

**Dette er et historisk øjeblik, hvor vi kan ændre verden og historien.**

**Opfordring til International aktionsdag 23. februar.  
Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

*Det er, hvad denne aktion faktisk handler om: Hvordan kan vi optrappe denne kamp for grundlæggende set at skabe en situation, hvor Trump, når han holder sin Tale om Nationens Tilstand (28. feb.), inkluderer Glass-Steagall, den ægte Glass-Steagall, og ikke en eller anden udvandet 'ring-fencing' (intern bankopdeling), en Volcker-regel, eller noget som helst andet.*

*Dette er alt sammen ekstremt vigtigt, for vi vil udgive et dossier om Soros, der præcis viser, hvorfor dette apparat, der laver kupforsøget imod Trump-administrationen, er nøjagtig det, man gjorde i Ukraine; og jeg beder jer om at deltage i en aktionsdag den 23. februar, som er treårsdagen for kuppet i Ukraine, Maidan, der førte til kuppet. Og jeg beder jer også om at være med til at udsende viden om, hvad Soros-apparatet er, der står bag dette kup i USA.*

*Det følgende er Helga Zepp-LaRouches indlæg fra LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, den 17. februar. (Se hele webcastet)*

Lad mig sige godaften til jer alle. Det er en glæde at kunne tale med jer. Jeg vil tro, de fleste af jer så præsident **Trumps pressekonference** i dag, der helt åbenbart beviser, at dette er en meget aktiv og fyrig person, der ved, hvordan man

håndterer en uregerlig medieflok. Jeg syntes, det var ret morsomt, og jeg nød at se i hvert fald et par minutter af det, for det viser, at dette virkelig er et meget interessant øjeblik i historien. For han sætter sig ikke bare ned og accepterer, at der rent faktisk er et kup i gang imod ham. Jeg mener, at dette er meget alvorligt. Det gamle establishment, det neolibérale, neokonservative, unipolære verdensetablissement, både i USA og Europa, er *fuldstændig* fra koncepterne. De vil ikke acceptere den kendsgerning, at Trump blev valgt, og de er helt åbenlyst involveret i et forsøg på at få Trump ud af Det Hvide Hus. I al fald, enten et kup, et militærkup, som der er blevet talt om, en rigsret, eller værre endnu, som chefredaktøren for den tyske, liberale avis, *Die Zeit*, sagde på et talk show; han sagde: »Mord i Det Hvide Hus«. Jeg mener, det er fuldstændig skandaløst, at chefredaktøren for den såkaldte mainstream-avis siger sådan noget.

Men det, der foregår, er meget alvorligt. For de har indsat George Soros, der ikke er andet end et instrument for Det britiske Imperium; og George Soros, der er opfinderen af, eller finansmanden bag, konceptet med 'farvet revolution', med andre ord, manden, der finansierer alle former for borgergrupper, NGO'er, og andre grupper, for, hvordan man fremkalder regimeskifte. De har været involveret i dette i størstedelen af tiden efter Sovjetunionen, i mange lande i Østeuropa; i Ukraine i 2004, med den Orange Revolution; i Georgien med Rosenrevolutionen; og senere, det Arabiske Forår; de forsøgte en Hvid Revolution i Rusland, der slog fejl; de forsøgte den såkaldte Gule Revolution med gule paraplyer i Hongkong imod Kina, der slog fejl. Det, vi i øjeblikket ser i USA, er præcis den samme form for organisation, finansieret af Soros, og den har virkelig til formål at omstøde dette valg [af præsident Trump]. Det er meget alvorligt.

Og hele den historie med, at det var Rusland, der 'stjal' det amerikanske valg, er selvfølgelig fuldstændig latterlig. Det

var Hillary, der helt på egen hånd tabte valget. Hun talte om mennesker i det amerikanske midtvesten og rustbæltet, om de såkaldte »ynkværdige«, om de mennesker, der »ikke klarede det«. Det var disse mennesker, der stemte på Trump. Det, som dette etablissement absolut nægter at se, er, at det var deres politik for neoliberalisme, for skabelse af krig i Mellemøsten, baseret på løgne, i Irak, Afghanistan, Libyen og Syrien – hvilket er årsagen til, at vi har en gigantisk flygtningekrise i Europa; denne flygtningekrise var ikke årsagen til, men udløseren af Brexit, Storbritanniens udtræden af EU. Og mere fundamentalt; det var dette udsnit af den britiske befolkning, som følte, at de ikke længere blev repræsenteret af den Europæiske Union, og det var grunden til, at de ville ud. Det var i princippet nøjagtig samme grund til, at folk i USA ikke ville have Hillary, men stemte på Trump.

Hvis man ser på det fra et strategisk standpunkt; se ikke på det ud fra den interne, amerikanske situation, som i øjeblikket er meget polariseret. Se på massemedierne; aldrig har vi set et sådant hysteri i vores levetid. Så se ikke på det ud fra et internt, amerikansk standpunkt; se først på det ud fra et strategisk standpunkt. Og ud fra dette standpunkt kan man sige, at, alt imens Trump helt sikkert gør nogle ting, der ikke er perfekte; men det vigtigste spørgsmål er, at Trumps valgsejr betyder en mulig løsning på faren for krig. Hvis det var fortsat med Obama og Hillary, ville vi nu stå på en kort lunte til Tredje Verdenskrig, fordi hele inddæmningen af Rusland, af Kina, hele ideen med flyveforbudszoner over Syrien, på meget kort sigt ville have bragt os frem til en konfrontation med Rusland og Kina.

Trump's første aktiviteter af diplomatisk art er meget, meget positive, for han havde gode ordvekslinger med Xi Jinping, den kinesiske leder, og han karakteriserede diskussionerne som ekstremt venskabelige, ekstremt varme; og kineserne gav udtryk for den samme mening efter telefonsamtalen for et par dage siden.

Dernæst var der den japanske premierminister Abes besøg i USA, og de aftalte massive investeringer fra japanske selskaber i infrastruktur i USA; og Kina tilbød ligeledes at investere massivt i genopbygningen af den amerikanske infrastruktur. Trump havde jo lovet at investere \$1 billion i USA's infrastruktur, men ser man på den amerikanske infrastrukturens faktiske tilstand, så kan alle ganske klart se, at \$1 billion ikke rækker. Kinesiske eksperter har sagt, at der behøves \$8 billion, og Kina ville være villig til at investere en meget stor del af dette; og tilsammen ville Kina og Japan være i besiddelse af den fornødne industrielle kapacitet til at genopbygge den amerikanske infrastruktur på en meget effektiv måde, og på kort tid.

Den indledende korrespondance mellem Tillerson, den nye, amerikanske udenrigsminister, og den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov, der i dag mødtes i Bonn i forbindelse med G20, er ligeledes omhyggeligt, forsigtigt positive tegn på, at de mener, de kan arbejde sammen, og de ting, der skal overvindes, er selvsagt enorme, men dette er positive første skridt.

Ser man på det strategisk, så har USA's Trump-administration sagt, at de ikke er modstandere af Japans bestræbelser på at få gode relationer med Rusland. Premierminister Abe var i Rusland; han vil besøge Rusland yderligere to gange i år. Putin besøgte Japan i december. De samarbejder nu økonomisk om at udvikle Kurilerne, de såkaldte nordlige territorier; og Abe ønsker at underskrive en fredstraktat med Rusland i løbet af sin embedstid, dvs., inden for de næste par år.

Hvis USA har en positiv holdning over for Ruslands forbedring af relationerne med Japan, og hvis USA samtidig har lovende tegn på at forbedre relationerne med Kina, og Rusland og Kina arbejder rigtig godt sammen; og hvis USA dernæst kommer til en positiv aftale med Rusland, så har vi det! Så vil vi, for første gang i – jeg ved ikke hvor længe, måske for første gang i historien, nogensinde – så har vi muligheden for at rette op på relationerne mellem denne verdens stormagter, og vi har en

reel mulighed for at eliminere faren for krig for altid.

Dette er ekstremt vigtigt, for hvad er vigtigere end menneskeslægtens eksistens og perspektivet om at eliminere krig for evigt! I de termonukleare våbens tidsalder kan krig ikke længere være en måde at løse konflikter på.

Så dette er alt sammen meget positivt. Og Lyndon LaRouche, min mand, havde en meget positiv holdning til alle disse udviklinger, da han i løbet af de seneste dage blev briefet om dem. Han sagde, »Lad være med at gå i panik, lad være med at falde for massemediernes dækning. Det går alt sammen i en meget positiv retning.« Jeg mener, at der absolut er god grund til optimisme; og måden, hvorpå Trump responderer til dette kupforsøg; han siger, at det er efterretningssamfundet, der lækker klassificeret information til medierne; de deler det ud som slik, og der bør indledes en undersøgelse for kriminelle aktiviteter mod dem, der gør det. Og det er præcis den rette holdning.

Dette er et stort slag, for Trump-administrationen er selvsagt endnu ikke kommet på plads – mange udnævnelser [til regeringsposter] hænger stadig i luften, og nogle af dem er selvsagt problematiske, inklusive den meget store repræsentation af Wall Street, hvilket er et problem.

Det er derfor ekstremt vigtigt, at vi optrapper denne kampagne. Der finder en masse bevægelse sted i Kongressen. Vi så senator Cantwells tale, hvordan hun modsatte sig Mnuchin til posten som finansminister. Der foregår en masse bevægelse.

☒ Der er diverse medlemmer af delstatskongresserne, der implementerer ikke alene resolutioner for Glass-Steagall, men i realiteten det, der er Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love: først og fremmest Glass-Steagall; for det andet, en nationalbank (statsejet bank) til udstedelse af kredit; for det tredje, et kreditsystem, og for det fjerde, en forøgelse af arbejdskraftens produktivitet gennem at fokusere på opnåelse

af fusionskraft og rumteknologi, på basis af internationalt samarbejde. For, det er nødvendigt at forøge produktionsapparatets og arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Der er mange delstats-kongresser, jeg tror seks eller syv på nuværende tidspunkt, der har vedtaget disse **Fire Love**.

Det er, hvad denne aktion faktisk handler om: Hvordan kan vi optrappe denne kamp for grundlæggende set at skabe en situation, hvor Trump, når han holder sin Tale om Nationens Tilstand (28. feb.), inkluderer Glass-Steagall, den ægte Glass-Steagall, og ikke en eller anden udvandet 'ring-fencing' (intern bankopdeling), en Volcker-regel, eller noget som helst andet.

Dette er alt sammen ekstremt vigtigt, for vi vil udgive et dossier om Soros, der præcis viser, hvorfor dette apparat, der laver kupforsøget imod Trump-administrationen, er nøjagtig det, man gjorde i Ukraine; og jeg beder jer om at deltage i en aktionsdag den 23. februar, som er treårsdagen for kuppet i Ukraine, Maidan, der førte til kuppet. Og jeg beder jer også om at være med til at udsende viden om, hvad Soros-apparatet er, der står bag dette kup i USA.

Jeg vil lade det være godt med disse indledende bemærkninger, så I kan sige, hvad I vil, og dernæst kan vi diskutere det. Men jeg kan forsikre jer om, at [det drejer sig om] kampen i USA nu, for ikke alene at beskytte Trump-administrationen mod at blive kuppet og afsat, men for rent faktisk at sikre, at det potentiale, som denne administration repræsenterer, bliver implementeret. For muligheden for, at USA går i samarbejde med Kina, går med i Silkevejen, ikke alene ved at forlænge Silkevejen ind i USA gennem infrastrukturbyggeri, men ved også at samarbejde med Rusland og Kina i andre dele af verden. For eksempel i Mellemøsten, hvilket kun disse magter i fællesskab kan præstere; eller om industrialiseringen af Afrika, som Kina allerede har indledt med mange, mange spændende projekter.

Japan er involveret; Indien er involveret, og vi må få USA til at gå med i det, som FN netop har kaldt »menneskehedens fælles fremtid i Afrika«.

Ale disse store nationer må bringes til at arbejde sammen for hele civilisationens almene vel, og dette er inden for rækkevidde. Dette er meget spændende. For jeg mener, at vi står ved øjeblikke i historien, hvor, hvis folk har en god plan, så kan de ændre verden, og de kan ændre historien.

---

## **Putin anklager, at NATO »forsøger at trække os ind i en konfrontation«**

*17. feb. 2017* – Under et møde i Kreml den 16. feb. med bestyrelsen af statens sikkerhedstjeneste (FSB), kom den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin offentligt med anklager om, at NATO »provokerer os konstant og forsøger at trække os ind i en konfrontation. Vi ser fortsatte forsøg på at blande sig i vore interne anliggender i et forsøg på at destabilisere den sociale og politiske situation i selve Rusland.«

Putin anklagede, at situationen var blevet forværret, siden NATO-topmødet sidste juli i Warszawa, Polen, hvor »Rusland blev udråbt til at være alliancens hovedtrussel, for første gang siden 1989, og hvor NATO officielt erklærede, at inddæmningen af Rusland var alliancens nye mission. Det er med dette sigte, at NATO fortsætter sin ekspansion. Denne ekspansion har tidligere været i gang, men nu mener de, at de har alvorligere grunde til at gøre det. De har optrappet deployeringen af strategiske og konventionelle våben ud over grænserne af NATO's hovedmedlemslande«.

Det er, fastslog Putin, »ikke desto mindre i vores fælles interesse at genoprette dialogen med USA's efterretningstjenester og med andre NATO-medlemslande. Vi er ikke skyld i, at disse bånd blev afbrudt og ikke udvikler sig«. Putin har ved forskellige lejligheder udtalt, at han håber, at denne forværring fra Obama-årene ville blive rettet under præsident Putin.

Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, Alexander Grushko, havde lignende kommentarer, da han talte med pressen efter sin deltagelse i mødet i Rusland/NATO-rådet i Bruxelles. Grushko bemærkede, at der synes at være en vis erkendelse i NATO af »faren ved ikke at have nogen kommunikationskanaler med os«, men hidtil er der ikke opnået meget. Han angreb også NATO's provokationer og sagde, at »beslutningen om at forøge NATO's flådetilstedeværelse i Sortehavet under alle omstændigheder er endnu et skridt hen imod en optrapning af spændingerne i regioner, der er af vital betydning for Rusland«. Han tilføjede, at Rusland er i færd med at forstærke sine styrker mod syd og i Krim, som respons til NATO's øgede tilstedeværelse. »Vi er i færd med at genvæbne vores gruppe i Krim. Vi vil selvfølgelig træffe alle nødvendige forholdsregler for på passende vis at sikre Ruslands interesser i disse områder.«

*Foto: NATO-krigsskibe under en militærøvelse i Sortehavet.*

*Sea Shield 2017 flådeøvelser med deltagelse af syv NATO-lande og Ukraine begyndte den 1. februar i Sortehavet.*

---

**På en pressekonference**



# forsvarer præsident Trump kraftfuldt sin politik for opbygning af positive relationer med Rusland, Kina og Japan

17. feb., 2017 – Under en temperamentsfuld, 77 minutter lang pressekonference i går, gentog præsident Donald Trump med eftertryk sin politik over for Rusland, Kina, Japan og andre nationer, en politik, som gør Det britiske Imperium og dets servile medier apoplektiske: »Hvis vi kan komme godt ud af det med Rusland – og for resten også Kina og Japan og alle andre – hvis vi kan komme godt ud af det, ville det være en positiv ting, ikke en negativ ting.«

Pressekonferencen som helhed var et uregerligt slagsmål, hvor medierne overgik sig selv med at gå efter Trump og vise total despekt. Trump var ret onskabsfuld til gengæld, alt imens han eftertrykkeligt gentog sin politik for Rusland (blandt mange andre spørgsmål, der blev dækket).

Han forklarede, at medierne og andre forsøgte at oppiske befolkningen til at støtte en militær konfrontation med Rusland, som han fordømte som værende ekstremt farlig. »Et atomholocaust vil ikke være som noget som helst andet. De [Rusland] er et meget magtfuld, atomart land, og det er vi også. Hvis vi har et godt forhold til Rusland, så, tro mig, er det en god ting, ikke en dårlig ting.«

Han holdt fast i, at hele »Ruslands-tingen«, som oppiskes af medierne, er »en krigslist«:

»Jeg står her i dag for at fortælle jer, at hele denne Ruslands-ting er en krigslist. Det er en krigslist. Det ville

for resten være godt, hvis vi kom godt ud af det med Rusland, bare, så I forstår dette.

I morgen vil I sige, 'Donald Trump ønsker at komme godt ud af det med Rusland, det er forfærdeligt'. Det er ikke forfærdeligt. Det er godt ... Hvis vi kommer godt ud af det med Rusland, er det en positiv ting. Vi har en meget talentfuld mand, [udenrigsminister] Rex Tillerson, som snart skal mødes med dem, og jeg sagde til ham: 'Jeg ved, at det rent politisk nok ikke er så godt for mig'. Det mest storslåede, jeg kunne gøre, var at skyde det [russiske] skib, der ligger 30 mil ud for [den amerikanske] kysten, i søen. Alle i dette land ville sige, 'Ih, hvor er det fantastisk'. Det er ikke fantastisk.

Jeg ville virkelig gerne komme godt ud af det med Rusland. Se, vi har haft en masse præsidenter, der ikke har taget denne vending. Se, hvor vi nu er ...

Men jeg vil bare fortælle jer, at den falske rapportering fra medierne, fra jer folk, den falske, rædselsfulde, svindelagtige rapportering gør det langt vanskeligere at indgå en aftale med Rusland. Og Putin har sandsynligvis sagt, 'ved I hvad'. Han sidder bag sit skrivebord og siger, 'ved I hvad, jeg ser, hvad det er, der foregår i USA, jeg følger det nøje. Det vil blive umuligt for præsident Trump nogensinde at komme godt ud af det med Rusland, pga. alt det pres, han har med denne falske historie'. OK?

Og det er en skam, for, hvis vi kunne komme godt ud af det med Rusland – og for resten også med Kina og Japan og alle andre. Hvis vi kom godt ud af det, ville det være en positiv ting, og ikke en negativ ting.«

En journalist spurgte dernæst Trump: »Mener De, sir, at Putin afprøver Dem?«

Trump svarede: »Nej, det mener jeg ikke. Jeg tror, at Putin sandsynligvis antager, at han ikke længere kan indgå en aftale med mig, fordi det rent politisk ville være upopulært for en

politiker at indgå en aftale ... Hør, det ville være meget lettere for mig at være hård over for Rusland, men så kan vi ikke indgå en aftale. Nu ved jeg ikke, om vi kan lave en aftale. Jeg ved det ikke. Måske. Måske ikke. Men det ville være meget lettere for mig at være hård – jo hårdere, jeg er mod Rusland, desto bedre. Men ved I hvad? Jeg ønsker at gøre det, der er rigtigt for det amerikanske folk. Og for at være ærlig, som nummer to, ønsker jeg at gøre det, der er rigtigt for verden.«

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=00d5zUFeeEk>

---

## Hvad er det afgørende i kampen om Trumps præsidentskab?

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 13. februar, 2017* – Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har gjort klart, hvad situationen for organisering i USA er, ud fra et højere standpunkt end de bitre kampe over denne eller hin eksekutive ordre.

☒ De har arbejdet for at skabe et nyt paradigme i verden hen over mange års kamp for politikken med Verdenslandbroen, som nu er en realitet, der udvikler sig med udgangspunkt i Kina; for et nyt, globalt sikkerhedskoncept til erstatning for »geopolitik«, der nu er i færd med at blive realiseret af Ruslands Putin; og for de nye, økonomiske politikker for Vesten, som nu er specificeret for USA i form af **LaRouches Fire Love for at redde Nationen**.

Det afgørende er nu den mulighed, som Donald Trumps præsidentskab repræsenterer for, at disse nye politikker skal

blive virkeliggjort. For det første, at forhindre en atomkrig ved at begrave geopolitik, hvilket begynder med amerikansk samarbejde med Putins Rusland. For det andet, at komme endnu et overhængende finanssammenbrud i forkøbet, hvilket begynder med at genindføre Glass/Steagall-loven.

I dag påmindede Lyndon LaRouche: Der er en nyvalgt præsident. Vi har et nyt præsidentskab. Den nye præsident er allerede lykkedes med nogle internationale forhandlinger, der peger på *muligheden* for, at USA, Rusland, Kina, Japan og Indien tilslutter sig dette nye paradigme. Men dette er skrøbeligt med en hjemlig, økonomisk politik, der stadig i heldigste fald udgøres af endnu ikke udformede løfter; og det er under vedvarende angreb fra kræfter, der anføres af en hævngherrig Barack Obama og af briterne, der anførte alt, hvad Obama gjorde.

Dette angreb får tilslutning fra hele eliten og medierne i den Europæiske Union – som altid var et London-projekt – der ikke vil indse, at geopolitik og en økonomi for globalisme taber valg og folkeafstemninger overalt.

Det afgørende, sagde LaRouche, er at »gå til dette nye præsidentskab«, ved enhver organisatorisk mulig lejlighed, »og forhandle om vore spørgsmål«, LaRouches egne Fire Love. »Vi må ikke afvige fra dette nye præsidentskabs potentielle karakter, og fra at nå ind til denne potentielle karakter.«

Vi må omgående indse, at det nye Trump-præsidentskabs Akilleshæl er, at det ikke har opfyldt løftet om at genindføre Glass-Steagall. De liberale Demokrater, der talte højest, har kastet deres egne løfter om Glass-Steagall til side til fordel for at blive anti-Trump-demagoger. Vi udfylder dette tomrum og kender det økonomiske paradigme, Glass-Steagall kan føre til.

---

# Brug LaRouches videnskabelige autoritet til at skære igennem havet af uro og kaos

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 13. februar, 2017* – »Det globale, strategiske billede er dynamisk, omskifteligt, lovende og farligt, alt sammen på én gang«, udtalte Helga Zepp-LaRouche i en diskussion søndag med aktivister fra LaRouche-bevægelsen i hele USA. Hun påpegede flere positive udviklinger, der kommer fra Trump-administrationen – lovende og konstruktive samtaler med Kinas Xi Jinping; en ny åbning over for Rusland; potentielt, økonomisk samarbejde med Japan om højteknologisk infrastruktur; en erklæring om hans plan om at føre en seriøs krig mod narkotika – hvilket alt sammen betyder, at »der eksisterer en mulighed for at etablere et fornuftsplan i international politik«.

»Det står imidlertid også klart, at dette meget langt fra er afgjort: det er et *potentiale*«, understregede Zepp-LaRouche. »Meget kan gå galt, og meget afhænger af LaRouche-bevægelsens intervention, for jeg mener, i al beskedenhed, at LaRouche-organisationen er den eneste, der har en videnskabelig, sammenhængende anskuelse med hensyn til, hvad menneskehedens fremtid må være. Og andre kræfter, om de så er nok så gode, har tendens til at have ideologiske fejl i den ene eller anden retning.«

☒ Lykkeligvis er Lyndon LaRouches ideer fra 50 års intensiv videnskabelig og politisk aktivitet i færd med at blive den dominerende holdning i verden i dag. De dominerer den globale dynamik, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche, fra Kinas konfucianske renæssance til Ruslands bevægelse hen imod et moralsk samfund. LaRouches ideer har lagt grunden til at gøre en ende på

geopolitik og krig, én gang for alle, og for at genopbygge den globale økonomi omkring de principper, der fremlægges i **LaRouches Fire Love**.

Fr. Zepp-LaRouche fortsatte med at fordømme kampagnen for en 'farvet revolution' imod den nye Trump-administration, på grund af det positive potentiale, den repræsenterer. Hun udfordrede specifikt tidligere præsident Barack Obama, der er centrum for denne operation: »Dette er virkelig utroligt«, erklærede Zepp-LaRouche. »Dette har aldrig før fundet sted med en præsident, der har forladt embedet. Det ser ud til, at Obama nu personligt organiserer denne Farvede Revolution!«

I denne eksplosive atmosfære, som Zepp-LaRouche beskrev som »en hav af uro og kaos«, er det af afgørende betydning at organisere befolkningen ved at udgå fra det mest kvalificerede standpunkt, og ikke ved at bekymre os om petitesser, eller ved at lade os trække ind i det af medierne definerede »dagens varme emne«, men ved at præsentere de nødvendige forslag ud fra et standpunkt om, hvad der er den rette politik. De to centrale spørgsmål, som i dag konfronterer menneskeheden, understregede hun, er faren for en term nuklear verdenskrig, induceret af britisk geopolitik, og så det transatlantiske finanssystems visse, totale kollaps, med mindre Glass-Steagall og relaterede forholdsregler vedtages.

»En kombination af USA, Kina, Rusland, Japan, Indien og andre større nationer er det, der kræves, for at nå frem til et globalt, Nyt Paradigme ... Det, der er vigtigt, er at overvinde geopolitik, for geopolitik fører til Tredje Verdenskrig, og så vil der ikke længere findes nogen menneskehed tilbage af betydning.«

»Det andet, vigtige spørgsmål er, at finanssystemet vil nedsmelte, big time. Derfor er Glass-Steagall og Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love det, der er absolut afgørende. Det faktum, at Glass-Steagall hidtil endnu ikke er blevet implementeret, er Trump-administrationens Akilleshæl.«

Alle de positive ting, som Trump hidtil har gjort, vil gå op i røg, konkluderede Zepp-Larouche, med mindre Glass-Steagall implementeres. Dette faktum dikterer, med hensyn til omgående handling, en fortsat kampagne, der kræver, at Trump bruger sin Tale om Nationens Tilstand ('State of the Union') den 28. februar til at bebude en tilbagevenden til Franklin Roosevelts originale Glass/Steagall-lov fra 1933.

---

## **NATO's militære oprustning i Baltikum fortsætter**

10. feb., 2017 – USA/NATO's militære oprustning, der blev sat i gang under Barack Obamas præsidentskab, fortsætter på autopilot. Den 7. feb. blev hundreder af tyske tropper budt velkommen til Litauen af den litauiske præsident, Dalia Grybauskaitė. De tyske tropper skal danne kernen i NATO-kampgruppen for Litauen. Den 10. feb. blev de fulgt af et pansret kompagni med 120 amerikanske tropper, der medbragte 10 M1 tanks og 5 Bradley kampvogne. De baltiske Stater kræver imidlertid endnu mere fra NATO, og bruger den russiske Zapad 2017-øvelse, der skal finde sted til september, som påskud. »Vi ser, at risiciene øges, og vi er bekymrede over den forestående 'Zapad 2017'-øvelse, som vil deployere en meget stor og aggressiv styrke (på vore grænser), som meget demonstrativt vil forberede krig mod Vesten«, sagde Grybauskaitė efter samtaler med sine modparter fra Letland og Estland i Riga, iflg. en rapport fra Reuters. »Dette betyder, at vi vil forhandle med NATO om skabelse af yderligere stående forsvarsplaner, om at udstationere yderligere militære midler og om at skabe en hurtigere beslutningstagningsproces«, sagde hun. Reuters tilføjede, at de tre, baltiske ledere vil udføre lobbyisme over for den amerikanske forsvarsminister, James

Mattis, om yderligere amerikanske tropper, under München Sikkerhedskonferencen den 17.-19. feb.

Ikke overraskende responderer russerne til den fortsatte NATO-oprustning. »Alliancen vides at have deployeret hundreder af militærbaser langs den temmelig store omkreds af Rusland. Den reelle forøgelse af antallet af NATO-tropper i lande, der støder op til Rusland, gennem permanente rotationer af mandskabskontingenter, så vel som også fraværet af en konstruktiv dialog med os, tvinger Rusland til at tage seriøse gengældesskridt«, sagde Ruslands ambassadør til Litauen, Alexander Udaltsov, her til morgen til Sputnik. Samtidig holdt han imidlertid en dør åben for russisk-litauisk samarbejde om spørgsmål af fælles interesse. »For øvrigt kan Rusland arbejde tættere sammen med Litauen mht. at indskrænke terrortrusler og fremme grænsernes sikkerhed. Vi har sådanne forslag, så det er muligt at gå frem med deres realisering«, sagde Udaltsov.

Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov adresserede ligeledes i dag NATO's oprustning. »Alliancens igangværende aktiviteter i de områder, der grænser op til de russiske grænser, er helt bestemt provokerende og destabiliserende«, sagde han til Izvestiya i et interview. Lavrov sagde, Rusland ville forme sin respons til de fremvoksende risici i overensstemmelse hermed og »er i færd med at tage skridt til at neutralisere potentielle og reelle trusler«. »Rusland er et fredeligt land. Men vores fred er baseret på evnen til at garantere landets sikkerhed i enhver situation. Vi er fortsat fortalere for en snarlig deeskalering af den militærpolitiske situation i Europa«, tilføjede han.

*Foto: Tirsdag, 7. feb.: Den tyske forsvarsminister Ursula von der Leyen, højre, og Litauens præsident Dalia Grybauskaitė, taler med en soldat under velkomstceremonien for NATO's forstærkede, fremskudte bataljon, som fandt sted på Rukla-militærbasen omkring 130 km vest for hovedstaden Vilnius, Litauen.*



---

# **Briterne trækker stoppeklodserne væk for ødelæggelse af Trump – Den nøgterne verden fremmer samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina omkring et Nyt Paradigme**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 7. februar, 2017* – Den kinesiske udenrigsminister, Wang Yi, svarede en australsk journalist, der spurgte, hvor bekymret han var for, at der ville blive krig mellem USA og Kina, at præsident Trump og præsident Xi havde talt sammen, og at de begge var »100 % enige« om, at de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer ville være »meget positive«, og at »enhver nøgtern politiker« indser, at »der kan ikke være en konflikt mellem Kina og USA, fordi begge ville tabe, og det har ingen af siderne råd til«. Wang tilføjede, at Kina vurderer den officielle politik fra USA's side, og ikke »kampagne-retorik«.

Der er liden nøgternhed i England i disse dage, og heller ikke i den hektiske, miskrediterede Obama-lejr i USA. *The Economist*, et hovedtalerør for City of London og Storbritanniens monarki, har en hovedhistorie i denne uge, der viser Donald Trump, som kaster en Molotovcocktail, med overskriften: »En oprører i Det Hvide Hus.« De understreger,

at »USA's allierede er bekymrede, og med rette«. Deres bekymring går på, at netværket af traktater og handelsaftaler, som Trump behandler med foragt, »udgør et system, der binder Amerika til sine allierede og projicerer dets magt ud i hele verden«.

Lige præcist. Her har vi Det britiske Imperium, som indrømmer, at de har brugt USA som den 'dumme kæmpe' ved at bruge USA's militære og økonomiske magt til at opretholde Det britiske Imperium, baseret på den geopolitiske forudsætning, at verden må forblive splittet, Øst vs. Vest. Se, ikke alene indgår Trump fred med den formodede »fjende«, Rusland og Kina, men kendsgerningen er også, at London er rædselsslagen over, at dette vil få indvirkning på alle andre lande, som hidtil er blevet tvunget til at følge Imperiets militære og økonomiske diktater. Som *The Economist* ligefremt skriver: »Lande, der er utilfredse med verden, kunne fristes til at ændre den.«

Det forbyde Gud!

Imperiet er tydeligvis ude efter mord, som de gentagne gange har gjort med amerikanske præsidenter, der forsvarede de principper, hvorpå Amerika blev grundlagt, imod den ondskab, som er Det britiske Imperium. Londons Obama og hans håndlangere har lanceret en række »farvede revolution«-operationer i hele USA, hvis mål er at bringe Trump til fald. Hvad Molotovcocktails angår, så var det ikke Trump, men sortklædte anarkister, der i sidste uge kastede dem mod politiet i Berkeley, Californien, for at splitte en pro-Trump-begivenhed. Tidligere højtplacerede Obama-regeringsfolk har mobiliseret to »Ven af Domstolen«-briefs ('*amicus curiae*'[1]) til støtte for den delstatsdommer i Washington, der nedkendte Trumps immigrationsordre og ganske åbenlyst indrømmede, at dette blot var en belejlig måde at aktivere en 'farvet revolution' imod regeringen på. Trumps handlinger er »u-amerikanske«, skrider de, alt imens de intet siger om Obamas tusindvis af ulovlige dronedrab, ulovlige krige for »regimeskifte« i ledtog med terrorister og trusler om

verdenskrig med Rusland og Kina. Faktisk var en af disse briefs skrevet af Harold Koh, berygtet som Obamas advokat, der udtalte den juridiske vurdering, at Obamas dronedrab var legale og således grundlæggende set spyttede på Forfatningen og international lov.

Alt imens Trump har fordømt mange af de mest ekstreme Obama-politikker, der har ødelagt nationens økonomi og efterladt landet forhadet i store dele af verden, så har Lyndon og Helga LaRouche krævet, at Trump også afslører en af de ondeste af Obamas onde gerninger: orkestreringen af et fascistisk kup imod Ukraines valgte regering i 2014, som dernæst blev brugt i Obamas bestræbelse på at fremprovokere en krig med Rusland. *EIR* har meget detaljeret dokumenteret den åbenlyse støtte fra Obama og hans agent, [tidligere amerikanske viceudenrigsminister for europæiske og eurasiske anliggender] Victoria Nuland, til de svastika-bærende neonazister, der anførte denne voldelige kamp. Selv Polens politiske leder, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, fordømte i dag den ukrainske regering for sin fortsatte støtte til dem, der bakkede op om Stepan Bandera – Hitlers kollaboratør i Ukraine – og som fortsat paraderer i gaderne med Banderas bannere og behandler enhver politisk opposition med brutalitet.[2]

Verden er gjort klar til, én gang for alle, at bortfeje Det britiske Imperium. Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i sidste uge, hvis præsident Trump bringer USA ind i et samarbejde med Rusland om nedkæmpelse af terrorisme, og bringer USA ind i et samarbejde med Kina omkring den Nye Silkevejsudvikling med nationsopbygning i alle hjørner af kloden, vil han blive husket som en af historiens største ledere. Vi må alle handle med al vor menneskelige kreativitet for at bringe dette skønne resultat til fuldførelse.

*Foto: Den russiske præsident Putin med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, maj, 2015. [kremlin.ru]*

[1] En *amicus curiae* (bogstaveligt, 'ven af

domstolen/retten'), er en person, der ikke er part i en sag, og som ikke er hyret af en part, men som assisterer en domstol ved at tilbyde information, der har betydning for sagen. *Amicus curiae* er juridisk latin. (definition Wikipedia).

[2] Vi anbefaler læsning af vores hjemmesides meget udførlige dækning af kuppet i Ukraine og Victoria Nulands fremtrædende rolle i at fremprovokere den. SE tag 'Ukraine'.

---

# Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: Iran en værdifuld antiterrorisme-partner

7. feb., 2017 – Under en fælles pressekonference i Moskva med sin modpart fra Venezuela, tilbageviste den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov totalt den idé, som de seneste par dage er udsendt fra Washington, at Iran skulle være den »førende sponsor« af terrorisme. Faktisk demonstrerede Lavrov, at det modsatte er tilfældet, derved, at Iran bekæmper ISIS og al-Qaeda, de to grupper, som præsident Trump har lovet især at udrydde.

»Præsident Trump har gentagne gange, både under sin valgkamp og som tiltrådt præsident, erklæret, at truslen om international terrorisme, der repræsenteres af det såkaldte 'Islamisk Stat', er det udenrigspolitiske hovedspørgsmål«, sagde Lavrov. »Hvis dette er tilfældet, og vi er fælles om dette mål, ligesom det store flertal af andre lande, så må vi huske, at Iran aldrig har haft nogen som helst relation med ISIS eller Jabhat al-Nusra, eller nogen anden gruppe, der er

affilieret til disse terroristorganisationer, og som er inkluderet på den tilsvarende liste fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd.«

»Vi har længe talt om nødvendigheden (præsident Putin nævnte det på FN's Generalforsamling i 2015) af at danne en virkelig universel front imod terrorisme«, fortsatte Lavrov. »Alle de, der ser ISIS som en eksistentiel trussel mod mange lande, bør handle på en koordineret måde under én paraply. Jeg er overbevist om, at, hvis vi bruger en objektiv fremgangsmåde mht. potentielle deltagere i en sådan koalition, bør Iran selvfølgelig være en del af vore fælles bestræbelser.«

Lavrov gik videre med at påpege, at Den Finansielle Specialenhed for Pengehvidvasknings seneste undersøgelse af, hvorvidt Iran overholder sine forpligtelser, ikke fandt noget at kritisere. »Desuden fandt undersøgelsen, at Iran gør sit bedste og arbejder i den rigtige retning«, sagde Lavrov. »Så jeg synes, vi bør fokusere på fakta.«

---

## **Hvis Trump slutter USA til Kinas Nye Silkevej, vil han huskes som en af historiens store ledere**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. februar, 2017* – Alle medlemmer bør i dag lytte til vores nationale aktivistbriefing (pr. telefon), så vel som også til [Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale](#) på Manhattan-konferencen lørdag, og især [hendes kommentarer efter dr. Patrick Hos tale](#), hvor hun foreslår en international konference for i dybden at adressere de historiske misforståelser i Kina og Vesten omkring den anden parts sande,

storslåede kulturer. Lige såvel som briterne løj vildt om arten af den konfucianske kultur til den vestlige verden, så arbejdede de samtidig flittigt for at inducere kineserne til at tro, at den degenererede, britiske imperieideologi var den vestlige tankegangs karakteristiske ideologi.[1]

I søndags understregede Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, at den afskyelige »farvede revolution«, der føres imod den nye Trump-regering, både i USA og i Europa, må afsløres som de britiske/Obama-ondskab, som den er, men at man ikke behøver blive dér, og slet ikke blive trukket med ind i de fabrikerede, splittende debatter, der faldbydes i pressen. Befolkningen har fået en brat opvågning – det, Renée Sigerson kaldte en »optøning« fra 16 års intellektuel dybfrysning – både gennem det økonomiske og kulturelle sammenbruds virkelighed, men også gennem valget af en person, der afviser krig – både krige for regimeskifte og global krig med Rusland – så vel som også den perverse »offentlige mening«, der repræsenteres af mainstream-medierne, og det 'grønne' vanvid, der bruges til at retfærdiggøre globalisering (læs: Det britiske Imperium) og sammenbruddet af industri i indland og udland.

Dette er et historisk øjeblik for revolutionært, kreativt lederskab

– det øjeblik, for hvilket Lyndon LaRouche opbyggede denne organisation. Der er ingen tid til frygt eller forkrøblende bekymring over, hvad »de« kunne gøre. Som Lyndon LaRouche i dag sagde: »Ikke bekymring, bekymring, bekymring, men win, win, win.«

[1] Se: »The British Role in the Creation of Maoism«, [http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1992/eirv19n36-19920911/eirv19n36-19920911\\_048-the\\_british\\_role\\_in\\_the\\_creation.pdf](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1992/eirv19n36-19920911/eirv19n36-19920911_048-the_british_role_in_the_creation.pdf)

---

# **Glass-Steagall-lovforslag fremsat i USA's Kongres – Nu skal loven vedtages sammen med LaRouches Fire Love**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 1. februar, 2017* – Tre udviklinger fandt i dag sted i Washington, D.C., som satte scenen for et politisk opgør, der vil afgøre, om USA's økonomi, og nationen USA, vil overleve.

Den første udvikling: Kongresmedlem Marcy Kaptur annoncerede genfremsættelsen af sit Glass/Steagall-lovforslag i den aktuelle, 115. nationale kongressamling, med 26 medsponsorer. Hun holdt også en højtprofileret pressekonference sammen med kongresmedlemmerne Walter Jones, Tulsi Gabbard og Tim Ryan, hvor hun udtalte: »Præsident Donald Trump har under sin valgkamp, i Charlotte, North Carolina, krævet en 'Glass/Steagall-version for det 21. århundrede'. Vi har en forpligtelse til at arbejde sammen med ham for at gennemføre dette.«

Dette er præcis den form for tværpolitisk fremstød, der kræves for at tvinge Det britiske Imperium og Wall Street til at sluge den medicin, de afskyer – men som landet og verden så desperat behøver.

Den anden udvikling: Pressetalsmand for Det Hvide Hus, Sean Spicer, responderede til *EIR's* Bill Jones' forespørgsel om, hvorvidt præsident Trump stadig støtter Glass-Steagall, som han i valgkampagnen tilbage i oktober 2016 havde erklæret, at

han gjorde. Jones refererede til de »tvetydige« udtalelser fra den nominerede finansminister, Steven Mnuchin, hvis godkendelseshøring i Senatet i øjeblikket pågår. Spicer forsikrede Jones og det forsamlede pressekorps om, at Trumps politik fortsat er »konsekvent« omkring Glass-Steagall.

Den tredje udvikling: Det skammelige syn af de Republikanske medlemmer af Senatets Finanskomite, der rev deres egen regelbog i stykker, for at godkende nomineringen af Steven Mnuchin, der er i åbenlys opposition til Glass-Steagall, til posten som finansminister, på trods af den kendsgerning, at ikke én eneste Demokratisk senator var til stede – en åbenlys overtrædelse af Senatets regler. Denne manøvre har *de facto* indført et parlamentarisk system i Washington – i det mindste for indværende. Nomineringen af George Soros' øksemand Mnuchin går nu videre til det fulde Senat til vedtagelse, med mindre én senator – en hvilken som helst senator – kræver, at spørgsmålet sættes i »venteposition«.

I dag sagde Lyndon LaRouche til medarbejdere, at Glass-Steagall er fjendens mest sårbare punkt, og at vi må virkeliggøre hensigten i Kongressen som helhed, med en klar politisk programerklæring i dette spørgsmål. Dét tager vi først, sagde han; vi kan få et flertal imod dem, og dernæst gå videre til resten af de Fire Love, der kræves for en national og international, økonomisk genrejsning.

Under den samme diskussion med medarbejderne understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at vores mobilisering både må gå meget hurtigt frem for, inden for de næste 24 timer, at finde senatorer, der vil kæve spørgsmålet om Mnuchins godkendelse sat på »venteposition«; og også gå i dybden, for at opnå en omgående tilbagevenden til Glass-Steagall og LaRouches Fire Love. Dette spørgsmål om Glass-Steagall er den ene af to, centrale politiske kampe, der må vindes i, og omkring, den tiltrædende Trump-administration, understregede hun. Den anden politiske kamp er at komme væk fra randen af termonuklear krig med Rusland og Kina, som Bush' og Obamas politik har skabt,



baseret på en genetablering af en fornuftig relation mellem USA og Rusland.

Trump gør betydelige tiltag i denne henseende, som det atter blev understreget af Kremles talsmand Dmitri Peskov, der roste den »gode og konstruktive« telefonsamtale, som Trump og Putin havde den 28. januar. Og det voksende hysteri hos talsmænd for Det britiske Imperium og Wall Street, der huler op om, hvordan Trump har skabt »exceptionel usikkerhed« for dem ved at samtale venskabeligt med Putin, viser, at der gøres reelt fremskridt.

Tiden er nu inde til at gøre Det britiske Imperiums værste mareridt til sandhed, i begge disse spørgsmål.

(Video: Pressekonference med Marcy Kaptur, Tulsi Gabbard, Walter Jones, Tim Ryan).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xFH1Mwhx0Qk>

---

# **Formand for EU-rådet Donald Tusk: Europa konfronteres med eksistentiel trussel fra Rusland, Kina og nu USA**

*31. jan., 2017* – Når man hører de europæiske »lederes« seneste ordskvalder, ved man ikke, om man skal le eller tilkalde en ambulance, så disse stakkels mennesker kan komme i ordentlig

lægebehandling, af hensyn til offentlighedens sikkerhed. Nu har formanden for Det europæiske Råd, Donald Tusk, fra Polen, en af Den europæiske Unions tre »præsidenter«, krævet, at Europa forener sig imod den eksistentielle trussel, som udgøres af Rusland, Kina – og nu USA!

I et brev, skrevet til EU-medlemsnationernes ledere forud for EU-topmødet i Malta i denne uge, advarer Tusk om, at EU's udfordrere er »farligere end nogensinde«. Disse farer, der kommer fra et »selvhævdende Kina, især på havene; Ruslands aggressive politik mod Ukraine og dets naboer; krig, terror og anarki i Mellemøsten og Afrika, hvor radikal islamisme spiller en hovedrolle, såvel som også bekymrende erklæringer fra den nye, amerikanske administration, gør vores fremtid yderst uforudsigelig«. I anden række udgøres farerne af euro-skepticisme og de pro-europæiske elitors svaghed.

Men for Tusk er truslen fra udlandet langt den farligste: »I dag må vi klart hævde vores værdighed, et forenet Europas værdighed – hvad enten vi taler med Rusland, Kina, USA eller Tyrkiet... Vi må gøre det ganske klart, at opløsningen af Den europæiske Union ikke vil føre til genoprettelsen af en eller anden mytisk, fuld suverænitæt af dens medlemslande, men derimod til deres reelle og faktiske afhængighed af de store supermagter; USA, Rusland og Kina. Kun sammen kan vi være helt uafhængige.« Med andre ord, hvis man forsøger at genvinde ens suverænitæt fra EU, så bliver man en del af det Nye Paradigme!

(Tusk kunne have været mere farverig og advaret om truslen fra barbarerne fra de russiske stepper, den gule trussel, tyrken og dem, der pønser på at fratage kongerne deres guddommelige ret til at herske.)

Ifølge den tyrkiske avis *Yeni Safak* sagde europæiske diplomater, at højtplacerede nationale regeringsfolk og diplomater havde diskuteret en mulig respons til Trump ved et møde i Bruxelles mandag, men mere fattede personer advarede om, at europæerne ikke skulle handle overilet og fremmedgøre

en hovedallieret.

*Foto: Formand for Det europæiske Råd, Donald Tusk*

---

# Norges forsvarschef kræver en dialog mellem USA, Rusland og NATO

31. jan., 2017 – Forsvarschefen for de Norske Bevæbnede Styrker, admiral Haakon Bruun-Hanssen, krævede, i et interview med nyhedstjenesten Norsk Telegrambyrå (NTB), en direkte dialog med Rusland for at nedskalere de spændinger, der er opbygget i relationerne mellem USA og NATO på den ene side, og Rusland på den anden.

»Det er vigtigt for Norge, USA og NATO at kombinere forholdsregler for begrænsning med en dialog i relationerne med Rusland«, sagde Bruun-Hanssen, da en reporter spurgte ham, hvad han mente om udsigterne for de russisk-amerikanske relationer efter den første telefonsamtale mellem præsidenterne Vladimir Putin og Donald Trump. »Dette [kombinationen af begrænsning og dialog] er nødvendigt for at nedskalere de spændinger, der er opstået i sikkerhedssfæren«, sagde han.

Bruun-Hanssen advarede ligeledes imod russisk aktivitet i Det arktiske Område og sagde, at Norge burde tage skridt, og allerede gør et, med henblik på at afvise disse hypotetiske, nye trusler. Norge vil ligeledes udvide sin kapacitet for indsamling og analyse af situationen i havene i Det arktiske Område, iflg. en rapport fra TASS.

Samtidig sagde Bruun-Hanssen, at det norske militær ikke havde nogen klager imod deres russiske modparter i 2016, idet russerne havde udvist en professionel tilgang til deres aktiviteter.

*Foto: Forsvarschefen for de Norske Bevæbnede Styrker, admiral Haakon Bruun-Hanssen.*

---

## Hold jer til LaRouches dagsorden

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. januar, 2017* – Tiden er atter inde for verden til at lytte til de vise ord fra Lyndon LaRouche. De spørgsmål, som han nu i årtier har været fortaler for, er nu eksistentielle spørgsmål for transatlantiske nationer, hvis »eliter« har mistet deres lederskab, og som bogstaveligt talt også er gået fra forstanden over de afvisninger, som rammer dem i nationale valg og afsættelser.

✘ Netop, som det amerikanske præsidentskab er brudt ud af atlanticisternes indespærring, bliver LaRouches ideer nu repræsenteret med voksende styrke af den nye, strategiske trekant, Rusland-Kina-Indien. Dette nye paradigme repræsenterer den eneste, produktive vej for USA at gå – og dette har LaRouche grundigt forklaret i de »**Fire Love til USA's Redning**«. Dét er vores mobilisering, med Trump-administrationens retning, der endnu er uafklaret. Vi bør ikke udelukke betydningen af Trumps uforsonlighed over for den britiske kongefamilies forsøg på at gelejde ham ind i en politik for krig med Rusland, og for krig imod industri og vareproduktion; og heller ikke hans uforsonlighed imod konservative GOP-tosser som McCain og Graham, og imod Obama-

maskinen.

Mandag gentog Helga Zepp-LaRouche, hvad hun havde sagt under søndagens **diskussion om vores mobilisering**; at det absolut vigtigste er – at forhindre Tredje Verdenskrig; dette på den måde, som Lyndon LaRouche har specificeret, og som er den eneste mulige måde, nemlig gennem en amerikansk præsident, der accepterer Putins strategiske geni og aftaler at samarbejde. Denne amerikanske præsident vil således, langsomt, men sikkert, være i færd med at samarbejde også med Indien og Kina. En Trump, der ikke er under britisk kontrol og atlanticistkontrol, er i færd med at tage nogle skridt i denne retning.

Det betyder at gennemtvinge Glass-Steagall så hurtigt som muligt og at mobilisere omkring Lyndon LaRouches politik med de Fire Love for en økonomisk genrejsning. Dette må være omdrejningspunktet for vores mobilisering, på trods af det hysteri, der sender den etablerede elite ud på gaderne i forsøg på at standse Trump.

Sidste uges mobilisering for at holde George Soros' partner Steven Mnuchin ude af USA's Finansministerium og i stedet fremme Glass-Steagall er først ved at komme i gang. Her til aften blev Mnuchins forventede godkendelse i Senatets Finanskomite blokeret af Demokratiske senatorer, men kun til i morgen, hvor kampen i komiteen genoptages. Frontlinjen i Senatet må fortsat være talstærk, med mange delegationers kampagne for Glass-Steagall på Capitol Hill på onsdag. Vi må holde øje med Chuck Schumers krokodilletårer og fortsætte mobiliseringen omkring LaRouches politik.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag tilføjede; de har indespærret amerikanske præsidenter i mere end et halvt århundrede, og indespærret Lyndon LaRouche i mere end 30 år; nu er begge i færd med at bryde ud.

---

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

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

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

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

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

terrorisme og mange andre lignende problemer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\* En Nationalbank i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton;

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

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

**(Se: Lyndon LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love:)**

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## **Hold George Soros' allierede Steven Mnuchin væk fra Trumps Finansministerium!**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 25. januar, 2017* – George Soros, mangeårig agent for den britiske indflydelse, mega-spekulant og ødelægger af nationer, er den selvudnævnte, førende finansmagt, der står bag det politiske fremstød for at ødelægge Donald Trumps præsidentskab, eller endda bringe det til fald. Han var også den førende, for ikke at sige den primære, sponsor af Barack Obamas adkomst til præsidentskabet. Det er en fatal fejltagelse, at én af George Soros' mangeårige medarbejdere, partnere og medinvestorer, Steven Mnuchin, nu måske bliver præsident Trumps finansminister!

Soros – som allerede har støttet en masse-march på Washington imod Trump, og som støtter et »forfatningsmæssigt« sagsanlæg, der intet som helst har på sig, i et forsøg på at stille ham for en rigsret – har ansat eller arbejdet sammen med den udpegede finansminister Steven Mnuchin omkring finansielle spekulationer i næsten 15 år. I Davos, Schweiz, sagde Soros:

»Personligt er jeg overbevist om, at han [Trump] vil mislykkes ... jeg ønsker, at han vil mislykkes.«

En godkendelse af Mnuchin truer med at ødelægge præsident Trumps løfte om at genopbygge USA's økonomi.

Donald Trumps administration vandt det amerikanske folks støtte med kampagneløfter om at modernisere Amerikas infrastruktur og bygge højhastighedsjernbaner, moderne havne og teknologisk avanceret vareproduktion. Dette indebærer, at Amerika atter får et rumprogram som Kina og Rusland har det, og som ville forøge den amerikanske økonomis produktivitet, ligesom JFK's »Moonshot« gjorde i 1969. USA og verden har brug for term nuklear fusionskraft – den energi, der udgør Solens kraft, og som udleder simpel H<sub>2</sub>O som sit biprodukt – som energikilde til at udføre udforskning af andre himmellegemer.

En Steven Mnuchin i Finansministeriet vil ikke lade dette ske; han er modstander af en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven, som Trump lovede »for atter at få kredit til at strømme til små foretagender«; han investerer sammen med spekulanten Soros, der bringer regeringer til fald gennem finansiell manipulation og ved at finansiere »farvede revolutioner«.

Mnuchin har været politisk og finansiell fælde til George Soros siden i hvert fald 2002. Efter 12 år hos Goldman Sachs – tænk på pro-Wall Street finansministre som Robert Rubin (1995-99) og Hank Paulson (2006-09) – blev Mnuchin rekrutteret af George Soros til at køre det Soros-støttede SFM Capital, der blev etableret for at købe »højrisiko-værdipapirer«. Mnuchin arbejdede også for Soros Fund Management. Støttet af Soros stiftede han Dune Capital Management med tidligere kolleger fra Goldman Sachs.

Nathan Vardi skrev i *Forbes*-magasinet den 22. juli, 2014: »Et hold, bestående af nogle af Wall Streets største navne og partner i Goldman Sachs, Steve Mnuchin, der var dets adm. dir., står til at indkassere en stor gevinst ved salget af One

West Bank til CIT-gruppen for \$3,4 mia.« Dette »hold« af hedgefonds var Soros Capital Management og seks andre funds, der købte Indy May og gjorde Mnuchin til adm. dir. af det omdøbte One West.

