelig udvikling, begyndende med et genoplivet NASA-rumprogram og stærkt udvidet forskning inden

for fusionskraft.

I dag ankom hold af aktivister fra New York, Baltimore og Virginia til Kongressen med krav om ikke at vente til Trumps indsættelse, men derimod handle i denne 'lame duck'-overgangsperiode for at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og de Fire Love. Det Demokratiske Parti er i oprør efter de tæsk, de fik i valgene til præsidentskabet og Kongressen, men meldinger fra LaRouche-aktivister i hele landet lyder på, at mange demokrater langt om længe ser den kendsgerning i øjnene, at Obama og Hillary Clinton havde tilsluttet sig de republikanske neokonservative, der ikke tjener den amerikanske befolkning, men Wall Street og krigsmaskinen. Trumps afvisning af både Obama og de republikanske neokonservative, med samt deres krigsplaner, under sin kampagne, skabte et tilflugtssted for demokrater, der så ondskaen med Obamas drabsmaskine.

De neokonservatives »unipolære« verden – med Obamas udtryk, »vi sætter reglerne« – har beviseligt skabt USA's og dets EU-allieredes totale isolation internationalt. I Europa går valgene, efter Brexit, imod EU-diktaturet og for en genopretning af bånd til Rusland, som det ses i Bulgarien og Moldova. Tyrkiets udenrigsminister sagde i dag, at hans land føler en sådan lede over de europæiske ledere, der truer med at smide det ud af NATO eller afslår dets anmodning om optagelse i EU, at de planlægger en folkeafstemning om nationens forhold til EU – en »Tyrkxit«.

Et alternativ viser sig klart. Med sit »Nye Paradigme« centreret omkring politikken for den Nye Silkevej, rejste Xi Jinping i dag til Sydamerika, hvor Ecuador, Peru og Chile vil være vært for statsbesøg, og hvor han også vil deltage i APEC-topmødet i Peru. Ecuadors præsident Correa lovpriste Kinas rolle i at transformere hans lands fysiske økonomi i løbet af det seneste årti og beskrev det aktuelle besøg som »det vigtigste besøg af noget statsoverhoved i Ecuadors historie«.

☒ Den samme entusiasme for et nyt paradigme ses i hele Afrika

og Asien, og i stigende grad også i Øst- og Vesteuropa. Overalt grunder folk på en fremtid, hvor USA ikke længere truer med krige og undergravning gennem »farvede revolutioner«, men som i stedet går med i BRIKS, AIIB og den Nye Silkevej om opbygning af en fremtid for hele menneskeheden. Dette potentiale må realiseres, især i selve USA. Et vindue mod muligheder åbner sig for os, men det kunne være kortvarigt, og med utænkelige konsekvenser, hvis vi mislykkes.

Foto: Gipsmodellen af Frihedsstatuen (Statue of Freedom), bronzestatuen på toppen af Capitols kuppel, står i Capitols Emancipation Hall.

Efter Trumps valgsejr: Tyskland må nu gribe initiativet for Den nye Silkevej! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Den »Marshallplan« på en milliard euro, som udviklingsminister Gerd Müller har foreslået, er et skridt i den rigtige retning, men slår langt fra til. Tyskland kan nu yde et enestående bidrag til det nødvendige epokeskift ved officielt at erklære, at det samarbejder med Kinas Nye Silkevej, frem for alt i genopbygningen af Mellemøsten og Afrikas industrialisering.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 14.
november 2016:
Efter Trumps valg: Skab en
USA-Rusland alliance,
gennemfør Glass/Steagall-
bankopdeling**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg