

Lad dette blive Dag Ét – indvielsesdag – for en ny æra for udviklingen af menneskeheden som helhed! LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 20. januar, 2017; Leder

Vi har et par emner, vi vil fremlægge her i dag, men vi lægger ud med en umiddelbar gennemgang fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche af de begivenheder, der fandt sted i dag, og vore marchordrer for de kommende par dage. Det er i dag naturligvis indsættelsesdag. Vi er nu officielt kommet til slutningen af 16 år med Bush/Obama-æraen. Vi står på tærsklen til noget nyt; vi har et nyt, officielt præsidentskab. Hvad dette nye præsidentskab vil blive, står endnu uklart; det er stadig undefineret, og det er Lyndon og Helga LaRouches vurdering, at vores job ikke har ændret sig. Det er stadig vores opgave at lægge Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love på bordet. Vi er, og må fortsætte med at være, dette lands intellektuelle lederskab, og det er vores ansvar nu at indvarsle et nyt, internationalt paradigme, som USA i høj grad må blive en del af – det, vi kan kalde for det »Nye Paradigme for Udvikling«.

Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er i dag 20. januar, 2017; indvielsesdag. Dette er vores special-webcast på indvielsesdagen fra LaRouchepac.com. Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg to kolleger – Benjamin Deniston her i studiet; og, via video, Michael Steger, som er med os i dag fra Houston, Texas, hvor han har tilbragt nogen tid sammen med Kesha Rogers.

Vi har et par emner, vi vil fremlægge her i dag, men vi lægger ud med en umiddelbar gennemgang fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche af de begivenheder, der fandt sted i dag, og vore marchorder for de kommende par dage. Det er i dag naturligvis indsættelsesdag. Vi er nu officielt kommet til slutningen af 16 år med Bush/Obama-æraen. Vi står på tærsklen til noget nyt; vi har et nyt, officielt præsidentskab. Hvad dette nye præsidentskab vil blive, står endnu uklart; det er stadig udefineret, og det er Lyndon og Helga LaRouches vurdering, at vores job ikke har ændret sig. Det er stadig vores opgave at lægge Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love på bordet. Vi er, og må fortsætte med at være, dette lands intellektuelle lederskab, og det er vores ansvar nu at indvarsle et nyt, internationalt paradigme, som USA i høj grad må blive en del af – det, vi kan kalde for det »Nye Paradigme for Udvikling«.

Dette er nogle af de emner, vi vil diskutere i dybden senere i programmet, med vægt på to, store projekter, der er eksempler på, og paradigmatiske for, dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling: Kra-kanalprojektet i Thailand og Transaqua-projektet i Afrika – to projekter, som hr. og fr. LaRouche i årtiernes løb har været meget involveret i, og som blot eksemplificerer den form for store projekter for *menneskelig* udvikling, som må forfølges i de kommende måneder og uger, både internationalt, men også store projekter af den art, som vi må gennemføre herhjemme i USA.

Lad mig begynde med en næsten ordret gennemgang af nogle kommentarer, som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche kom med umiddelbart efter præsident Donald Trumps indsættelsestale her i eftermiddag, og vi vil så diskutere dette lidt mere i detaljer, før vi går videre med en gennemgang af disse store, internationale udviklingsprojekter.

LaRouche sagde omgående, at det er meget uklart, mht. principper, hvad præsident Donald Trump har i sinde ud fra det, han fremlagde i sin indsættelsestale i dag. Lyndon LaRouche sagde, »De er meget forvirret på overfladen, og vi må

vente og se, hvad der ligger under denne overflade. På baggrund af det, der blev fremlagt i denne tale, er der ingen klarhed over principper i det.«

Helga LaRouche sagde: »Det vigtigste på hjemmefronten er, hvordan Donald Trump vil honorere de løfter, han har afgivet. Hvilke handlinger vil han faktisk tage?« spurgte hun. Med hensyn til den internationale front, var Helga LaRouches vurdering, »Trump burde vide, at det ikke fungerer sådan; blot at sige 'Amerika først'. Spørgsmålet er: Hvordan finder man fælles interesser, som er fælles for mange nationer, og ikke kun 'Amerika først'? Hvad er de fælles mål for mange nationer, og hvordan handler man for at forfølge disse mål?«

Dernæst sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Problemet er, at princippet endnu ikke er klart. Det kunne gå i retning af et forenende princip; men, ud fra det, der blev fremlagt, står det endnu ikke klart, at det nødvendigvis vil blive det, eller præcis, hvad dette princip vil være.« Helga LaRouche gentog, »Generelt set var talen en meget blandet pose. Der er bestemt løfter om, at dette kunne gå i den rigtige retning, men vi må se konkrete planer for handling. Vi, LaRouche-bevægelsen, LaRouche Political Action Committee, må forstærke vores mobilisering for Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love. Det er godt, at Obama er ude. Vi vil få en frisk vind, en frisk brise, men der er brug for langt mere klarhed.«

Sluttelig sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Vi vil ikke gå for meget ind på deres argumenter. Lad dem selv forklare deres egne argumenter.« Helga LaRouche sagde: »Vi behøver ikke nødvendigvis støtte ethvert aspekt af, hvad præsident Trump siger. Vi behøver heller ikke være overdrevent kritiske, men vi bør fokusere på vore egne principper og vore egne mål.«

Først og fremmest: Hvad er disse mål?

Nummer 1 – og det er stadig dagsordenen – må Glass-Steagall omgående genindføres som landets lov. I løbet af de seneste 24

timer har vi atter set et udbrud, i vid udstrækning pga. den mobilisering, som I, dette webcasts seere, og medlemmer af LaRouche-bevægelsen i USA har været engageret i; Glass-Steagall er nu tilbage i forreste front, tilbage på dagsordenen. Dette sås tydeligst af de spørgsmål, der blev stillet under høringsen for godkendelsen af den udpegede finansminister, Steven Mnuchin, og som rejstes af senator Maria Cantwell. Hun har, som folk ved, længe været en støtte af en tilbagevenden til Glass-Steagall, i mange år. Hendes første, og *eneste* spørgsmål til Steven Mnuchin, var, »Støtter De Glass-Steagall?«

Steven Mnuchins svar – og dette er Helga LaRouches analyse – var, »ægte sofisteri«. »Lyndon LaRouche har været meget klar omkring, at dét, vi har brug for, er den *originale Glass-Steagall, uden ændringer*. Så kommer denne Mnuchin-fyr og taler om en *modificeret* Glass-Steagall og blander det med Volcker-reglen«, sagde hun. »Dette er ægte sofisteri. Det er virkelig godt, at Maria Cantwell har meldt klart ud om dette spørgsmål, og nu må vi lægge meget pres på hende og andre, inklusive på præsident Donald Trump, for at få den ægte Glass-Steagall vedtaget. Som Maria Cantwell sagde, så kræver det en klar, skarp linje mellem investeringsbankaktivitet og kommerciel bankaktivitet sådan, som Glass-Steagall oprindeligt blev udarbejdet af Franklin Roosevelt.«

Men Glass-Steagall er blot det første skridt til det fulde program for de Fire Love; og jeg mener, vi vil diskutere dette, ikke nødvendigvis stykke for stykke, men som en generel gennemgang, det princip, der forener Lyndon LaRouches program. Og vi må, som Helga LaRouches analyse siger, tænke på det som blot Dag Ét af de første 100 dage.

Hvad vi omgående må få at se, fra dette øjeblik, er en omgående forbedring i de amerikansk-russiske relationer. Det er der allerede positive indikationer på. Der er en invitation til præsident Donald Trump til at deltage, eller sende en delegation til at deltage, i Astana Fredsforhandlingerne i

Kasakhstan; fredsforhandlingerne om Syrien. Det kunne ikke være mere presserende, end det er nu, med nyhederne her til morgen om, at ISIS på tragisk vis nu har ødelagt de storslåede, romerske ruiner i Palmyra, det smukke amfiteater og de andre ruiner. Så det er presserende vigtigt.

Men samtidig må der blive et seriøst partnerskab mellem USA og Kina. Den store mulighed for dette – i kølvandet på præsident Xi Jinpings tale om en fremtid for en fælles og almen skæbne, som var temaet i hans tale for Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum under sit nylige besøg i Schweiz – er en konference, der kommer til maj i Kina, om Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, og som mange statsoverhoveder vil deltage i. En eksplicit invitation er blevet overgivet til Donald Trump personligt for hans personlige deltagelse i denne konference.

Det, der står klart, er, at vi befinder os midt i en global proces for dramatisk og radikal forandring. Der kommer et betydningsfuldt skifte i dynamikken, som allerede finder sted, men som vil fortsætte med at udkrystallisere sig i de kommende måneder. De franske valg er i horisonten. Ifølge nogle beregninger er 75 % af vælgerne nu for at reducere sanktionerne mod Rusland. Dernæst er der de tyske valg, der kommer lidt senere efter de franske. I løbet af disse måneder kunne vi få at se en meget anderledes verden komme til syne. Det står klart, at det ikke længere er »business as usual«. Bush/Obama-æraen er forbi, og vi står nu på tærsklen til noget helt nyt.

Jeg vil gerne invitere Michael [Steger] og Ben [Deniston] til at sige lidt mere om dette, før vi går over til disse projekter, men, lad mig blot sige, om denne nye æra, som Helga LaRouche refererer til som nødvendigheden af at definere fælles interesser blandt mange nationer, og dernæst at samarbejde om at opnå disse interesser, eller, som præsident Xi Jinping udtrykker det, en fremtid for en fælles skæbne.

To store projekter, som jeg nævnte det, og som eksemplificerer

mulighederne for at engagere sig på et sådant niveau og indvarsle dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling, er Kra-kanalen i Thailand, der nu er meget konkret tilbage på dagsordenen – jeg kommer med flere detaljer senere – og Transaqua-projektet i Afrika. Det, vi ser, er, at den Nye Silkevej, Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, går støt fremad og nu bærer frugt efter årtiers arbejde fra LaRouche-bevægelsens side internationalt. Senere i aftenens udsendelse vil vi vise et kort klip af en video, vi har lavet, og som belyser Kra-kanalens historie, og som i de kommende dage vil blive ledsaget af et interview med en af hovedarrangørerne af dette projekt, Pakdee Tanapura. Og så får vi en slags generel præsentation af dette Transaqua-projekt i Afrika.

Men dette er store projekter, der blot eksemplificerer det, der, kan man sige, må blive det »nye normale« i dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling, og for det, som USA som en *presserende* sag må deltage i.

Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet:

**LET'S MAKE THIS DAY ONE – INAUGURATION DAY –
OF A NEW ERA FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR MANKIND AS A WHOLE!**

LaRouche PAC International Webcast, January 20, 2017

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's January 20th, 2017. Today is Inauguration Day, and this is our Inauguration Day Special Webcast from Larouchepac.com. I'm pleased to be joined today by two of my colleagues – Benjamin Deniston, here in the studio; and, via video, Michael Steger, who is joining us today from Houston, Texas, where he's been spending some time with Kesha Rogers.

We have a few items that we're going to present to you today, but we're going to begin with an immediate overview from

both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche of the events that occurred today,
and our marching orders for the days to come. Obviously, today is
Inauguration Day. We've come now, officially, to the end of 16
years of the Bush/Obama era. We're on the verge of something
new;
we have a new Presidency, officially. What that new Presidency
will be, is unclear; it is very much still undefined, and
Lyndon
and Helga LaRouche's assessment is, our job has not changed.
We
still have the task of putting Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws on
the
table. We are, and must continue to be, the intellectual
leadership in this country, and we are having the
responsibility
now of ushering in a new international paradigm of which the
United States must very much indeed be a part – what we can
call
the "New Development Paradigm."

That will be some of what we will discuss in substance
later
in this broadcast with an emphasis on two major projects which
are exemplary and paradigmatic of that New Development
Paradigm:
the Kra Canal Project in Thailand, and the Transaqua Project
in
Africa – two projects with which the LaRouches have been very
much involved over decades and which are merely exemplary of
the
kinds of great projects for {human} development that must be
pursued in the coming months, in the coming weeks, both
internationally, but also great projects of that type which we
must carry out here at home in the United States.

Let me begin with an almost verbatim overview of some
comments that both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche had, immediately

following President Donald Trump's inaugural speech this afternoon, and then we will discuss that in a little bit more detail before we get to the overview of these great international development projects.

What Mr. LaRouche said, right off the bat, is that it's very unclear, in terms of principle, what President Donald Trump has in mind, just based on what he presented in his inaugural speech today. Lyndon LaRouche said, "It's very confused on the surface, and we will have to wait and see what is underneath that surface. On the basis of what was presented in that speech, there is no clarity of principle there."

Helga LaRouche said, "The most important thing on the domestic front is how Donald Trump will deliver on the promises that he's made. What are the actions that he will actually take?" she asked. Regarding the international front, Helga LaRouche's assessment was, "Trump should know it doesn't work that way; merely saying 'America First.' The issue is: how do you find {common} interests, shared among {many} nations, not just 'America First'? What are the common objectives of multiple nations, and how do you act in pursuit of those objectives?"

Lyndon LaRouche then said, "The problem is that the principle is not clear yet. It could go in the direction of a unifying principle; but from what was presented, it's not yet clear that it necessarily will, or exactly what that principle will be." Helga LaRouche's reiterating remarks were: "Overall, the address was a very mixed bag. There are certainly promises that this could go in the right direction, but we need to see concrete plans of action. We, the LaRouche Movement, the LaRouche

Political Action Committee, must increase our mobilization on Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws program. It is good," she said, "that Obama is out. We will get a fresh wind, a fresh breeze, but a lot more clarity is still needed."

And then, finally, Lyndon LaRouche said, "We don't want to get too close to their arguments. Let them clarify their own arguments." And Helga LaRouche said, "We don't necessarily need to support every aspect of what President Trump says. We also don't need to be overly critical either, but we should be focusing on our own principles and our own objectives."

Now, first and foremost, what are those objectives?

No. 1 – and the agenda still stands – Glass-Steagall must be immediately reinstated as the law of the land. We saw, over the last 24 hours, an eruption again, largely due to the mobilization that you, the viewers of this webcast and members of the LaRouche Movement in the United States have been engaged in; Glass-Steagall is now back in the forefront, back on the agenda.

This could be seen most clearly by questions that were raised during the confirmation hearing of Treasury designate-Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, that were raised by Senator Maria Cantwell. Maria Cantwell, as people know, has been a long-standing supporter of a return to Glass-Steagall for many years now. Her very first question and her {only} question of Steven Mnuchin was, "Do you support Glass-Steagall?"

Steven Mnuchin's answer – and this is Helga LaRouche's analysis

– was "real sophistry." "Lyndon LaRouche has been very clear that what we need is the {original Glass-Steagall, without modification}. And here comes this Mnuchin guy, going on about a

{modified} Glass-Steagall, mixing it in with the Volcker Rule,"

she said. "This is real sophistry. It is very good that Maria Cantwell has now put herself on the spot on this issue, and now

{we} have to put real pressure on her and on others, including on

President Donald Trump, to get the real Glass-Steagall in place.

As Maria Cantwell said, that requires a clear bright line between

investment banking and commercial banking in the way that Glass-Steagall was originally designed by Franklin Roosevelt."

But Glass-Steagall is merely the first step in the full Four

Laws program; and I think we're going to discuss that, not necessarily piecemeal, but in terms of the broad overview, the principle which unifies Lyndon LaRouche's program. And the way to

think about that is what Helga LaRouche's analysis was, that this

is merely Day One out of what must be the First 100 Days.

What we have to see, immediately, from this moment on, is an

immediate improvement in U.S.-Russian relations. There are already positive indications of that. You have the official invitation of now-President Donald Trump to attend, or to send a

delegation to attend, the Astana Peace Talks in Astana, Kazakhstan; the peace talks for Syria. This could not be more urgent than it is right now, with the news that we received

this morning, that ISIS has, tragically, now destroyed the grand Roman ruins of Palmyra, the beautiful amphitheater, and the other ruins there. So, this is of urgent importance.

But, simultaneously, there must be a serious partnership between the United States and China. The grand opportunity for that, following President Xi Jinping's keynote speech on the future of shared and common destiny – that was his theme at the Davos World Economic Forum during his recent trip to Switzerland.

[<http://america.cgtn.com/2017/01/17/full-text-of-xi-jinping-keynote-at-the-world-economic-forum>] The most immediate opportunity is a conference that's coming up in May, in China, on the subject of the Belt and Road Initiative, which many head of state will be attending. There has been an explicit invitation extended, for Donald Trump, himself, to attend this conference.

What is clear, is that we are in the midst of a global process of dramatic and radical change. There will be a major shift of dynamic which is already ongoing, but which will continue to crystallize in the coming months. The French elections are on the horizon. According to some calculations, 75% of the electorate are now in favor of rolling back the sanctions against Russia. Then you have the German elections coming later after that. Over the course of these months, we could see a very different world emerging. What is very clear is that this is no

longer "business as usual." The Bush/Obama era is over, and now we're on the verge of something completely new.

Now, I would like to invite Michael and Ben to say a little bit more about this, before we get into these projects, but let me just say, this new era, what Helga LaRouche is referring to as the necessity of defining common interests among multiple nations, and then working together to achieve those interests, or, as President Xi Jinping put it, a future of shared destiny.

Two great projects, as I mentioned, which exemplify the opportunities to engage on that kind of level and to usher in this New Development Paradigm, are the Kra Canal in Thailand, which is now back on the agenda in a very real way – and I'll get into some of the details on that later – and the Transaqua Project in Africa. What we see is that the New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative, is steadily moving forward, and it's coming to fruition after decades of work by the LaRouche Movement internationally. Later in this show, we will be playing a brief clip of a video that we made highlighting the history of the Kra Canal, which also will be accompanied in the coming days by an interview with one of the key organizers of that project, Pakdee Tanapura. And then we will have sort of an overview presentation of this Transaqua Project in Africa.

But what these are, are great projects which are merely exemplary of what must become, you could say, the "new normal" in

this New Development Paradigm, and what the United States must {urgently} become a participant in.

Let me leave it at that. We can have a little bit more discussion and then get into some of the bulk of those projects.

MICHAEL STEGER: Well, I think everyone's fairly happy watching this broadcast, given the fact that especially the last eight years under Obama were a kind of psychological terror. There's definitely a relief. The one thing that's clear, is that it's a moment of action. Perhaps President Trump understands that. As, Matt, you indicated, as Lyn said, himself, we have to see what this actually means. But we, the LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche Association internationally know very well what this means. It's largely determined by the actions that both Russia and China have taken over the last three years around the New Silk Road initiative and a real collaboration, as Vladimir Putin himself called for in the 2015 United Nations General Assembly – an anti-Nazi coalition, like you saw in World War II – has to be brought together, a collaboration of nations.

And what that means – I think President Putin understands this – and I think it's very important that the American people grasp this. The eradication of this kind of terrorism, is the elimination of the British Empire, in the essence of a construction orientation; that you're actually building up the civilizations again, you're building up the populations. You're taking the areas of Southwest Asia, North Africa; the project of the Transaqua is in a key area to begin to develop many parts of

Africa that are right now threatened by this terrorist scourge.

The same is true from India through Pakistan, the Kra Canal. The areas of Myanmar and Thailand and into Malaysia are also threatened. The Philippines.

So these questions of development are really the means by which an international coalition eradicates the terrorism; eradicates the drug trade; and begins to collaborate on mankind's true destiny, which is really much greater than simply solving some of these basic problems.

I'll say that for now. I think Ben might have more to say.

BEN DENISTON: That's exactly the issue. Maybe we can get it to it a little bit more, but you look at the United States, you look at the issue of Mexico and our relation to Mexico, for example, which has been a big subject of discussion. But what hasn't been put on the table, is, again, the kind of campaign and the programs that the LaRouche Movement has led up for major development projects. Mr. LaRouche, again, has a very rich and high-level history of relations with top Mexican officials, including one-time President Jos  L pez Portillo of Mexico, with whom he had a direct personal relationship around this idea of common development.

This can be directly taken to one of the key issues we'll get into – the issue of water development, as we'll discuss in the case of Africa; but that can serve as a model for the kind of projects that we could bring back to the United States. What

Michael is saying here is critical: development is the key; development is the future; development is what's needed to actually {solve} these problems, not just address immediate crises, not just deal with catastrophes as they occur. But actually how do you move the world in many of these regions that have been plunged into years if not decades of horrific activities led by the Saudis, Obama, Bush – all of these factions? How do you actually bring that into some real solutions and resolutions that will create a long-term substantial change?

I think what Mrs. LaRouche said was very right on, in terms of her response to the inauguration speech; is that it's a new world. We can no longer be thinking about individual nations alone; that's just part of the natural state that mankind is at, at this point. Mankind has developed to the point where we're a global force; the level of development and growth needed is something that goes beyond individual national boundaries. You have to do it with respect to nations and their interests and their boundaries and their cultures; but it's also undeniable that we're at a point where we have to think as a global species – and really, an interplanetary species.

That's the basis for the future of mankind now. Where do you define these common areas of mutual benefit, mutual interest that nations can participate in; which creates a net higher amount of wealth and growth for all participants involved? There's a principle! Mr. LaRouche was raising the issue of where's the principle; that's an actual scientific principle rooted in the scientific nature of mankind as a creative

species,
and rooted in the very historical view of the point of human
development that we're currently at. That is a principle;
that
is something which you can continue to come to as the defining
point for policy and what's needed now.

OGDEN: Absolutely! There is obviously a sense of
dramatic
change which is sweeping the country; and I think that
President
Trump addressed what is a reality. That there is a
desperation
among the American people; and that is obviously what rendered
this election. The forgotten men, the forgotten women who
feel a
desperation and a despair as they look at these old abandoned
factories, as he said, standing like tombstones scattered
across
the territory of this country. People who feel like they have
no
voice; and the sense that they now have the opportunity to
participate once again in the policies of the United States.
But
participating in the policies of this country means a
necessity
for a deeply held education and profound understanding of
principle, not just policies but a principle around which
those
actions can be taken. The sentiment of saying we're going to
look at ourselves as standing on the threshold of a new
millennium and unlocking the mysteries of space; and using
American labor to build infrastructure across the United
States,
and roads and railroads and tunnels and bridges, is a positive
one. But the understanding of where mankind is at in our
history

as a species right now, and what are the true scientific challenges that are facing us that require our creativity [in order] to be solved. That is where the real questions lie in terms of clarity of principle. And great leaders of the United

States always had an understanding of what the principles were that mankind as a whole must resolve; the principled questions which are there to be solved.

So, we're going to take a look at these two case studies

which we're selecting because of, first of all, their magnitude

in terms of the importance of their role in this interconnection

of a World Land-Bridge or a new land-based and maritime Silk Road, as it's being called with the initiative from Xi Jinping;

but also because of the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have

played in these two projects over a number of decades, and the fact that their progress at this point does actually represent a

milestone in terms of the coming to fruition of a campaign of inaugurating this new era of development for mankind.

So, we're going to start with a short excerpt from a video

that LaRouche PAC made a number of years ago on the Kra Canal; the Thailand canal which has a long history going back over a century in terms of people looking at the different possible routes of cutting a canal through the isthmus of Thailand.

But

it's also something that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche personally was involved in, in the 1980s. There are a lot of new developments

and hopeful developments around this, including a new book that

just was published called {Kra Canal: The Strategic History of

Thailand}, which Pakdee Tanapura, who is an associate of the LaRouche Movement in Thailand and who was one of the prime organizers in the 1980s, is a contributor to this book; but also a number of generals and admirals and other high-ranking and leading figures inside Thailand. This book is now being printed in 10,000 copies and is being circulated among some of the leading government institutions. With the passage of the previous king and the new king coming to power in Thailand, there is a strong openness; not to mention that there is a strategic shift now underway in Asia as a whole. The abandonment of the Obama Asia Pivot, the crumbling of the TPP; there's a strong potential in terms of the possibility of this project moving forward.

So, I'll have a little bit more to say about this after we play this clip; but again, this project – taken together with the other project we're going to talk about today – are merely exemplary of the type of new era of development that we must inaugurate today.

VIDEO voice [begins mid-sentence]: century, the concept of the preferred location for the canal route generally shifted towards southern Thailand, as compared to the earliest proposed routes.

We can compare the dimensions of a proposed Kra Canal with other well-known canals. The width of the Kra isthmus at its narrowest point is around 27 miles. Compare this to the width of the Panama Canal – about 48 miles. The length of the various Kra Canal proposals range from between 30 and 60 miles. The Suez

Canal, for comparison, has a length of 119 miles. The height of the interior mountain chain where the Kra Canal would be constructed is about 246 feet. Compare this to the height of the Gaillard Cut of the Panama Canal, which is slightly lower at 210 feet.

The Straits of Malacca are not sufficiently deep for many large ships to pass through; the straits are 620 miles long, but very narrow – less than 1.6 miles at the narrowest, and only 82 feet deep at the shallowest point. Currently, large ships are required to travel much further south to the Lombok Straits near Java; which have a depth of 820 feet.

OGDEN: This is the beginning of the clip that we're going to play for you. We're going to explore a little bit more of the advantages of cutting this Kra Canal through the Thailand isthmus. What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that you're linking together two very crucial oceans in the world – the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean; this is a key connection in terms of this new Maritime Silk Road, and will completely transform the potential relationships between the countries in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. So, we'll continue playing this clip for you right now.

VIDEO voice: Clearly, a Kra Canal poses a more reasonable option than travelling so much further south for larger ships;

or

for any ship taking the 620-mile detour through the congested and pirate-infested Straits of Malacca.

The 600-plus-mile Malacca Straits are by far the most heavily travelled of the world's canals, with more than twice the traffic of the Suez and Panama Canals combined. By a recent estimate, one-fifth of world trade goes through the Malacca Straits; congestion or obstruction of the straits would dramatically increase the cost of trade. The maximum capacity of the Singapore-Malacca Straits being 200,000 ships annually. A more recent assessment estimates that the traffic of the straits has been increasing at an annual rate of 20%.

In 1973, Tams Engineering had conducted a study of choices of Kra Canal routes, and suggested that route 5-A was the most suitable for the construction of a Kra Canal. At either end of the canal would be located industrial zones estimated to span collectively about 100,000 acres. A decade later, in 1983-84, the Fusion Energy Foundation and {Executive Intelligence Review}, together with the Thai Ministry of Communication, held two successful conferences on the Kra Canal project. FEF updated the earlier feasibility study done by Tams, and developed further on the project's economic and industrial benefits. The Fall 1984 conference entitled "Industrialization of Thailand and the Kra Canal" took place in Bangkok, Thailand. The conference brought together businessmen, engineers, and government officials from all of the ASEAN countries, to hash out the feasibility of building the canal.

PAKDEE TANAPURA: The idea of building the canal, of course, was picked up again in 1983 when Lyndon LaRouche travelled to Thailand and organized an international conference on the Kra Canal. The participation was very good; we had representatives from India, representatives from Indonesia, representatives from Malaysia, representatives from Japan. In 1983, we didn't have a representative from China, but the Chinese are very observant about what we were doing. We had participation of the Ministry of Transport and Communications of Thailand, the Minister, Mr. Samatzu Tamaraif [ph] himself came to deliver a speech at the conference along with Lyndon LaRouche. Also, we had the participation of the GIF, the Global Infrastructure Fund group; from Japan, we had Dr. Yamamoto from the GIF group, as well as participation from Japan; a very prominent figure, Mr. Nakajima of the Mitsubishi Research Institute – a very prominent figure from the Mitsubishi Group. We had Mr. Saito also from the Toshiba Group, and we had lots of participation from [inaud; 28:55]. So, that was back in 1983.

VIDEO voice: The four panels covered all aspects, including a presentation by EIR/FEF researchers on the use of PNEs – or peaceful nuclear explosions – as the fastest, most efficient and cost effective method of construction.

OGDEN: So, the full video that that was just an excerpt from, is available on YouTube – "The Kra Canal; The Development of Southeast Asia"; and the link to that video is available in

the description of this YouTube video. But as you heard Mr. Pakdee Tanapura mention, Lyndon LaRouche was a keynote speaker at both the 1983 conference and the 1984 conference that were organized there in Bangkok, Thailand with very high-level representation from almost every Asian country and from the Thai government itself.

What Lyndon LaRouche said in a recent interview, and he continues to emphasize, is the absolute critical nature of the Kra Canal. But he delivered an interview in 2014 to the {Fortune Times} of Singapore, on the Kra Canal project. I'm just going to read a short excerpt of what Mr. LaRouche said, which will clarify, I think, why this is such a key project in the overall global development perspective that we're talking about. Mr. LaRouche said the following:

"Divide the maritime region of East and South Asia into three principal categories: China – a giant; India – a giant; and the maritime connection throughout Southeast Asia's maritime regions. Add the impact of such a triadic maritime and related connection to the physical economic relations to the Americas to the east, and the Middle East's underbelly and Africa. Then, the potency of a Kra Canal development appears not only as an eminently feasible feature, but as a strategic, political, economic force for the planet." He went on to say, "The sheer volume of maritime trade between the two great nations of Asia – China and India – and their connections through the South Asia

maritime regions make the canal probably the most potentially beneficial and also efficient project for the entire region of the Pacific and Indian Oceans regions; and the co-development of

the major regions of planet Earth as a whole."

Then, later, the following year, in 2015, some comments in

an informal discussion, but here's quote from those comments:

"With the completion of the Kra Canal, on top of the Suez Canal

expansion which is ongoing in Egypt, there will be no longer a separation between the Atlantic and Pacific economies. China and

India will greatly benefit from those two canal projects, along

with the smaller nations along the Southeast Asian Rim. This must be pushed, hard. This will end the British geo-political games in the Eurasian region; it will change the economic character of the entire world."

So, I think that's the key here. What we're looking at;

{this} is what Helga LaRouche was referring to when you identify

a vision of common destiny or principles which are shared for the

mutual benefit of many nations, of an entire region, or potentially even, the entire globe; and then work together to achieve those benefits. That's the era of development; that's the new era of development which we have to inaugurate here.

And

I think that's exemplary – as Mr. LaRouche was just saying – of

these kinds of global visions of how we can bring mankind to the

next platform in terms of our development of the planet for the

mutual benefit of all nations.

So, let's take that as one project; and then, shift over to Africa and look at what is now progressing around this really unprecedented project in terms of water transfer in terms of the magnitude and the potential benefits for that continent also.

DENISTON: Regular viewers of our website might have seen this, but it was just this past December that there was a new Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Lake Chad Basin Commission, the Nigerian government, and also a major company out of China, called China Power. This is now a new, formal, serious step towards a feasibility study, a detailed engineering study of what it would take to actualize this Transaqua project, as it has been called in its earlier designs. As it now stands, as the designs stand and even a slightly smaller version which was cited in this new Memorandum of Understanding would be the single largest water transfer project ever created on the planet Earth; being brought right into Central Africa to address some of major needs of that region. This has been on the table for decades – we'll get into that in a second – but what stands out now, again? We're in a new global paradigm, and what appears to be the key change that's now bringing this out of design and discussion and general acknowledgement of it being important; but into actual realization? Again, we have China's role. China Power is the company that led the construction of the Three Gorges Dam in China.

So again, we're seeing China playing a key role in bringing these much-needed, much-discussed mega-projects of development into fruition. While it might not technically be included as part of the whole New Silk Road or what they are now calling the Belt and Road initiative; it is intimately part of that entire perspective, that entire program. This design to bring water from the Congo River Basin, not necessarily the end of the Congo River where all the tributaries become the Congo River itself, but many of the upper tributaries that are at higher elevations further inland; to bring a fraction – 5%, 8% of this water flow – divert it to the north and to the west into Lake Chad to begin refilling Lake Chad. This was designed in the early 1980s by certain Italian engineers; in particular, Dr. Marcello Vichi, who has worked with the Bonifica Engineering Consulting Firm, who has been very happy to collaborate with the Schiller Institute and Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the past and recently in his promotion of this project.

But again, this would be an incredibly amazing contribution to this entire region. Just compare it to the level of discussion you still get in the West around poverty in Africa; you still just get disgusting discussions of how we need to provide them with gravity-powered light bulbs because they don't have electricity, so you can create a mechanism to provide light by a certain gravity-powered mechanism. And that's some kind of amazing contribution to the people of Africa who need

electricity. That's just such a disgusting low level of thought from this whole anti-development, Green perspective. And you look what China is saying: Let's bring the most modern, the most advanced, the largest water infrastructure project ever built on the planet Earth; and let's engage Africa in building it there. Just to clarify, despite some of the lies that are put out, this would not be China coming in and building the entire project with their own people and their own labor force. That's often stated, but it's not the case, and it's being demonstrated that it's not the case. Just look at what's already happened and what's ongoing with the rail projects that China is working with various African nations in developing. New standard rail lines in Kenya, for example; just look at the figures on that. About 3000 Chinese are employed on that project there; 30,000 Kenyans are employed, and Kenyans are being trained to run these rail systems in addition to the skill sets being developed to construct these things. It's similar with other rail lines in other African nations. So, just to clarify that, this is not China coming in and employing their own people and exploiting these African nations. This is coming in with this "win-win" perspective of an investment; engaging with the populations there and developing the region for the benefit of all parties involved.

Just to emphasize, we have a first slide here [Fig. 1]

just

to show a couple of examples; but this is a project and a general

idea that Mr. LaRouche and his associates have been advocating for decades. Prior to the design of the Transaqua itself, which

is the name given by this Italian engineer who did a more detailed initial engineering study for this project, the general

idea was recognized as feasible and made sense if you just look

at the region – which we'll look at in a second – you can see where there's an abundance of water; you can see where there might be regions where you can transfer it. It was recognized, going back to Mr. LaRouche's famous 1975 International Development Bank, that these kinds of investments into large-scale water transfer is exactly typical of the kinds of projects we need for Africa, for example; for nations in Africa.

Similar ideas were featured in the Fusion Energy Foundation report, "The Industrialization of Africa", just to cite another

example. This has been often discussed and developed and proposed in various other publications by {Executive Intelligence

Review}, by LaRouche PAC, by the Schiller Institute.

But it's probably also worth just highlighting that in March

2016, {Executive Intelligence Review} held a seminar in Frankfurt, Germany to discuss the development perspective needed

to solve the refugee crisis in northern Africa and stretching into the Middle East; which has been something that Mrs. LaRouche

has campaigned on for well over a year now. That the solution to

this refugee crisis is to reverse the destruction that's been

caused by Bush's wars, Obama's wars in that region, the support of terrorism through support of Saudi Arabia and more directly.

But do the complete opposite and engage in large-scale development of this region to ensure that there's a future for people; especially for the younger generation. That's the only

way you're going to fundamentally get rid of terrorism; the exact

opposite of Obama's drone strike policy, where every wedding party he drones, he creates ten times more future terrorists – because their lives have been destroyed – than he killed with his drone strikes. So, this was a very high-level seminar on that topic; and one of major projects that was featured, was this

Transaqua project. It featured two of the leading engineers; again this Dr. Marcello Vichi – and one of his associates who's

also involved and is an expert on the project – as well as a representative of the Lake Chad Basin Commission. This is the level of promotion and discussion that our organization {Executive Intelligence Review}, Mrs. LaRouche, also our friend

over in France, Jacques Cheminade who's currently running a campaign for the Presidency in France, has been a major supporter

of this project. So, we have a very close history with this entire thing. Now again, with China actually taking the lead, this is becoming a reality.

Just to put that in a little bit of context, I want to briefly look at this map; because it's well known that water is a

major issue for many parts of the world. And it's expected to become a growing issue for many regions as water use increases,

population grows; and under the assumption that we're not

going

to have the level of water infrastructure that we need. If you

just look at this map, put out by a United Nations report on global water issues, you can see in the lighter blues, you see regions where there is water scarcity due to the physical availability of water; and that's probably not a surprise in the

regions you see. In the west and southwestern United States, we

see physical water scarcity. But you see much of Africa is not

light blue, it's dark blue, which indicates economic water scarcity; meaning the water is there, but the infrastructure hasn't been developed to utilize the water supplies that are there. So, I think that's an immediate reference point that's worth making. You have major water supplies available throughout

the African continent; what's been lacking is the ability to facilitate the kind of projects needed to develop and take advantage of those.

Here [Fig. 2] is just a global depiction of river run-off

globally for all the major coastal watersheds combined that run

into different oceans and basins. Here, you can see where I'm indicating, the Congo Basin has a very large and significant water flow out into the South Atlantic Ocean there. So, it's a

major – maybe not the largest – but a major region of water flow that's available; the vast majority of which is not being used for any economic purposes. The Congo River itself, if people don't know, is the second largest river on the planet in

terms of discharge into the ocean. It's kind of hard to compete

with the Amazon itself, but the Congo is the second globally

largest river; running at 1300 cubic kilometers per year of outflow. For a comparative reference for Americans, the Mississippi is 500 [cubic km]. So this is over 2.5 times the size of the Mississippi River. The Nile River, another major river in Africa, that obviously supports a very large population and development, is more in the range of 80-90 cubic km per year.

So, we're talking about an order of magnitude plus larger than the Nile River.

Here [Fig. 3] we have a quick breakdown of the different water basins in Africa. This graphic is actually labelled in German,

so my German-speaking friends can read this just fine. But the entire Congo River Basin, as I'm indicating here, so you can get

a sense of the size; all funneling down into the Congo River out

into the Atlantic again. Then, just bordering it to the north and to the west, is the Lake Chad Basin. So this entire region,

all water deposited in here filters into Lake Chad itself.

Currently, this basin and the water in this basin, the water in

the Lake Chad system supports somewhere in the range of 30-40 million people. Over the past 40-45 years, Lake Chad – in terms

of total surface area – is now only one-tenth of its former size. So, if you compare 1972 to today, it's one-tenth of the size it was then. There have also been issues of rainfall decreasing in the past 20 years or so on the order of 15% to 20%.

So, none of these figures are new or a surprise; this has

been known since our organization has been campaigning for the development of this project. But it is a very real and

developing crisis in the region, and it can be alleviated. Here's a depiction [Fig. 4] of the actual change in the size of the lake; it's rather dramatic. The total outlying area here is the 1972 level; it had a low record in 1987, and it's recovered just a little bit. But it's still a tenth of its original, expected size.

So this rather brilliant, beautiful proposal is to create a canal – again, that would not connect all the way down to the headwaters of the Congo River itself; but it would feed off many of the tributaries up in the highland regions and collect the water through a series of dams and reservoirs and canals in that region in the Democratic Republic of Congo and in the Central African Republic. You can see here an indication of the Congo River Basin as a whole, and the catchment region, and this is the canal that would be developed. Once it captures the water in that region, it could then be funneled into canals and existing rivers crossing the Congo River divide into the Lake Chad Basin, and then funneled directly into Lake Chad. What is being proposed here is something in the range of 50-100 cubic kilometers per year for the diversion. The original designs by the Italian leaders who originally did the engineering studies on this project, were looking at 100 cubic kilometers per year. Again, that's something on the order of 8% of the total water flow of the basin.

It's also worth noting that this would also provide

flood

control for the Congo Basin itself; so you could alleviate some

of the periodic flooding which itself can be very problematic with the lack of infrastructure in the region.

So, the original designs are looking on the order of 100

cubic kilometers a year; this new Memorandum of Understanding threw out the figure of half of that – 50 cubic kilometers per year. Both of which are massive figures. You're talking about

on the order of a Nile River of flow, created by man, refilling

Lake Chad over some number of years. Again, just to help to get

a sense of some of these figures and what they mean, if you take

all of the western water projects in the United States: the Central Valley Project; the Franklin Roosevelt projects of the '30s; the Pat Brown projects of the '60s; the projects to divert

from the Colorado River into various regions. You combine all of

that, and you look at what is the total functional capacity of all these projects; you're talking about a maximum of 20 cubic kilometers per year. So, this is already 2.5 if not 5 times larger than all of California's water projects combined.

You take China's beautiful brand new South Water North project; they've completed two of the three routes for that project; the so-called eastern route, and the so-called central

route. Those combined are going to be transferring about 30 cubic kilometers a year. When the western route is added on, that'll be closer to 45. But again, even the lower estimate of

the Lake Chad Transaqua diversion project is 50 – is larger than

the South Water North project in its entirety; and it could be even twice that if the full extent is developed.

Hydropower will be developed along this region to provide much-needed electricity; and obviously the water will be used not just for refilling the lake, but an entire development of this region. If the full design is developed in its entirety, you can have a navigable canal that will be part of that; along with which, you can have inland ports, new industrial development, all kinds of economic activity along the canal itself. The level of land irrigation for farming that's being discussed – even with the current proposal of 50 cubic km per year – is equivalent to the entire California Central Valley.

If you know what the California Central Valley means for food production for the United States, this should tell you something. You're going to have a California Central Valley potential of food production right in the central heart of Africa. So this is an amazing project that will not just benefit the immediate nations touching the project; it will have spreading effects throughout [Africa], and is typical of the type of principle of development that is needed in this current period. You look for these large-scale actions that can benefit all the partners involved. China is making an investment; they're going to benefit from the project by being able to participate in its construction, but also getting new markets to work with as these African nations are able to grow and develop.

All these African nations are going to get power, water, skilled training to construct and operate these projects, the related industry that can go along with these development corridors.

This is exemplary of the type of programs that are needed today. I think it deserves a very high level of support and praise for the potential of this thing becoming a reality. Again, it should serve as a reference point for the level of discussion needed for the United States. Much could be said – we've already taken up a fair amount of time with this, but the United States' relation to Mexico; you have the entire NAWAPA design in principle of managing the entire – and then potentials to add in southern contributions from Mexico itself. So, you have similar ideas of joint development that can not only alleviate current drought conditions that are ravaging California, the southwest United States, and much of northern Mexico; you can actually create a qualitatively higher level of ability to support completely new levels of agriculture development. You turn entire territories that are now uninhabitable into potentially some of the best land that you're going to want to get your hands on.

It's this future-oriented level of development on this scale, rooted in these types of principles, that I think is only reference point and the only standard that we should really be holding ourselves to at this point. So, you take, this is exemplary; what we just discussed with the Kra Canal. These are just a few keystone projects that really signify a new era for

mankind, and define the level of discussion that we need to rise to in the United States.

OGDEN: So again, this is the paradigm which we wish to inaugurate today. This is something that the United States must be a part of, when we talk about a vision of common destiny for mankind; which was the way that Xi Jinping put it in his speech at Davos. When we talk about the mutual benefit among nations, it's defining these sorts of principles of the future and scientific challenges that can be overcome; and doing that together among nations, which is the paradigm of the 21st Century. We cannot retreat from that.

I think it's very clear, as President Trump said in his inaugural address, the time for empty talk is over; now is the hour of action. True! But the question is, what form will that action take? And according to what principle will that action be conceived? We go back to the Four Laws document of Lyndon LaRouche. The principle is very clear in that document; this is not just a policy paper. This is document which is formed around the principle that makes mankind different from animals; that we can master nature and improve it for the benefit of all mankind. Increasing the productive powers of the labor force through new technologies and new principles that are discovered; that's the

core principle of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws document. But I think that's what defines this hour of action which must be taken.

I'd like to put up on the screen right now the link to our petition – which we are still circulating – this is lpac.co/trumpsotu. Again, this is a petition demanding that Trump act on his words promising Glass-Steagall, which he said in his campaign; and it must be a strict Glass-Steagall as LaRouche has defined it. This is between now and the State of the Union address. So again, if you haven't signed that petition, this is still the active, leading campaign from LaRouche PAC here in the United States.

But let me let Michael say a little bit – if you wish to.

MICHAEL STEGER: I think what Ben indicated is that what are possible today are platform-like projects; and that's sort of the question for this new administration. Are we going to take actions which don't simply address the problems which we currently face? But as President Trump said, are we going to move into the future? That's not characterized by some linear notions of time; that requires a physical leap in mankind's sense of productivity and mankind himself as a species. The kind of projects that need to be taken up in the United States, being here in Houston with Kesha Rogers, we had a chance to meet with about 25 former rocket scientists from NASA. Leading figures, some of whom worked their entire careers in the manned space

program. They are ready to move forward; they see the potential,
but I think what defines the Apollo-like project today is to conquer the fusion energy program. That's something mankind has yet to do; we've clearly got a capability internationally with robotics, and combined with the manned space program to begin to really advance our abilities of exploration on the Moon and Mars.

But the real question for mankind on Earth, and for mankind throughout the Solar System, is going to be this fusion platform. That's the kind of clear and distinct action that, if this administration takes, we will certainly move into the future in an un paralleled way.

OGDEN: We do see some references in this inaugural speech. As President Trump said, we're standing on the verge of a new millennium; and it's one in which we can unlock the mysteries of space, free Earth from the miseries of disease, and harness the energies, industries, and technologies of tomorrow. Fusion power as my example of what that could be. But, it's not enough to say those words; there has to be a clear pathway to achieve that, and the clear intention from the leadership of the United States to make that happen. But it requires an entirely new paradigm of thinking among the American people and among the nations of the

planet generally.

We must maintain a sense of common destiny, a shared future of common benefit; and I think if we take this as an Inauguration Day, but in a much broader sense of the word. Not just the inauguration of a new President in the United States; but potentially the inauguration of a new era of development for the planet. One which is already in motion; that paradigm is already underway, but it's waiting for the United States to become an active and willing participant in that new economic and strategic paradigm.

So, let me go back to the remarks that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche made earlier today which I cited in the beginning. Helga LaRouche was very clear; we must be focussed on our own principles and our own objectives, and proceed as we have been proceeding. We are very clear in terms of the fact that yes, the Bush and Obama era is over; a fresh breeze could be blowing through. A lot can change; this could potentially be the end of business as usual, but more clarity is still needed. And that clarity can only come from the leadership exemplified by the LaRouche Movement, defined and informed by clear scientific principle.

So, let's take these two great projects that we discussed here today – the Kra Canal and the Transaqua project in Africa – as paradigmatic of what the new era of development can be. Let's make the decision that this is not just Day One of the First 100 Days of new Presidency of the United States. It's not

just Day One of a new administration, but let's make this Day One, Inauguration Day, of a new era for development for mankind as a whole.

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Please be sure to watch the video of the Kra Canal project in full; the link is available in the description. And watch out for an interview with Pakdee Tanapura that will be coming very soon. And also hopefully, we will have more elaboration of the great and optimistic vision that Ben laid out in terms of this potential to develop the African continent as a whole.

Thank you very much for joining us here today, and please stay tuned. We're in for, I think, a wild ride; and we have a lot of work to do. Sign up to our email list if you haven't yet; subscribe to the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 19. januar 2017: Dagen før Trumps indsættelse

Med formang Tom Gillesberg.

Lyd:

Kom til koncerten:

En Musikalsk Dialog Mellem Kulturer

Fredag den 17. februar 2017, kl. 19,

Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur

Vester Voldgade 11, København.

Gratis adgang.

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

Oxfam Globale Velfærdsrapport: de 8 rigeste = de 3,6 mia. fattigste

16. jan., 2017 – Ifølge en netop publiceret rapport fra den britiske NGO, Oxfam, »er svælget mellem de superrige og den fattigste halvdel af den globale befolkning skarpere end tidligere antaget, med blot otte personer, der ejer lige så meget rigdom, som 3,6 mia. mennesker tilsammen«. For et år siden skulle der 62 af verdens rigeste mennesker til at udgøre det samme som halvdelen af planetens befolkning. Disse otte personer omfatter seks amerikanere, en mexicaner og en spanier; alle for nær en enkelt får deres rigdom fra finansaktiviteter eller fra informationsteknologi-sektoren.

Det er sandsynligt, at disse otte personer ikke er blevet så

meget rigere, men – som det ses at den uafbrudte tidevandsbølge af flygtninge, der strømmer ind i Europa fra briternes, saudiernes og Obamas krige, eller fra det igangværende folkemord i Yemen – så er et udsnit af verden blevet meget fattigere.

Oxfam-rapporten, der har timet sin publikation til at falde samtidigt med den årlige samling af de globale, politiske eliter og forretningseliter i Davos, Schweiz, dokumenterer virkningerne i den virkelige verden af imperiepolitikken med »langvarige krige«.

»Ifølge Forbes-listen«, siger rapporten, »er grundlæggeren af Microsoft, Gates, den rigeste person, med en nettoværdi på \$75 mia. De andre er, efter rangfølge, Amancio Ortega, den spanske grundlægger af modehuset Inditex, finansmanden Warren Buffett, den mexicanske forretningsmagnat Carlos Slim Helu, Amazon-bossen Jeff Bezos, Facebook-skaber Mark Zuckerberg, Oracles Larry Ellison og Bloomberg, New Yorks tidligere borgmester.«

Oxfam rapporterede ligeledes, at indtægterne for verdens 10 største selskaber overstiger de samlede indtægter for 180 nationer.

Dette er frugterne af det gamle paradigme, der nu bliver afvist i nationale valg og erstattet af BRIKS-paradigmet med udvikling gennem Den Nye Silkevej.

Foto: Citat af Mahatma Gandhi: 'Fattigdom er den værste form for vold'.

Til refleksion.

Trump kræver atomvåbenaftale med Rusland; støtter EU's opløsning

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

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

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

Trump's kritik af Ruslands intervention i Syrien som værende en »meget dårlig ting«, der førte til en »forfærdelig humanitær situation«, oprørte ikke den transatlantiske elite, og det gjorde hans gentagne erklæring om, at det var »en stor fejltagelse« af Tyskland at have taget syriske flygtninge ind,

heller ikke.

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

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

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

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

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

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

»Hvis man ser på Den europæiske Union, så er det Tyskland. Grundlæggende set, et instrument for Tyskland. Det er derfor, jeg syntes, det var intelligent af UK at udtræde«, sagde han

til de to redaktører. »Jeg mener, andre også vil udtræde. Jeg mener ikke, det bliver så nemt at holde sammen på det, som mange mennesker mener.«

Med Trump, der ser den nye internationale virkelighed, er Obama og EU rasende

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. januar, 2017 – Nyvalgte præsident Trumps seneste og mest substantielle interview gør det ganske klart, hvad det nye paradigme for verden er, i den umiddelbare fremtid. Trump prioriterer en aftale om reduktion af atomvåben og sandsynlige reduktion af sanktioner mod Vladimir Putins Rusland. Han erklærer, at NATO er »forældet«, og at dets europæiske medlemmer hverken støtter dets militær eller bekæmper jihadistisk terrorisme. Han forudsagde, at Den europæiske Union sandsynligvis vil opløses, og at dette vil være en god ting.

Til trods for de hysteriske udbrud, som dette interview med Londonavisen *Times* og det tyske *Bild Zeitung* har frembragt fra den europæiske elite og Obamas ambassadører dér, så ser Donald Trump ganske enkelt den nye virkelighed – det nye paradigme – og indikerer, at han *muligvis* vil være med til at skabe den.

Putins Rusland er ansvarlig for muligheden af at afslutte 15 års uafbrudte krige i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og for et nyt sikkerhedskoncept, som han deler med Xi Jinpings Kina, og som kan brække ryggen af international terrorisme. I morgen vil Xi holde hovedtalen på Davos Verdensøkonomiske Forum. Han er ansvarlig for at være drivkraft bag en meget stor andel af den økonomiske og produktive vækst i verden, og for at tilbyde »et

fællesskab af en fælles bestemmelse« gennem den Nye Silkevejsinfrastruktur, gennem at lede forskning og udvikling af fusion, og gennem at lede udforskning af Månen.

Et USA, der er blevet af med Nobels Krigspris-præsident Obama, tilbydes at tilslutte sig dette nye paradigmes institutioner og handlinger.

Frygt for og had til denne udsigt er kilden bag den intense kampagne for anti-russisk, anti-Trump propaganda i USA, der dirigeres fra britisk efterretning, men rækker dybt ind i en »få Trump ned med nakken-specialenhed« i efterretningstjenester under Obama. Denne kampagne er forgæves og destruktiv, og amerikanske »progressive« bør ikke lade sig forlede til at tilslutte sig den.

Som *EIR's* stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche udtrykte det, »Som Trump i øjeblikket går frem, vil der komme en stor forandring internationalt. Det er ikke kun Trump. Det er de andre elementer i systemet, der kommer sammen for at bringe en kraft i spil, som vil dominere planeten.«

Vil den amerikanske befolkning, der har stemt for at afvise det gamle paradigme med »globalisering, afindustrialisering«, få den nye administration og Kongressen til at gøre det, der er nødvendigt for at tilslutte sig den nye drivkraft for vækst og videnskabeligt fremskridt?

En bevægelse fra en national, upartisk appel er i gang – og er på denne webside – som kræver, at Trump, der lovede »det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov« under sin valgkamp, foreslår dette for Kongressen i sin første tale til dem. At gøre en ende på Wall Street-kasinoets forgiftning af den amerikanske økonomi er et første skridt. Men så findes der ingen statslig kreditinstitution efter Hamilton-princippet, til at genskabe Amerikas forældede, økonomiske infrastruktur – selv, når Kinas statsmidler, som det her rapporteres, netop søger at få en sådan institution, som gør det muligt for dem at investere i

en ny, amerikansk infrastruktur. Obama sagde til vælgerne, at han anså revolutionen med fusionskraft/plasmateknologi for totalt unødvendig, og privatiserede NASA's store udforskningsprogrammer, med en forværrende virkning.

Tiden er nu inde til, at amerikanerne handler for deres fremtid, ikke deres frygt.

RADIO SCHILLER den 16. januar 2017:

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

2. del om at bygge Kra-kanalen i Thailand og Transaqua-projektet omkring Tchadsøen i Afrika

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

1. del:

2. del:

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

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

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

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

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

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

a break... [applause]

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

Now, obviously, in the system of globalization as we have known it, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, that system is completely unhinged and this is cause for a lot of freaked out reactions by those people who were the beneficiaries of that system of globalization, but I will hopefully be able to develop that this is a temporary phenomenon, and it will be replaced by some more optimistic developments.

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

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

takes

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

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

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

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

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

that revolt will continue until the causes of this injustice are removed, and it will continue, it will hold the measuring rod to President Trump, if he will fulfill his election promises; and if he would not do that I believe the same people would turn against Trump as they turned against Hillary.

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

So we are looking into dramatic changes.

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

And it was a good thing, because it was very clear that if Hillary Clinton would have won the election in the

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

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

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

Now, if you look at the reaction of the neo-con/neo-liberal faction on both sides of the Atlantic to this election of Trump, you can only describe it as *completely* hysterical. The *Washington Post* today has an article "How To Remove Trump from Office," calling him a liar, just every derogative you can possibly imagine, just an all-in-one unbelievable; the reaction in Germany was – von der Leyen, the Defense Minister, in the morning after the election said she was "deeply shocked," this was "terrible," this was a catastrophe, and it

keeps going like that. So they have not recovered.

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

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many cyber experts, also in Europe but also in the United States, already said that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an insider leak giving this information out, is more and more likely, and there's absolutely zero proof that it was Russian hacking. Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is that was the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved that Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie Sanders! That is not being talked about any more; but if there was any thought, I would say, look there, and there are many people who recognize, for example, a very important French intelligence person with the name of Eric Denécé who is a top-level think tanker in France who said: Well, it is quite clear why they put out this story, because the neo-cons had to expect the great cleanup and many of them would lose their positions, and this is why they basically all agreed on this story and changed the narrative.

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the neoliberal system of globalization which simply violated the interests of the majority of the people, especially in the "rust belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so arrogant that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states which are formerly industrialized. Where, you have to see that the United States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western media in Europe, the United States is in a state of economic collapse. They have for the first time, a shrinking life-expectancy; there is one indicator which shows if a society is doing good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first time for both men and

women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment. There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

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

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

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

A second area where you can see this effort to pin Trump down is the question of the THAAD missiles in Korea, where basically now North Korea has claimed to be able to be able to launch their ICBM anywhere, any time; and according to

Chinese experts, the United States is entirely to blame why North Korea is behaving this way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comey, in the Trump Tower where these three gentlemen wanted to impress Trump with their story about the Russian hacking; the other person who was with Trump was General Flynn, who is now in the driver's seat [to be National Security Advisor]. So anyway, you can expect the truth not be suppressed forever. And as a matter of fact, it was in the moment shortly before the U.S. military intervention in 2013, the U.S. military action was prepared to occur Sunday evening; we had gotten that from

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

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

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

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

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

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

finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure.

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

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

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

So this is very good, because the Schiller Institute already in 2015 published a report for the United States to

join the New Silk Road, which is a whole approach how you have to have a fast train system for the United States; as you know, China built as of the end of 2014, 20.000 km high-speed train systems. China wants to have to 50,000 km by 2020, connecting every major city in China with a fast train system. And the United States has none.

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

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

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

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

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

But from the beginning, we said that such a new world economic order can only function if it's combined with a Classical Renaissance, that we have to reject the popular culture as it is associated with modern globalization, because it is

depraved and degenerate. And that we had to go back to the revival, a Renaissance of the best traditions of every culture and have a dialogue among them. For example, in Germany, obviously you would emphasize the German Classical culture of Schiller, Beethoven, the whole Classical music; in China, you would emphasize Confucius; in India you would emphasize the Vedic writings, Tagore, and so forth. So you would go and revive in every country simply what they have contributed to universal history and make that known.

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

Now, in '89 therefore, when the Berlin Wall came down,

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

Anyway: Because you had Bush, Thatcher and Mitterrand, they did not like this at all, so in '91, when the Soviet Union collapsed, we immediately proposed to prolong this program of the Productive Triangle into the Eurasian Land-Bridge: The idea that you would connect the population and industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. The Iron Curtain was no longer there, so it was the natural thing to have infrastructure corridors to develop the landlocked areas of Eurasia.

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

As you know, then came '97 the Asia crisis; '98 the Russian GKO crisis, so this whole development became interrupted. But it basically did not stop us from making conferences about this proposal on five continents, all the U.S. cities, all the European cities; even in Latin America, São Paulo, Rio, New Delhi, even some African countries, Australia. We kept

organizing for this idea that the natural next phase of the evolution of mankind would be the infrastructure connections of the entire planet.

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

Now, in September 2013, when Xi Jinping in Kazakhstan announced the New Silk Road, we simply took all the different studies we had made in these 24 years, and published them, and we called it: "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge." This is a comprehensive proposal which has the yellow line there in the middle between China and Central Asia; this was the initial One Belt, One Road proposal by China, and we added simply – they had the Maritime Silk Road – but we had a whole infrastructure program for Africa, for the South of Europe, the Balkans, many corridors, including a Bering Strait Tunnel connecting the Eurasian infrastructure with the American system, with highways and high-speed trains all the way to Chile and Argentina. And eventually, when all of this is built, you can go by maglev train from the southern tip of South America to the Cape of Good Hope in Africa.

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

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

density, which can be maintained with that energy flux density; and there are other such important conceptions.

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

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

So, while we were publishing these reports, the New Silk Road promoted by China which has a few different names – first they called it One Belt, One Road; now they call it the Belt and Road Initiative; I always call it the "New Marshall Plan Silk Road," so that people get an idea. In any case, this policy of China has taken on a breathtaking dynamic. (Next slide)

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

(Next slide). This is the original One Belt, One Road, connecting China and Central and West Asia through an economic corridor. In June 2015, China and the five Central Asian governments agreed to build that and additional routes are being planned to go into Afghanistan. One is already going into Iran; when President Xi was in Iran last year, he promised, – or they both promised that they would extend this New Silk Road beyond Iran into Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Turkey.

(Next) This is the new Eurasian Land-Bridge which

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is the largest infrastructure project ever entertained in Africa. It was developed in the late '70s by an Italian firm Bonifica, and there, in particular, Dr. Marcello Vichi. Mr. LaRouche has promoted this project since he got news of it, because it was a perfect way of solving many problems at the same time. As you know, Lake Chad is shrinking; it is presently only about less than 10% of its original size, and it affects the life of the entire people, 40 million people, in the Chad Basin. And naturally, it is already having drought effects and so forth.

The concept is simply to transfer the water from the Congo River, using the unused discharge of the Congo River

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

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

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

into the Chari River which is a tributary of Lake Chad. So this way you would create a 2,400 km long waterway which would bring eventually 100 billion cubic meters of water per year into Lake Chad and also create navigable infrastructure.

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

PowerChina is now financing a feasibility study for a first phase of the project which would involve building a series of dams in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, and the Central African Republic. It would also potentially

generate 15-25 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectricity through the mass movement of water by gravity; it would potentially create a series of irrigated areas for crops, livestock, of an area of 50-70,000 sq km in the Sahel zone in Chad, in the northeast of Nigeria, in the north of Cameroon, and in Niger. It would also make possible an expanded economic zone basically creating a new economic platform for agriculture, industry, transportation, electricity for 12 Africa nations.

So PowerChina has put up \$1.8 million for the first

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

(Next) This is the expanded program of railways, nuclear power, just transforming the entire African continent. (Next) These are development plans for Latin America. The blue lines you see there, these are the longstanding, proposed high-speed railway routes in Latin America, which the Schiller Institute has proposed. In 1982, when Mr. LaRouche was working with President José López Portillo of Mexico on these projects, he called it "Operation Juárez," to refer back to the best traditions of Mexican-American cooperation. And these are all projects which are obvious. If you look at the map of Africa or Latin America, you don't see that kind of infrastructure! If you see some railway, you see it as a small line from a mine to the port to exploit the raw materials, but you don't have infrastructure. And we had this idea, which Alexander von Humboldt, by the way, proposed in 19th century, so it's not that revolutionary; it's sort of obvious.

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

step to the future.

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

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

So I can only mention the most important projects. There are many, many others. For example, China and Ecuador are building a science city in Ecuador where President Correa at the recent state visit of President Xi Jinping said that the collaboration between Ecuador and China will mean that Ecuador soon will be on the same level as all industrialized countries. They have the idea to overcome poverty forever. The science city is going to have the most advanced fields of science.

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

Now, just on a diplomatic level, this process of integration is going absolutely rapidly, especially since September last year, when you had on Sept. 2-3, the Eastern Economic Forum in Vladivostok where the integration of the Eurasian Economic Union and the Belt and Road Initiative was on the table. The Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe participated in that conference, and Japan is now massively

investing in the Far East of Russia, in terms of energy cooperation. Putin was just in Japan, as a state visit; Abe will go on a state visit to Russia this year. They're talking about settling the conflict concerning the Northern islands, the Kuril Islands. They're talk about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan, and obviously there is a complete strategic realignment going on. President Duterte changed the role of the Philippines from being the aircraft carrier for the United States in the South China Sea, to now, collaborate with China on economic cooperation, and also with Russia. The same by the way, goes for Turkey, which is now shifting and working with Russia, Iran and Syria, to bring peace to the region.

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

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

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

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

Why is Europe not joining this? Look, Europe is in bad shape. The EU is collapsing, the people in Italy *hate* by now the ECB, they hate Merkel, they have Schäuble, they hold Merkel responsible for the suffering of the population in Italy which is now reaching dimensions like Greece; Greece was destroyed – one-third of the Greek economy was destroyed by the austerity policy of the Troika. And you know, there's *nothing* left of the idea of unity in Europe. There are borders being built, Schengen is dead; look at the Eastern

European countries, they're simply not – the Eastern European and Central European countries are reorienting towards China! The 16+1 this is the Central and East European Countries, they have extensive infrastructure cooperation with China. China is building up the port in Piraeus port in Greece; they're building a fast railway between Budapest and Belgrade, and many other projects.

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

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

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

poverty right now.

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

The German 'Mittelstand' is still producing, I think, the third largest number of patents in the world. It is their natural interest to find cooperation not only in a bilateral cooperation, but in investments in third countries. It would be in the *best interest* of Germany – if Germany is freaked out about the refugees, which really has meant a complete destabilization of the country, why is Germany not cooperating, with Russia, with China, India, Iran, in the reconstruction of the Middle East? I think, now that the Syrian government has started to rebuild Aleppo, at least building the hospitals, the schools, the Schiller Institute had proposed already in 2012 a comprehensive proposal for the development of the entire Middle East, from

Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the Caucasus to the Gulf States, and it would be in the absolute self-interest because – sure you have to destroy ISIS and the terrorists with military means. But then you have to create conditions where young people in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, have a reason to become doctors, scientists, teachers, so that they have a future, that that way you drive out terrorism forever!

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

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

hunger and war and epidemics.

So would it not be in the self-interest that all the European nations join hands *with* the Chinese Silk Road initiative, and help to reconstruct and build up the economies of southwest Asia and Africa? I think that that mission would also

really help to overcome the disunity of Europe, because you will not solve that problem by looking at your navel; but you will solve that problem by a joint mission for the greater good of mankind.

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

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

Eventually man arrived. Man first settled at the oceans and the rivers; then with the help of infrastructure, man developed the interior regions of the continents; and we are now with the World Land-Bridge picture – go back to the first image – this will be, when it is built, the completion of that phase of the evolution of mankind, by simply bringing infrastructure into

all landlocked areas of the world, and you will have – with the help of new methods to create water, with modern technologies,

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

Right

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

But this is not the end: Mankind is not an Earth-bound species. Mankind is the only species which is capable of creative discovery, and the collaboration of all nations for space exploration and space research is the next phase of our evolution. Now China has a very ambitious space program. They already landed the Yutu rover in 2014. Next year, they will go to the far side of the Moon, and eventually bring back helium-3 from the far side of the Moon, which will be an important fuel for

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

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

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

And we know very, very little! But man is the only species which *can* know! No donkey will ever know about the great galaxies or – no dog will ever be able to breed rabbits to have better breakfast. They all like better breakfast, but they don't know how to do it. Man is capable of overcoming every limitation, and the mind of man is a physical force in the Universe. We're not outside of the Universe, but what our mind invents or discovers, is part of the Universe. And that is a very exciting thing.

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

Krafft Ehrlicke at the time had said, that building an industrial center on the Moon as a stepping stone for further travel of space will be important. And you now see the shaping up of new economic platforms. The first platform, Mr. LaRouche has developed this notion of an economic platform to signify a period of economic development which is governed by certain

laws, like for example, the development of the steam engine created a new platform; the development of railway created a new platform; fission is creating a new platform. And that platform is always governed by the most advanced technologies of that time. And you can already see that this infrastructure development of close-by space, the first platform is simply that man is able to reach the orbit! That's not self-evident. If you would have told man in the Middle Ages that you will get on a spaceship and go into orbit, he would have said you're crazy!

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

And so, the first economic platform will be simply to leave the planet Earth and to go into orbit; the second economic platform of space research will be to have an industrial base on the Moon and to eventually start to produce raw materials from space. Because you will, as this continues, not always transport materials from the Earth for your space travel, but once you have fusion as a propulsion fuel where the speed will become much larger, you will be able to take materials from asteroids, from other planets, for your production and your requirements in space. And then longer space travel between planets as the third platform, which is already visible.

Now, I could – this is very exciting, and once you start to think about it, it shows that mankind is really capable of magnificent achievements, and that we should really overcome geopolitics. Geopolitics is like a little, nasty two-year-old boy who is not yet educated and who knows nothing better than to kick his brother in the knee. Now that's about the level of geopolitics.

What Xi Jinping always talks about is that we have to

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

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

Beethoven, Verdi, Schubert, Schumann; Chinese Classical music, Indian poetry. You have this coming Saturday in New York, a beautiful event on style of civilizations, of cultures, where we will have a Chinese professor talking about literati painting.

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

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

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

a new era, a new civilization of mankind. And I would invite

all of you to not just look at it, but be part of it.
[applause]

Helga Zepp-LaRouche løfter tilhørere til sublime højder, på Schiller Institut/EIR- seminar i Stockholm. Uddrag på dansk af Helgas tale

12. jan., 2017 – Sublimt er det eneste, passende ord til at beskrive Helga Zepp-LaRouches intense og smukke præsentation og den atmosfære, hun skabte hos tilhørerne, med 60 deltagere (lokalet var helt fyldt) på Schiller Instituttets/EIR's seminar, der blev afholdt i Stockholm den 11. januar, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Helga Zepp-LaRouches optræden var ikke annonceret på forhånd, og hun skabte en stor succes for hele anledningen med arrangementet. Hendes tale bevægede tilhørerne til at adressere den grundlæggende, epistemologiske – erkendelsesteoretiske – dybere mening med Den Nye Silkevej, og meningen med menneskehedens udvikling i universet. Denne dybere mening rørte endda de tilstedeværende diplomater. En ambassadør fra et betydningsfuldt, asiatisk land indledte under diskussionsperioden en diskussion om netop nødvendigheden af at adressere disse bredere kulturelle og menneskelige implikationer.

Alt i alt var sytten diplomater til stede, heriblandt syv

ambassadører! (Dette har intet fortilfælde i LaRouche-bevægelsens historie i Sverige.) Fire europæiske lande var repræsenteret, ni lande fra Asien og fire lande fra Afrika. En kinesisk reporter kom til sit andet seminar, talte med Helga og tog billeder. Blandt de øvrige deltagere var kontakter fra forskellige svenske sammenslutninger, der arbejder for venskab med Rusland, Ukraine, Syrien, Yemen, Somalia, området omkring Det baltiske Hav (Østersøen) og en anden gruppe, der arbejder for at forlade EU, så vel som også tre kontakter fra erhvervslivet og mangeårige aktivister i den svenske LaRouche-bevægelse.

Formanden for Schiller Instituttet i Sverige, Hussein Askary, præsiderede seminaret og bød deltagerne velkommen. Dernæst holdt Helga Zepp-LaRouche hovedtalen, der havde en håbefuldt vision for verden. Hun gav en vurdering af de aftrædende neokonservatives og etablerede mediers igangværende kamp for at afvise berettigelsen af valget af Donald Trump. Hun påpegede den brede reaktion på den af de neoliberale anstiftede katastrofe, som værende det reelle grundlag for valget af Trump, så vel som også andre lignende reaktioner i hele verden, og sagde, at det er dér, man skal lede efter grunden til, at Trump blev valgt, og ikke i nogen computerhacking. Eftersom tilhørerne for det meste bestod af nye folk, fremlagde hun Schiller Instituttets historie, der samtidig er historien om politikken med Den Nye Silkevej. Hun beskrev processen med, at økonomien udvikler sig fra en platform til en anden og påpegede den kinesiske politik for at satse på den næste, økonomiske platform gennem en Månebaseret industriel udvikling, for menneskehedens videre udvikling som en art, der ikke er bundet til planeten Jord. Kinesernes motivering for deres globale politik kom frem under diskussionsperioden, i sammenhæng med Afrika. Helga understregede her, på basis af sin baggrund med mangeårige studier af Kinas historie og konfuciansk tankegang, at hendes konklusion er, at Kina virkelig forfølger en »win-win«-politik baseret på det konfucianske begreb om at tilstræbe visdom og

harmoni. Hun understregede nødvendigheden af en klassisk renæssance for, at det Nye Paradigme kan blive en succes, og at dette ikke er et punkt, vi kan overlade til Donald Trump.

Efter Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale gav Hussein Askary en kort gennemgang af perspektivet for Sydvestasien og Afrika. Dernæst holdt man en pause, hvor man nød kaffe og wienerbrød, der var doneret af en kontakt. Mange af deltagerne brugte lejligheden til at få taget deres foto sammen med Helga, og til at samtale med hende. To ambassadører, én fra Sydøstasien og én fra Sydvestasien, opsøgte Helga for at give udtryk for deres dybeste påskønnelse af hendes præsentation og skønheden i hendes tankegang.

Denne begivenhed var et sandt gennembrud for vores organisering i Sverige, med en kvalitet og intensitet, der vil bevæge vores politiske arbejde i dette land ind i nye dimensioner.

Uddrag af Helga Zepp LaRouches tale ved Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i Stockholm, 11. januar, 2017

Lad mig begynde med valget af Trump. Jeg har aldrig, i hele mit politiske liv, der er temmelig langt, flere årtier – jeg har aldrig i hele mit politiske liv set et sådant hysteri på vegne af de neokonservative, på vegne af etablisementets politikere, på vegne af de liberale medier, som med hensyn til Trump. Det skal indrømmes, at Trump ikke opfylder Baron von Knigges regler for god opførsel – han var en tysker, der i det 18. århundrede udviklede reglerne for god, diplomatisk opførsel. Men årsagen til [fremkomsten af] Trump er, at han simpelt hen lovede en afslutning af det politiske paradigme, der lå til grund for otte år med George W. Bush og otte år med Barack Obama, og som var en direkte fortsættelse af Bush-Cheney-politikken.

Og det var en god ting, for det var helt tydeligt, hvis Hillary Clinton havde vundet valget i USA, at alle de politikker, hun forfulgte, inklusive en flyveforbudszone over Syrien og en ekstremt krigerisk politik over for Rusland og Kina, ville have betydet, at vi ville have været på en direkte kurs til Tredje Verdenskrig. Hvis I har nogen tvivl om dette spørgsmål, vil jeg med glæde besvare jeres spørgsmål under spørgsmål & svar perioden.

Så den kendsgerning, at Hillary ikke vandt valget, var ekstremt vigtigt for bevarelse af verdensfreden. Jeg mener, at, af alle de løfter, Trump hidtil har afgivet, så er den kendsgerning, at han sagde – og gennem udnævnelsen af disse forskellige medlemmer af kabinettet, hvis de alle sammen kommer igennem nomineringsprocessen i Senatet – at han vil normalisere relationerne mellem USA og Rusland, efter min mening *det vigtigste skridt*. For, hvis relationen mellem USA og Rusland er ordentlig og baseret på tillid og samarbejde, så mener jeg, der er et grundlag for at løse alle andre problemer i verden. Hvis denne relation er som modstandere, så er verdensfreden i ekstrem fare.

Så efter min mening er der grund til at tro på, at dette vil ske. Den russiske reaktion har været meget moderat, men optimistisk omkring, at dette kan ske. Ser man på udnævnelserne, så er der flere kabinet-medlemmer og andre personer på andre høje poster, der også går ind for at forbedre relationen med Rusland, såsom Tillerson, der angiveligt skal være udenrigsminister; general Flynn, der er en konservativ militærmand, men også går ind for normalisering med Rusland, og mange andre, så jeg mener, det er et godt tegn.

Hvis man ser på reaktionen fra den neokonservatives/neoliberales side på begge sider af Atlanten, på dette valg af Trump, så kan det kun beskrives som *fuldstændig* hysterisk. *Washington Post* har en artikel i dag, »Hvordan man fjerner Trump fra embedet«, og kalder ham en

løgner, og enhver nedsættende ting, man kan forestille sig, fuldstændig utroligt; reaktionen i Tyskland var – [forsvarsminister Ursula] von der Leyen sagde morgenen efter valget, at hun var »dybt chokeret«, dette var »forførdeligt«, dette var en katastrofe, og sådan bliver det ved. Så de er endnu ikke kommet sig.

Og så er der naturligvis rapporterne fra de forskellige amerikanske efterretningstjenester, Clapper, Brennan, Comey fra FBI, og de offentliggjorde alle sammen den kendsgerning, at det var russisk hacking af e-mails fra DNC og Podesta, der skulle have stjålet valget, fordi de angiveligt skulle have ændret amerikanernes mening til at stemme på Trump.

Jeg mener, at dette er latterligt. Ikke alene har mange cyber-eksperter i Europa, og også i USA, allerede sagt, at alle tegnene tyder på, at der ikke var nogen hacking, men at et insider-læk, der røbede denne information, er mere sandsynligt, og der findes absolut *ingen* beviser på, at det skulle være russisk hacking. Det, der selvfølgelig bliver mørklagt med denne historie, er, hvad handlede »hackingen« om? Det var »hacking« af e-mails, der beviste, at Hillary Clinton manipulerede valget imod Bernie Sanders! Det taler man ikke længere om; men hvis der var nogen tænkning, ville jeg sige, hør her – og der er mange mennesker, der indser, f.eks. en meget betydningsfuld fransk efterretningsmand, Eric Danécé, der er en tænketank-person på højeste niveau i Frankrig, og som sagde: Det er helt klart, hvorfor de udgav denne historie, for de neokonservative måtte forvente den store udrensning, og mange af dem ville miste deres position, og det er grunden til, at de alle blev enige om denne historie og ændrede narrativen.

Den virkelige narrativ er, at det var det neoliberale globaliseringssystemets uretfærdighed, der simpelt hen krænkede flertallet af befolkningens interesser, især i »rustbæltet«. I valgkampen var Hillary Clinton så arrogant, at hun ikke engang tog til Ohio eller nogle af de andre stater, der tidligere var

industrialiserede. Man må indse, at dér – at USA, i modsætning til, hvad man for det meste rapporterer i de vestlige medier i Europa, befinder sig i en tilstand af økonomisk kollaps. De har for første gang [nogensinde] en faldende forventet levealder; der er én indikator, der viser, om det går et samfund godt eller skidt, og det er, at den forventede levealder stiger eller falder. I USA falder den for både mænd og kvinder. I den 16 år lange periode med Bush-Cheney og Obama, som man kan tage som en samlet pakke, er selvmordsraten firdoblet i alle aldersgrupper; årsagerne er alkoholisme, narcoafhængighed, håbløshed, depression pga. arbejdsløshed. Der er omkring 94 mio. amerikanere i den arbejdsdygtige alder, der ikke engang er talt med i statistikken, fordi de har opgivet ethvert håb om nogensinde igen at finde et job. Hvis man for nylig har rejst i USA, så er USA virkelig i en forfærdelig forfatning; infrastrukturen er i en forfærdelig tilstand, og folk er simpelt hen ikke glade.

Så valget, og narrativen var derfor årsagen til, at Hillary blev stemt ude, fordi hun blev opfattet som den direkte fortsættelse af disse 16 år, og forsøget på at ændre denne narrativ ved at sige, at det var »russisk hacking«, er temmelig åbenlys.

Men nu er der 10 eller 9 dage tilbage, til den nye præsident indsættes. Og det er ikke en periode for afslapning, for igen, Obamas gamle team forsøger på en måde, der ikke har fortilfælde, at skabe omstændigheder for den tiltrædende præsident Trump for at tvinge ham til at fortsætte Obamas kurs. For kun et par dage siden begyndte de f.eks. en deployering af amerikanske tropper og NATO-tropper, der skal deployeres ved den russiske grænse i De baltiske Lande, i Polen og Rumænien, via den tyske by Bremerhaven, hvor 6.000 tropper landede med tungt militærudstyr; f.eks. amerikanske Abrams tanks, Paladin artilleri, Bradley kampvogne, 2.800 stk. militært isenkram, 50 Black Hawk helikoptere, som involverer 1.800 stk. personel; 400 tropper, der skal tilknyttes de 24

Apache-helikoptere.

Denne deployering skal selvfølgelig være en provokation mod Rusland, og det er meningen, at det skal gøre det meget vanskeligt for Trump at begynde at forbedre relationerne.

Et andet område, hvor man kan se dette forsøg på at tvinge Trump, er med spørgsmålet om THAAD-missilerne i Korea, hvor Nordkorea nu har hævdet, at de kan lancere deres ICBM'er overalt, til enhver tid; og iflg. kinesiske eksperter er USA alene ansvarlig for, at Nordkorea opfører sig på denne måde.

Sydkorea med den fratrædende præsident Park Geun-hye, der muligvis snart bliver afsat ved en rigsretssag, måske inden for få dage eller uger; hun gik med til at få en specialbrigade med en 1.000-2.000 mand stor specialenhed, der i tilfælde af krig angiveligt skal eliminere Pyongyang-kommandoen, inkl. Kim Jong-un; og dette forværrer situationen, for i betragtning af sådanne tings historie, kan man ikke vide, hvornår øjeblikket til sådanne handlinger kommer.

For det tredje ses det af deployeringen af det amerikanske hangarskib *USS Carl Vinson* til Asien, i nærheden af Kina. Dette hangarskib er et atomdrevet skib af Nimitz-klassen, og det vil ankomme præcis den 20. januar, den dag, Trump overtager embedet. *Global Times*, den officielle kinesiske avis, sagde, at denne deployering har til hensigt at ødelægge potentielle forhandlinger med Kina og andre lande i området; det skal selvfølgelig også slå en sur tone an i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer.

Der er andre bestræbelser på at ændre og bestemme narrativen i perioden efter Obama. Ash Carter, USA's forsvarsminister, har netop holdt en pressekonference, hvor han sagde, at det kun var USA, der bekæmpede ISIS i Syrien. Der skal en solid portion frækhed til at sige dette, for alle i hele verden ved, at, uden præsident Putins beslutning om at intervenere militært i Syrien, med start i september 2015, og med enorm

støtte fra russiske luftstyrker til de syriske troppers kamp, ville denne militære situation i Syrien aldrig have udviklet sig. Og det var tværtimod USA's meget tvivlsomme opførsel, hvor de støttede diverse terroristgrupper, der forlængede denne proces og forsinkede den.

Men også som et forsøg på at tvinge narrativen var selvfølgelig John Kerry, der for en uge eller så siden holdt en tale, hvor han sagde, at det var det Britiske Parlament, der skulle have forhindret den amerikanske militærintervention i Syrien. Alle disse mennesker må tro, at hele verden har en meget kort hukommelse, for jeg husker ganske tydeligt, at det var general Michael Flynn, der i sin egenskab af leder af DIA [Defense Intelligence Agency] offentligt udtalte, at det var Obama-administrationens plan at opbygge et kalifat i området med det formål at få et regimeskifte imod Assad, og han blev dernæst fyret af [DNI] Clapper. Og der ligger en vis ironi i det faktum, at her sidste fredag mødtes Trump med Clapper, Brennan og Comey i Trump Tower, hvor disse tre herrer ville imponere Trump med deres historie om den russiske hacking; den anden person, der var sammen med Trump, var general Flynn, der nu sidder i førersædet [til at blive national sikkerhedsrådgiver]. Så man kan forvente, at sandheden ikke bliver undertrykt i al evighed. Det var faktisk kort før den amerikanske militære intervention i 2013, den amerikanske militære aktion var planlagt til at skulle finde sted om søndagen; det havde vi fra velunderrettede kilder i Washington, og i sidste øjeblik tog formanden for generalstabscheferne, general Martin Dempsey, hen til Obama og sagde, »De bør ikke starte en krig, når De ikke ved, hvordan den vil ende. Og hvis De ikke spørger Kongressen, bliver De stillet for, eller risikerer at blive stillet for en rigsret.« Kun pga. dette spurgte Obama den amerikanske Kongres, og Kongressen stemte nej, og den amerikanske intervention blev forhindret.

Så det forholdt sig altså helt anderledes. Og dette forsøg på

at fikse narrativen vil ikke lykkes.

Jeg kan ikke sige, hvordan denne Trump-administration vil blive. Jeg nævnte vist det ene punkt, jeg er sikker på: Jeg tror, vi sandsynligvis først i februar eller endda hen i marts får at se, hvem, der faktisk vil være i hans regering, hvem, der vil blive godkendt af Senatet. Men der er andre interessante elementer: Trump havde f.eks. i sin valgkampagne lovet at investere \$1 billion i fornyelse af infrastrukturen i USA. Det er virkelig godt, som jeg sagde, for USA har et presserende behov for at blive udbedret. Det vil imidlertid kun virke, hvis et andet af Trumps løfter, som han lovede i oktober i North Carolina, om, at han ville indføre det 21. århundredes Glass/Steagall-lov, bliver ført ud i livet, for det transatlantiske finanssystem er stadig på randen af bankerot. Vi kunne få en gentagelse af det finansielle sammenbrud i 2007-08, hvad øjeblik, det skal være; og *kun*, hvis vi får en Glass/Steagall-lov i Franklin D. Roosevelts tradition, det, som Roosevelt gjorde i 1933 ved at opdele bankerne, ved at fjerne det kriminelle element i banksystemet, og dernæst erstatte det med en [statslig] kreditpolitik i Alexander Hamiltons tradition, kan man råde bod på denne situation. I modsat fald kan man ikke finansiere \$1 billion til infrastruktur.

Helgas tale kan ses her:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdl0Hxg_Ubc

Engelsk udskrift af hele talen kan læses her:

Ruslands general Gerasimov

tilbageviser USA's forsvarsminister Ash Carters påstand om, at Rusland »stort set intet har gjort« mod ISIS i Syrien

11. jan., 2017 – General Valery Gerasimov, Ruslands generalstabschef, rapporterede i går, at russiske krigsfly i Syrien har fløjet 19.160 sortier og leveret 71.000 angreb mod terroristmål.

Vore fly angreb mål for militante kæmpers træningslejre, ammunitionsfabrikker og -værksteder, og ligeledes ISIL-terroristers illegale olieudvindingsfaciliteter«, sagde han og tilføjede, at de russiske luftstyrkers specialenhed »ødelagde flere end 200 sådanne mål, 174 olieraffinaderier og 111 konvojer af olietankbiler«. Efter Gerasimovs estimat »var dette med til både at afbryde systemet med ISIL's illegale bevæbnede formationers forsyninger og fratage dem deres grundlæggende indtægtskilde«.

Med støtte fra de russiske luftstyrkers specialenheder har de syriske regeringssoldater befriet 12.360 km² af Syriens territorium og 499 lokalsamfund, siden starten af deres operation, sagde chefen for generalstaben.

»Vore specialenheders handlinger begyndte 30. september, 2015, og har vendt forløbet af kampen mod terrorisme i den Syriske Arabiske Republik omkring«, bemærkede han. »I løbet af denne periode er store, illegale bevæbnede formationer omdirigeret nær Hama og Homs. Provinsen Latakia er blevet befriet for militante kæmpere, befrielsen af Damaskus-forstæder nærmer sig sin fuldendelse, og den basale transportåre, der forbinder

hovedstaden med landets nordlige del, er blevet ryddet. Byerne Aleppo og Al-Karyatein, som er af afgørende betydning, er blevet befriet«, sagde Gerasimov.

Og i det, der tydeligvis var en irettesættelse, møntet på Ash Carter, der under en optræden den 8. jan. på NBC's *Meet the Press* sagde, at den russiske, militære deployering i Syrien stort set intet har gjort mod ISIS, sagde Gerasimov, at den amerikanskledede koalition var langt mindre effektiv.

»De [den amerikanskledede koalition] har ikke opnået nogen succes af betydning. Samtidig er der registreret et stort antal dræbte, både blandt civile og blandt de syriske tropper«, bemærkede Gerasimov, der her refererede til det amerikanskledede luftangreb den 17. september, 2016, mod syriske tropper i Dier ez-Zur. »Det seneste i rækken af sådanne angreb fandt sted den 3. januar, da et B-52 bombefly angreb byen Sarmada i Idlib-provinsen, uden forudgående at advisere Rusland til trods for, at våbenhvileaftalen gælder for dette område. Dette angreb dræbte flere end 20 civile personer«, sagde Gerasimov.

Foto: Chefen for Ruslands generalstab, Valery Gerasimov.

Britisk efterretningstjeneste snubler over sine egne løgne

Den britiske efterretningstjenestes rolle i at køre den svingagtige kampagne for at male Donald Trump som en farlig agent til Rusland og Vladimir Putin, der angiveligt er i gang med at undergrave amerikansk frihed og demokrati, er gået det bekendte »ét skridt for vidt«. Husker I hærens chefrådgiver Joseph Welch i McCarthys høringer om USA's hær i 1954 (senator

Joseph McCarthy indledte undersøgelser af angivelig kommunistisk aktivitet i hæren), mod slutningen af Truman/McCarthys antikommunistiske heksejagter? Da McCarthy angreb en ung jurist i Welch's advokatfirma for at være kommunist, fordi han havde været i Advokaternes Laug, svarede Welch: Nu er De gået for vidt. Har De trods alt ingen anstændighed i livet? Har De ingen anstændighed tilbage?« Denne ordveksling gjorde det grundlæggende set af med denne del af den beskidte, britiske operation for at sønderrive arven efter Franklin Roosevelt i Amerika – selv om andre britiske operationer fortsatte i andre former frem til i dag.

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

I sin pressekonference naglede Trump den forræderiske kendsgerning i denne operation. Hvis denne platte rapport var blevet offentliggjort af efterretningstjenesterne, sagde han, »ville det være en enorm plet på deres generalieblad, hvis de rent faktisk gjorde det ... Jeg synes, det var en skændsel ... en skændsel, at efterretningstjenesterne tillod sådanne informationer, der viste sig at være så forkerte og falske, at komme frem. Jeg synes, det er en skændsel, og jeg siger, at

det er noget, nazi-Tyskland ville have gjort, og også gjorde. Jeg synes, det er en skændsel, at information, der var forkert og falsk og aldrig fandt sted, blev offentliggjort.« Da CNN krævede retten til at respondere til Trumps fordømmelse af deres deltagelse i fupnummeret, afskar Trump dem med: »Ikke jer. Jeres organisation er forfærdelig.«

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

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

Men dette er præcis, hvad Lyndon LaRouche i mange, mange år har rapporteret, med hensyn til amerikansk efterretningstjenestes underdanighed over for Det britiske Imperium; især under Bush og Obama. Det var til syvende og sidst briterne, der trak USA ind i krig med Irak, baseret på

Tony Blairs »udmajede« efterretningsrapporter om Saddam Husseins ikkeeksisterende masseødelæggelsesvåben; ind i en krig mod Libyen, baseret på britisk efterretningstjenestes løgne om Gaddafi og de al-Qaeda-tilknyttede, libyske »frihedskæmpere«; og de igangværende krige mod Syrien og Yemen, baseret på løgne fra de samme, britisk-saudiske netværk, der støtter terrorister i hele Sydvestasien, med det formål at gennemtvinge »regimeskift« mod sekulære regeringer.

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

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

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

For fredens skyld må Obama opgive sin Nobelpris

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 10. januar, 2017 – Med blot få dage tilbage af sit præsidentskab fortsætter Barack Obama med at optrappe en potentiel krigskonfrontation med Rusland, mens hans regimeskiftkriges dødbringende kaos, i Libyen, Yemen og Afghanistan, fortsat forværres.

Foruden en ny, hurtig deployering af yderligere 6.000 soldater til Ruslands grænser, med fuld jord-og-luft kampbevæbning, er Obama og hans Pentagonchefer gået i gang med at skabe en 2.000 mand stærk »dræberenhed«, der skal uddannes til at myrde nordkoreanske ledere. Obama har indledt, været med til at starte eller fortsat ni separate krige, mens han har været præsident, alle uden bemyndigelse fra, eller blot væsentlige konsultationer med, Kongressen. Han er den eneste præsident i USA's historie, der har været i krig hver eneste dag i to konsekutive embedsperioder, som kongresmedlem Ron Paul påpegede på sin webside 9. jan. Hans dronedrab stiller George W. Bush' i skyggen, og hans erklærede politik for dronedrab fjerner grundlæggende set enhver grænse for præsidenters magt til at dræbe via droner overalt i verden.

Nogle af disse handlinger, såsom Obamas massive, \$115 mia. store bevæbning af saudiarabiske styrker for at bombe og invadere Yemen, har haft et sandt folkemord til følge; nogle af disse handlinger har næret fremvæksten af flere terroristgrupper; andre truer med generel krig med Rusland og/eller Kina.

At denne krigspræsident kan prale med en Nobels Fredspris er en vederstyggelighed og en trussel mod freden, både i krigen i

Syrien, og i hele verden.

Den 9. jan. krævede Schiller Instituttets præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at præsident Obama tilbageleverede Nobels Fredspris, som han fik i 2009 kort tid efter, at han overtog embedet. Pentagon har netop annonceret »dræberenheden« i Korea – en afgående præsident sammen med en koreansk regering, der selv er ved at blive fjernet gennem en rigsretssag! – samt de store, nye styrker, der nu deployeres, for at »standse russisk aggression« i Europa.

Det er nødvendigt at respondere til sådanne eskalerende krigshandlinger i Obamas sidste dage i embedet, med et krav om, at han omgående skal tilbagelevere sin Nobels Fredspris; og at dette krav udbredes internationalt og fortsætter efter, at han har forladt embedet.

Hvis Obama tvinges til at opgive sin uretmæssigt tildelte Fredspris, vil hans administrations forsøg på at tvinge det tiltrædende Trump-team til at *fortsætte* disse krige og stormagtskonfrontationer blive slået ned. Hans sidste øjeblikks optrædninger er nu i færd med at skabe så meget kaos og forvirring for hans efterfølger som overhovedet muligt.

Krigene, og truslerne om krige, kan få deres helt eget liv, med mindre de tilbagevises, og det på en synlig og stærk måde.

For fredens og udviklingens skyld må Obamas fredspris inddrages eller opgives.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 9. januar
2017:**

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

Obamas militære provokationer

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 5.
januar 2017:**

**Farvel til 2016, Obama og det
gamle paradigme.**

Se også 2. del.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

Lyd:

Obama går ned i flammer – Vedtag Glass Steagall nu!

4. januar, 2017 – Både i USA og hele verden bliver Obama latterliggjort og fordømt for sit massemyrderi, sine krigsforbrydelser, sine løgne og sine hektiske (men mislykkede) bestræbelser på at fremkalde »fabrikeret hysteri« vendt mod Rusland. Stort set ingen, udover de løgnagtige massemedier og de mest hæmningsløse neokonservative omkring Obama og Hillary Clinton, tror et ord af det.

Tirsdag aften blev et interview med WikiLeaks' Julian Assange sendt på Fox News, hvor Assange igen fremhævede, at de omtalte e-mails fra den Demokratiske Nationalkomite og Hillary Clintons kampagneleder John Podesta ikke kom fra Rusland, som Obama og hans »efterretningsteam« har hævdet, og heller ikke fra nogen statslig aktør. Assange tilføjede, at WikiLeaks, i de ti år, det har eksisteret, aldrig har afsløret sine kilder, og heller ikke vil gøre det nu, men også, at det aldrig har taget fejl, eller blot er blevet beskyldt for at tage fejl. Som mange efterretningseksperter har vist, så findes der intet bevis, eller blot troværdigt bevismateriale, for, at Rusland havde noget som helst at gøre med at skaffe og lække disse e-mails.

Men, sandheden bekymrer ikke den døende race af aktiver for Det britiske Imperium. CIA-chef John Brennan, der er mest kendt for sine ugentlige møder med Obama for at kortlægge ugens liste over dronedrab, optrådte tirsdag på PBS for at himle op om, at de informationer, der viser, at Rusland havde grebet ind i valget, var absolut sande, men at han endnu ikke kunne afsløre denne information. Forespurgt om CIA's »stensikre« bevis (som daværende CIA-direktør George Tenet dengang sagde) for, at Saddam Hussein havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, svarede Brennan, at det var noget, der fandt sted »for flere lysår siden«, og at CIA nu kun fortæller

sandheden.

I Tyrkiet udstedte den tyrkiske premierminister Yilderim en erklæring, der sagde, at, selv om Obama hævder, at han bekæmper terrorisme, så har han i realiteten »sendt våben til terroristorganisationer ... Det er kun Tyrkiet, der bekæmper Daesh (ISIS).

USA og andre gør ingenting ... Det, vi forventer af den nye administration, er, at den sætter en stopper for denne skændsel.« Tyrkiske ledere stiller alvorlige spørgsmålstegn ved, at USA's luftvåben fortsat skal have lov at bruge Incirlik Flyvebasen, eftersom de nægter at hjælpe tyrkiske og russiske styrker med at bekæmpe Daesch (ISIS) i Syrien.

Men, at sprænge Obamas krigsplaner vil i det lange løb ikke betyde stort, hvis disintegrationen af hele det vestlige finanssystem ikke standses og vendes omkring, hvilket kun er muligt gennem den omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Den nye Kongres åbnede i denne uge, med flere ledende Demokrater, der udtrykte, at de har i sinde at arbejde sammen med Trump omkring spørgsmål af gensidig interesse, og de nævnte især store investeringer i infrastruktur og en revision af den katastrofale frihandelsaftale NAFTA. Dette er nyttige og vigtige forholdsregler, men uden Glass-Steagall, der lukker de ulovlige spillebuler, centreret omkring Wall Street, vil intet andet kunne lade sig gøre i takt med, at den fremstormende implosion af det transatlantiske finansimperium vil feje alle andre bestræbelser på at genrejse økonomien væk. Kun gennem Glass-Steagall kan vi sætte scenen for et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, og som kan dirigere kredit til genopbygning og til fremskridt i forskning på videnskabens fremskudte grænser.

Aktivister fra LaRouchePAC var tirsdag til stede på Capitol Hill, hvor de mødtes med mange nye og tilbagevendende senatorer og medlemmer af Repræsentanternes Hus. De fik at vide, at Glass/Steagall-lovforslagene fra sidste

Kongresforsamling vil blive genintroduceret i den nye Kongres inden for få dage.

Men Demokraterne har hidtil forsømt at gribe til handlinger, der ville få Trump til at gøre det, han sagde, han ville gøre, under valgkampagnen – nemlig at støtte Glass-Steagall. Ved omgående at gennemtvinge spørgsmålet – før vi rammes af et nyt finanssammenbrud – kan, og må, et tværpolitisk flertal genoprette fornuft i nationen og genoplive regering af folket, ved folket og for folket – og ikke af Wall Street, ved Wall Street og for Wall Street. Det var netop en sådan erkendelse af denne degradering af nationens borgere på vegne af Wall Street, der forårsagede det solide nederlag for Obama/Hillary-kampagnen i 2016.

En koalition af Demokrater fra det nordøstlige Ohio, der har afholdt møder med repræsentanter for LaRouchePAC, har udstedt en stærk erklæring til nyvalgte præsident Trump om at inkludere et krav om Glass-Steagall i sin Tale til Nationen.

Onsdag, den 11. januar, bliver en LaRouchePAC »Aktionsdag« på Capitol Hill for at levere det nødvendige »opløftende« spark bagi til de tøvende og/eller feje kongresmedlemmer om at handle nu.

Rusland skænker mobilt hospital til Syrien

Søndag, 1. januar, 2017 – Den russiske regering har skænket Syrien det mobile hospital og et lager af medikamenter, som Minisiteriet for Nødforanstaltninger havde deployeret til Syrien i november på ordrer fra den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin. Syrisk lægepersonale er blevet uddannet til at

operere det, og det er tilsyneladende nu klart til at blive deployeret hvor som helst i landet, det måtte behøves, iflg. en rapport i RT. Aleksand Romanov, chef for Ruslands Ministerium for Nødforanstaltningers afdeling for internationale anliggender, sagde, at han håbede, at gaven ville hjælpe syrerne med bedre at yde lægehjælp til de trængende.

RT rapporterer ligeledes, at Elizabeth Hoth, Verdenssundhedsorganisationens repræsentant i Syrien, har rost russernes deployering af lægefaciliteten og sagde, at hun satte pris på, hvor hurtigt, Rusland deployerede hospitalet til Syrien. »Jeg talte med mange patienter, der var meget glade for den behandling, de havde fået af de russiske læger«, sagde hun, citeret af det russiske Ministerium.

USA's nye Kongres åbner i dag, med et land, der forfølges af sandheden

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 3. januar, 2017 – USA's 115. Kongres tages i dag i ed i en tid, hvor den sandhed bliver mere og mere åbenlys for ethvert blot nogenlunde menneskeligt væsen, at der må komme et skifte i USA's politik, bort fra økonomisk kollaps, krig og løgne. Hold af LaRouchePAC-aktivister var på stedet for at modtage kongresmedlemmerne med detaljerne for denne bydende nødvendige proces i form af en handleplan – genindfør Glass/Steagall-loven og sæt USA på en kurs for produktivitet gennem et nyt kreditsystem, og forny det forpligtende engagement over for videnskab og økonomisk udvikling.

Ydermere er sandhedens lys i færd med at brænde huller i Obama-administrationens aktuelle, store favoritløgn, nemlig, at det dæmoniske Rusland er i færd med at 'hacke' Amerika i stumper og stykker. For det første måtte *Washington Post* i dag bide i det sure æble og trække sin påstand tilbage, som avisen fremkom med i sidste uge, om, at Rusland havde hacket et elektricitetselskab i New England, med mulige blackouts til følge. *WP's* forsideartikel i dag lyder, »El-selskab i Vermont har tilsyneladende ikke været udsat for russisk hacking«. *WP* havde urigtigt rapporteret, at selve værket var blevet hacket; at den skadelige software (malware) kunne forbindes til Rusland; og at der var fare for et blackout på værket – Burlington Electric. Intet af dette var sandt.

Man bør huske på, at dette er den samme *Washington Post*, der, sammen med *New York Times*, oprindeligt fremkom med den påstand, at Rusland hakede den Demokratiske Nationalkomites computere og opsnappede e-mails fra John Podesta, Hillary Clintons kampagneleder, og med disse e-mails, der senere blev offentliggjort af WikiLeaks og således på ulovlig vis greb ind i valgresultatet (til Trumps fordel).

I denne sammenhæng udtalte WikiLeaks' grundlægger og redaktør, Julian Assange, sig offentligt imod denne påstand og sagde, at han er 1000 % sikker på, at Rusland ikke leverede hakede e-mails til WikiLeaks. »Vi kan sige, og har sagt, gentagne gange i løbet af de seneste to måneder, at vores kilde ikke er den russiske regering, og ikke er et nationalt parti.« Dette, og mere, sagde Assange i et eksklusivt interview i sidste uge med Sean Hannity fra Fox News, der vil blive udsendt i sin fulde udstrækning (første del) kl. 22 den 3. januar. Dette er første gang nogensinde, at Assange giver et interview til en Tv-kanal, og hans foreløbige kommentarer får allerede stor opmærksomhed internationalt og skaber ravage for Obama-flokken, inklusive for det Republikanske Partis russofober.

Disse afsløringer understreger den pointe, Lyndon LaRouche for nylig kom med, om Obama-præsidentskabets sidste dage: »Husk,

hvem, der står bag Obama.« Han refererer til det døende, britiske City of London/Wall Street slæng. Men, tilføjer han, i takt med, at deres system udånder – og så længe der ikke gennemtvinges et skift i politikken for at udslukke det – så er de farlige og i stand til at udføre grusomheder.

I Sydvestasien skal man se hen til dette netværk i forbindelse med de ansvarlige for massenedskydningen i Istanbul nytårsaften. De tyrkiske myndigheders og samarbejdende, asiatiske regerings efterforskning er stadig i gang og holdes hemmelig, men LaRouche bemærkede: Led efter de britisk-tjetjenske netværks hånd i denne grusomme handling. Ud over visse empiriske 'signatur-fakta', der er knyttet til hændelsen, er der den grelle realitet med en sådan handlings onde formål – at forsøge at sabotere det igangværende tyrkisk-russisk-iranske samarbejde om en syrisk våbenhvile, forhandlinger i Kasakhstan i næste uge og en politisk løsning. Den tyrkiske vicepremierminister, Numann Kurtulmus, bekræftede imidlertid i dag, at Tyrkiets forpligtelse forbliver resolut.

Samme dag som massenedskydningsforbrydelsen fandt sted i Sydvestasien – hjemstedet for Det gamle, britiske Imperiums »Store Spil«, med alle dets årtier med blodsudgydelser – holdt den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping i Østasien sin årlige nytårstale, hvor han specifikt udtalte den sandhed, at menneskeheden kan handle på en måde, hvor der er fred i verden. Efter en gennemgang af Kinas præstationer i 2016, især inden for rumforskning, Bælt-og-Vej og præstationen med at løfte 10 millioner borgere ud af fattigdom, sluttede Xi:

»Det kinesiske folk har altid troet på, at verden er et fællesskab. Vi kinesere aspirerer ikke kun til et godt liv for os selv, men vi håber også, at mennesker i andre dele af verden har et anstændigt liv. I øjeblikket plages mennesker i visse lande og områder stadig af krige og uroligheder; mange lider under sygdomme og katastrofer. Vi håber inderligt, at det internationale samfund vil gøre en fælles indsats, arbejde i den overbevisning, at menneskeheden har en fælles skæbne som

et fællesskab og bygge vores planet op til at være et mere fredeligt og fremgangsrigt sted at leve.«

Foto: LaRouchePAC-aktivister foran Capitol uddeler materiale under banner for 'Genindfør Glass-Steagall'. Foto fra 2014.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 3. januar
2017:**

**Året 2017: Hvor vi
konsoliderer verdens nye
Silkevejsparadigme**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Tysk Udenrigsministerium:
Assads fremtid; andre syriske
spørgsmål
på Astana-møde; EU's**

Mogherini: FN vil styre det hele

2. jan., 2017 – Talsmand for det Tyske Udenrigsministerium Martin Schäfer udtalte i dag i Berlin, at den syriske præsident Assads fremtid og andre interne, syriske spørgsmål bør blive drøftet ved fredsforhandlingerne i Astana, Kasakhstan. Det Tyske Udenrigsministeriums talsmand tilføjede, at Tyskland hilste våbenstilstanden i Syrien, som Rusland og Tyrkiet har mæglet, velkommen, rapporterer Sputnik i dag.

I skarp kontrast til Syriens, Ruslands og det Tyske Udenrigsministeriums fokus på mødet i Astana, foreslog EU's chef for udenrigsanliggender, Federica Mogherini, en anden linje, der kun vedrørte Astana, hvis visse betingelser opfyldes, og som aldrig nævnte Rusland.

Den 31. dec. meddelte Mogherini i Bruxelles, at EU vil være vært for »en bilateral forhandlingsrunde« i Bruxelles i midten af januar måned, for at finde et fælles udgangspunkt vedr. syriske spørgsmål efter konflikten, og vedr. forsoning og genopbygning, med fuld støtte til de forhandlinger, der vil blive afholdt i Genève i februar måned. Dernæst vil EU være vært for en konference i Bruxelles, som en opfølgning af sidste års møde i London.

Med hensyn til konferencen i Astana sagde Mogherini, at EU ville »byde ethvert midlertidigt skridt velkommen, såsom det annoncerede møde i Astana, hvis dette er fuldt ud inkluderende og har til formål at forberede en frugtbar og meningsfuld genoptagelse af interne syriske forhandlinger i Genève under FN-regi«.

Foto: EU-chef for udenrigsanliggender, Federica Mogherini.

Endnu et terrorangreb rammer Istanbul

Søndag, 1. januar, 2017 – Omkring kl. 1:15 Istanbul-tid (23:15, 31. dec., UTC) gik en attentatmand ind i en fashionabel natklub, der ligger ved Bosphorus i Istanbul, og åbnede ild med automatvåben mod et nytårsselskab og dræbte 39 mennesker og sårede 69 andre. De våben, han brugte, skal have været Kalasjnikov-geværer, iflg. avisen *Hurriyet*. De tyrkiske myndigheder havde sendt henved 25.000 politibetjente på vagt i Istanbul i en forventning om, at der kunne finde et terrorangreb sted et sted i byen, men kunne ikke forhindre dette angreb. Et af de første ofre var faktisk en politibetjent uden for klubben. Den tyrkiske indenrigsminister Suleyman Soylu har meddelt, at 24 af de 35 dødsofre, der foreløbigt er blevet identificeret, var udlændinge, inkl. jordanske, belgiske, saudiske, marokkanske, libanesiske og libyske borgere, såvel som også en 19-årig israelsk kvinde.

Den tyrkiske præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan sagde i en udtalelse om angrebet, at det havde til hensigt at skabe kaos i Tyrkiet. »De, der angriber freden i vores nation, og deres skakbrikker, arbejder på at destabilisere vort land og udløse kaos ved at demoralisere vort folk gennem deres afskyelige angreb, der også har civile som mål«, sagde han. »Vi vil som nation imidlertid aldrig tillade sådanne beskidte spil og vil yderligere forenes og bevare roen.«

»Vi er klar over, at disse angreb, der udføres af diverse terrororganisationer imod vort land, ikke er uafhængige af begivenheder, der finder sted i vores region«, fortsatte han. »Vi er fast besluttet på at udrydde trusler og angreb imod vort land, samt deres ophavsmænd.«

Ifølge rapporter flygtede morderen og er nu genstand for en massiv menneskejagt. Ingen har taget ansvaret for handlingen, men ISIS er under mistanke. »Der er fremkommet nogle detaljer, men myndighederne arbejder hen imod et konkret resultat«, sagde den tyrkiske premierminister Binali Yildirim til reportere, da han blev spurgt, hvem, der kunne stå bag angrebet, rapporterer Reuters. »Politiet og sikkerhedsfolk vil offentliggøre informationer i takt med, at de bliver tilgængelige under efterforskningen«, sagde han.

Avisen *Hurriyet* forbinder i sin analyse indirekte angrebet til begivenheder i regionen. Bortset fra spørgsmålet om det direkte ansvar, er der imidlertid også spørgsmålet om fiaskoer på vegne af militær og efterretningsvæsen, især i kølvandet på udrensningen af Gulenister (tilhængere af Fethullah Gülen, - red.) af sikkerhedstjenesterne og militæret, i kølvandet på det fejlslagne kupforsøg den 15. juli. »Nogle af dem, der har erstattet gulenisterne, er novicer, 'sovende' agenter i forklædning (som man har mistanke om mht. den politibetjent, der myrdede den russiske ambassadør til Ankara den 19. dec.), eller også medlemmer af den berygtede 'undergrundsstat', før den blev overgivet til gulenisterne under AK Partiets regering«, bemærker *Hurriyet*.

Foto: Tyrkisk uropatrulje holder vagt efter terrorangrebet i den fashionable natklub.

**Rusland og Tyrkiet opfordrer
USA til at deltage i**

fredsprocessen i Syrien

31. dec., 2016 – Med en våbenhvile, der generelt stadig holder, er både Moskva og Ankara positivt indstillet over for ideen om, at USA deltager i fredsprocessen i Syrien ved mødet i Astana, Kasakhstan – der skal finde sted efter 20. januar. »Ja, vi forventer, at Trump-administrationen, efter sin tiltrædelse den 20. januar, vil blive en vigtig deltager«, sagde den russiske ambassadør til FN, Vitaly Churkin, i går. Tyrkiet ser også frem til amerikansk deltagelse. »Vi hilser den (mulige) amerikanske deltagelse i mødet i Astana velkommen«, sagde den tyrkiske udenrigsminister Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu til Al Arabiya Tv i går. Astana-mødet er nu fastsat til den 23. januar. En højtplaceret tyrkisk regeringsperson sagde til *Hurriyet*, at tyrkiske og russiske embedsfolk vil mødes enten den 8. eller 9. januar for at drøfte udviklingerne i marken og forberede sig til Astana-processen.

Med hensyn til andre mulige deltagere beskrev Churkin Iran som en »beredvillig deltager« og Egypten som et land, »der kan deltage i processen med at forberede mødet i Astana.« Han nævnte også Saudi-Arabien (over hvilken iranerne er temmelig stærkt uenige), Kuwait og Qatar som »meget vigtige medspillere«, der også kunne deltage.

Ifølge TASS talte udenrigsministrene Sergei Lavrov og Çavuşoğlu i går sammen i telefon, og de understregede betydningen af, at alle sider tilslutter sig aftalen om våbenstilstand. »De påpegede betydningen af, at alle oppositionsgrupper overholder standsningen af fjendtligheder og forholder sig konstruktive i lyset af det forestående møde i Astana«, sagde det Russiske Udenrigsministerium.

En højtplaceret, tyrkisk embedsmand sagde til *Hurriyet* her til morgen, at Tyrkiet og Rusland vil etablere fælles overvågningscentre på Eskisehir Hovedflyvebasen i Tyrkiet og Hmeimin Flyvebasen i Syrien for at følge implementeringen af

våbenstilstanden på tæt hold. »Vi, Ankara og Moskva, vil sammen følge processen med våbenstilstanden. Vi har allerede i den seneste måned arbejdet meget tæt sammen. Vi vil overvåge fra Eskisehir-basen, og de vil fra deres Hmeimim-base. Men vore landstyrker vil også følge med i udviklingerne og informere begge vore overvågningscentre«, sagde embedsmanden. Dagen før havde Çavuşoğlu, i et interview med *Hurriyet*, bekræftet oprettelsen af de fælles overvågningscentre, og at en hotline ville blive oprettet mellem dem for at koordinere processen med våbenstilstanden og undersøge enhver potentiel overtrædelse.

Foto: Den tyrkiske udenrigsminister, Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, til Al Arabiya Tv: »Vi hilser den (mulige) amerikanske deltagelse i mødet i Astana velkommen«

FN's Sikkerhedsråd vedtager aftale om våbenhvile, som Rusland, Tyrkiet og Iran har mæglet

31. dec., 2016 – FN's Sikkerhedsråd har enstemmigt vedtaget et russisk forlæg til en resolution, der støtter våbenstilstanden, mæglet af Rusland og Tyrkiet, som den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin annoncerede den 29. december. Ifølge RT hilste Sikkerhedsrådets medlemmer aftalen, der var opnået med Rusland og Tyrkiet som mæglere, velkommen og understregede betydningen af dens »fulde og omgående implementering«.

Resolutionen udtrykker også støtte til »Ruslands og Tyrkiets

indsats, og som tilsigter at stoppe volden i Syrien og lancere en politisk proces.« Rådets medlemmer understregede, at de ser mødet i Astana, Kasakhstan, som et vigtigt skridt hen imod en forsoning i den syriske konflikt. FN-organet genbekræftede ligeledes sin forpligtelse over for »den Syriske Arabiske Republiks suverænitet, uafhængighed, enhed og territoriale integritet« og gentog, at den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan løse den syriske konflikt, er ved at indlede en kompleks, politisk proces internt i Syrien.

I sine afsluttende bemærkninger ved mødet sagde Vitaly Churkin, Ruslands ambassadør til FN, til rådet, at den netop vedtagne resolution adresserer behovet for at overholde standsningen af fjendtlighederne, så vel som også mødet om en politisk afgørelse i Astana, hvor delegationer fra oppositionen og regeringen for første gang vil mødes ansigt til ansigt, under FN's mandat som udtrykt i FN's Sikkerhedsråds resolutioner 2254, 2268 og i andre dokumenter. »Alt dette, der er nedfældet i dokumentet, vedtog vi i dag«, sagde Churkin.

»Det er en meget kompliceret proces«, fortsatte Churkin. »Alt, hvad vi er i stand til at opnå, er resultatet af enormt arbejde og arbejdskraft. Hvis I ikke ønsker at hjælpe med, så lad være med at komplicere tingene. Lad være med at så tvivl, lad være med at omfortolke, lad være med at gentage forældede klicheer, det hjælper ikke. Lad os arbejde seriøst, og vi vil i 2017 være i stand til at opnå en politisk afgørelse.« Han fortsatte med at sige, at, hvis alle medlemmer i Sikkerhedsrådet »fokuserer på det essentielle i sagen og tilsidesætter deres private interesser, så kan Rådet træffe vigtige beslutninger.«

Foto: Ruslands ambassadør til FN Vitaly Churkin taler i FN's Sikkerhedsråd den 31. dec., 2016, hvor aftalen om våbenhvilen i Syrien blev enstemmigt vedtaget.

God grund til optimisme: Et nyt paradigme for 2017! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Kina vil i det nye år afholde to topmøder, hvor konsolideringen af Silkevejsinitiativet bliver temaet, og hvor det bliver klart, at en økonomisk model med win-win-samarbejde er langt den mest attraktive og for længst er blevet magneten i den globale udvikling. Dette globale udviklingsperspektiv er allerede nu det største infrastrukturprogram i menneskehedens historie, som over 100 nationer og internationale organisationer deltager i, allerede berører 4,4 mia. mennesker og for første gang i mindst 50 år repræsenterer et realistisk håb om, at problemer som sult, fattigdom, sygdomme, vi for længst har kunnet behandle og manglende uddannelse, én gang for alle kan overvindes.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Putin annoncerer aftale om våbenhvile i Syrien; LaRouche giver sin vurdering

29. dec., 2016 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin annoncerede under et transmitteret møde med forsvarsminister

Sergei Shoigu og udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at dokumenter for en våbenhvile er blevet underskrevet af syriske oppositionsgrupper og den syriske præsident Bashar al Assads regering. I dag kommenterede Lyndon LaRouche, at aftalen er usikker. »Man kan ikke regne med den, fordi Obama ikke er uskadeliggjort«, sagde han.

»Der er netop«, sagde Putin ved mødets start, »indløbet rapporter om, at, for flere timer siden var der en udvikling, som vi alle har set frem til og arbejdet så hårdt på. Tre dokumenter er blevet underskrevet. Et dokument er en våbenhvile mellem den syriske regering og den bevåbnede opposition. Et andet dokument omhandler en pakke af forholdsregler til at kontrollere våbenhvilen. Og så er der en erklæring om beredvillighed til at indlede fredsforhandlinger for en afgørelse af den syriske konflikt.« Rusland, Tyrkiet og Iran har påtaget sig forpligtelser til at garantere en fredelig afgørelse i Syrien. Aftalen er et resultat af Ruslands samarbejde med partnere i regionen, understregede Putin.

Putin gav klart udtryk for, at det virkelig hårde arbejde begynder nu.

»Der er ingen tvivl om, at de opnåede aftaler er skrøbelige og kræver særlig opmærksomhed og assistance med bevarelse og udvikling som mål. Men det er ikke desto mindre et betydningsfuldt resultat af vores fælles arbejde, bestræbelser fra Forsvarsministeriet, Udenrigsministeriet og vore partnere i regionen«, sagde han. »Som vi udmærket er klar over, så er de opnåede aftaler meget skrøbelige, de kræver særlig opmærksomhed og tålmodighed, en professionel fremgangsmåde over for disse spørgsmål og en konstant kontakt med vore partnere«, understregede Putin.

Iflg. Kremles udskrift præsenterede Shoigu Putin for en liste over de bevåbnede oppositionsgrupper, der er gået med til våbenhvilen, og som efterfølgende blev offentliggjort på

Forsvarsministeriets webside sammen med et kort over deres fordeling. Han rapporterede, at Forsvarsministeriet, med Tyrkiet som mægler, brugte to måneder til at forhandle med de øverstbefalende for disse syv grupper, der udgør henved 60.000 kæmpere.

Lavrov rapporterede, at Udenrigsministeriet vil tage skridt til at sikre, at pakken af aftaler, der blev underskrevet, blev uddelt som officielle dokumenter i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, og at medlemmer af Sikkerhedsrådet bliver briefet og deres spørgsmål besvaret.

»Det er vigtigt at øge antallet af garantlande, og vi ønsker derfor på dette stadium at invitere vore egyptiske kolleger til at tilslutte sig disse aftaler«, sagde Lavrov. »Senere, på efterfølgende stadier, kunne vi sikkert også få andre nøglelande med indflydelse på begivenheder i Syrien involveret, lande som Saudi-Arabien, Qatar, Irak og Jordan.«

I Damaskus annoncerede den syriske arabiske hærs generalkommando en »omfattende« standsning af fjendtligheder, der skal træde i kraft ved midnat i dag, lokal tid.

»Kommandoen tilføjede, at terroristorganisationerne Jabhat al-Nusra og ISIS og hermed affilierede grupper er ekskluderet fra aftalen og påpegede, at våbenhvilen sker med det mål, at skabe passende betingelser for at støtte en politisk vej i den syriske krise«, rapporterede SANA. Underskriverne på oppositionens side inkluderer, som det rapporteredes af det Russiske Forsvarsministerium, Ahrar al-Sham og Jaish al-Islam, de to største grupper, så vel som fem andre mindre grupper: Jaish al-Mujahideen, Faylak al-Sham, Suvar al-Sham, Jaish Idlib og Jabhat al-Shamiya.

Tyrkiet og Rusland enige om aftale for syrisk våbenhvile

28. dec., 2016 – Anadolu nyhedsagentur, den tyrkiske regerings pressetjeneste, rapporterer, at Rusland og Tyrkiet er blevet enige om en våbenhvile i Syrien, mellem syriske regeringsstyrker og oppositionsstyrker, og som kunne træde i kraft ved midnat, den 29. december. Våbenhvilen gælder ikke for terroristorganisationer og er inden for rammerne af FN's Sikkerhedsråds resolution 2254. Våbenhvilen vil bane vej for forhandlinger om en politisk afgørelse af konflikten, forhandlinger, der skal finde sted i Kasakhstans hovedstad, Astana, hvor Moskva og Ankara vil stå som garant for afgørelsen.

TASS rapporterer, at Quadri Jamil, leder af Folkefronten for Forandring og Befrielse, og repræsentanter for »Moskva-gruppen« af den syriske opposition, tidligere sagde til TASS, at Astana-forhandlingerne mellem Damaskus og oppositionen vil finde sted i sidste halvdel af januar.

Forespurgt, om han kunne bekræfte Anadolus rapport om våbenhvilen, sagde Kremls talsmand, Dmitry Peskov, til reportere, »Jeg kan ikke besvare dette spørgsmål nu, jeg har ikke tilstrækkelig information«, rapporterer TASS i en separat dækning. Han bekræftede imidlertid, at »der foregår konstant kontakt med de tyrkiske kolleger for at drøfte forskellige former for en mulig dialog, der er planlagt til at finde sted i Astana. Dette foregår alt sammen i overensstemmelse med en søgen efter en politisk afgørelse i Syrien.«

Den tyrkiske udenrigsminister, Mevlut Cavusoglu, gik imidlertid senere videre med at bekræfte, at en aftale er nært forestående.

»Vi arbejder stadig på det. Det kunne blive effektueret hvad

øjeblik, det skal være. Det handler om at udvide våbenhvilen. Vi arbejder også på en forhandlet, politisk løsning», sagde han.

Aftalen er blevet forelagt både den syriske regering og oppositionsgrupperne og kunne træde i kraft snarest. Cavusoglu indikerede også, at diskussioner stadig foregår mht., hvem, der skal deltage i Astana-forhandlingerne, selv om han udelukkede deltagelse af PYD (Partiya Yekîtiya Demokrat, et kurdisk syrisk politisk parti).

Foto: I sidste uge mødtes den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov (2. til venstre) med den tyrkiske udenrigsminister Cavasoglu (2. til højre) og den iranske udenrigsminister Zarif (højre) i Moskva for at drøfte krisen i Syrien. Onsdag meddelte tyrkiske statsmedier, at en våbenhvileaftale var opnået mellem Rusland og Tyrkiet, der støtter modstridende sider i konflikten.

Tyskland går frem med hjælp til Aleppo – Omgående fokus på lægehjælp

27. dec., 2016 – Den tyske udviklingsminister Gerd Müller har præsenteret et hjælpeprogram for Aleppo, hvor hovedfokus vil ligge på at genopbygge byens sektor for lægehjælp. Omkring 1.000 syriske læger, kirurger og sygeplejersker, plus yderligere 200 personel til behandling for traumer, vil blive finansieret med 15 mio. euro fra hans ministerium hen over de kommende 30 måneder.

Müller opfordrede andre lande til at bidrage til genopbygningen af Aleppo og sagde, at, efter det

internationale samfunds stater har forholdt sig passive under hele denne krig, »må der nu komme en humanitær indsats for befolkningen i Aleppo«. Situationen for lægehjælp er katastrofal, sagde Müller og advarede om, at, hvis der ikke kommer omgående lægebehandling og pleje til tusinder af syriske børn, vil de ikke overleve den kommende vinter. Ud over Aleppo har 13 millioner syrere et akut behov for humanitær hjælp, og 90 % af disse mennesker har behov for medicin.

Foto: Situation for lægehjælp i Aleppo, og andetsteds i Syrien, er katastrofal, og især vil mange børn med forbrændinger, diverse lemlæstelser og alvorlige traumer ikke overleve vinteren uden læge- og medicinhjælp fra det internationale samfund.