»I 2009«, fortsatte Vardi, »opkøbte gruppen aktiverne i det tidligere Indy May fra FDIC (USA's Statens Indskudsgarantifond), der havde overtaget dets aktiver. Gruppen betalte \$1,55 mia. for banken, der var i vanskeligheder i finanskrisen, og det skatteborgerfinansierede FDIC gik ind på at dele tabene på en låneportefølje. Mnuchins gruppe købte Indy Mac Bank, der udsatte titusinder af husejere, for \$1,55 mia.; ændrede navnet til One West Bank og solgte den til CIT-gruppen for \$3,4 mia. i juli 2014. Soros Management var gået i partnerskab med seks andre hedgefonds for at erhverve Indy Mac.«

Soros-Mnuchin-forbindelsen var så vedvarende, at en finans-website, ZeroHedge, den 11. nov., umiddelbart efter valget af Donald Trump, skrev, at »medarbejder ved Soros Fund Management, Steven Mnuchin«, var ved at blive kørt i stilling til noget større i Trump-administrationen.

Den generelle finanskrisen og krisen på ejendomsmarkedet i 2008 kunne aldrig være sket, hvis Glass/Steagall-loven af 1933 ikke var blevet ophævet af agenter for Wall Street-spekulanter. Man ville ikke have haft nogen bailout (statslig bankredning) af spekulanter. I sin valgkampagne støttede præsident Trump og det Republikanske partiprogram genindførelsen af Glass-Steagall. Men, da Mnuchin var til godkendelses-høring i Senatets Finanskomite, sagde han til senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA), at han ikke støttede, og ikke ville støtte, genindførelsen af Glass/Steagall-loven af 1933. Der findes ingen anden Glass-Steagall at støtte, til trods for, at Mnuchin forsøgte at opfinde én.

George Soros mener, og håber, at præsident Donald Trump vil mislykkes. I et videointerview fra Davos Økonomiske

Verdensforum den 19. jan., 2017, sagde Soros til *Bloombergs* Francine Laqua: »Personligt er jeg overbevist om, at han [Trump] vil mislykkes; ikke pga. folk som mig, der gerne ser ham mislykkes, men fordi de ideer, han ledes af, er iboende selvmodsige. Disse selvmodsigelser er allerede inkorporeret i hans rådgivere ... og i hans regeringskabinet. Man vil derfor se, at de forskellige etableringer bekæmper hinanden og forårsager et meget uforudsigeligt resultat ... uforudsigelighed er en fjende på lang sigt.«

Men, bortset fra blot Soros, så ønsker London at få kontrollen over Trump-præsidentskabet og ændre det tilbage til Obamas krigskonfrontationer mod Rusland OG Kina, og til »globalisering«. Soros' mand er Londons og Wall Streets mand. Han må holdes ude af Finansministeriet.

*Foto: Et fatalt triumvirat i den amerikanske regering: Præsident Donald Trump, der i sin valgkampagne har aflagt løfte over for amerikanerne om at genindføre Glass-Steagall, omgivet af den (måske) nye finansminister, Steven Mnuchin (højre) og dennes mangeårige partner ud i spekulationsforretninger', den globale storspekulant, George Soros.*

---

## **Målet for fredsforhandlinger i Astana: Syrien bør tilhøre syrere**

22. jan., 2017 – På tærsklen til fredsforhandlingerne i Astana, Kasakhstan, den 23. januar, rapporterer Sputnik i sin tyrkiske udgave, at »Tyrkiets primære mål er at sikre fred i Syrien og landets territoriale integritet«, med et citat af medlem af udenrigsudvalget og parlamentet, Hasan Basri Kurt

fra det regerende Lov og Udviklingsparti, AKP. Krigen har været i fem år, sagde Kurt, og »Mødet i Astana er det vitale initiativ fra Rusland og Tyrkiet, der har til formål at opnå fred og stabilitet i Syrien. Hele verden behandler dette initiativ med respekt og følger ængsteligt med i udviklingerne.«

Kurt sagde, at Tyrkiets mål er at inddrage mange flere deltagere i fredsforhandlingerne om Syrien, og at forhandlingerne i Astana vil blive endnu et skridt fremad. »Det er værd at understrege, at landene i området var ivrige efter at udtale deres initiativer for forhandlingerne, ulig i Genève. Det er højst usandsynligt, at dette vil blive det eneste og endegyldige møde. Vi håber imidlertid, at deltagerne i forhandlingerne vil kunne aftale en fortsat opretholdelse af våbenhvilen og en genoprettelse af fred i landet.«

Dr. Celalettin Yavuz, en tidligere udenrigspolitisk rådgiver til lederen af Partiet National Bevægelse (MHP), fortalte Sputnik om den syriske oppositions mål. Han sagde, at én idé, der må diskuteres i Astana, vil være at bringe de forenede oppositionsgrupper sammen med regeringshæren om at bekæmpe terroristgrupper i Syrien. »Den syriske regerings bevæbnede styrker er fortsat den største magt i landet, der kan samle de forskellige grupper, som opererer i landet.«

Han sagde, »Det vigtigste formål for forhandlingerne i Astana er at enes om russiske og tyrkiske officerers deltagelse i den fortsatte kamp mod jihadisterne.« Han sagde, at Damaskus bør være øverstkommanderende over operationerne mod Daesh (Islamisk Stat).

*Foto: Tre hovedaktører i fredsforhandlingerne i Astana: Udenrigsministrene Sergei Lavrov, Rusland (midten), Mevlut Cavasoglu, Tyrkiet (højre) og Mohammad Javad Zarif, Iran forlader en pressekonference i Moskva, Rusland, 20. december, 2016.*

---

# Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov gentager behovet for en international antiterror-koalition

20. jan., 2017 – I en tale i dag i Moskva ved åbningen af et møde på ministerplan i Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen (SCO), understregede den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov behovet for en »virkelig universel kontraterror-koalition«, som det oprindeligt blev foreslået af præsident Vladimir Putin i FN's Generalforsamling i 2015.

Med henvisning til den »komplekse« internationale situation påpegede Lavrov, at en stigning i terroraktiviteter »uden fortilfælde« volder stor bekymring, da de er blevet »hovedtruslen mod global stabilitet«. Terrorangreb i hele verden, inklusive mordet på den russiske ambassadør til Tyrkiet, Andrei Karlov, »beviser denne alarmerende og farlige trend«. Men, tilføjede han, de »har styrket den opfattelse, at der ikke er noget alternativ« til den form for internationalt samarbejde, som den russiske præsident har foreslået.

I denne sammenhæng, rapporterer Udenrigsministeriet, sagde Lavrov, at meget af det, der vil ske i globale anliggender, »vil afhænge af vore relationer med de førende, vestlige lande, frem for alt den nye, amerikanske administration. Vi håber, at vore partnere vil opgive deres skæve og kræmmeragtige holdning over for de internationale hovedspørgsmål. Vi har bemærket os Donald Trumps valgudtalelser, inklusive om at være rede og beslutsom mht. en fælles kamp mod ISIS. Som præsident Putin mere end en gang har

sagt, så er Rusland rede til at dække sin del af vejen mod at genoptage en konstruktiv dialog med Washington, først og fremmest med det formål at finde effektive responser til terrorisme og mange andre, globale udfordringer.«

Lavrov sagde til Sputnik, at fremskridt mht. at afgøre den syriske konflikt er opmuntrende, med en generel konsensus omkring en politisk-diplomatisk afgørelse som den eneste mulighed. Det forestående Astana-møde vil levere »vigtigt input«, sagde han, »og tilbyde parametre for en omfattende, politisk afgørelse i Syrien, som vil fortsætte i de udvidede forhandlinger i Genève i begyndelsen af februar«.

---

## **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](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 18<sup>th</sup> 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 GK0 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 11<sup>th</sup> 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 billion for the first phase of the feasibility study and if the construction starts, this is a big project so it's not expected to be finished overnight, but it will take generations: But it will create livelihoods for 40 million people in the basin. And this is just one project, but there are many others. For example, Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi is just on a five-nation tour through Africa [Jan. 7-12] and was already in Madagascar, in Tanzania, is going to Zambia, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, and he's inviting all Africa nations to join the Belt and Road Initiative.

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

you don't have infrastructure. And we had this idea, which Alexander von Humboldt, by the way, proposed in 19th century, so it's not that revolutionary; it's sort of obvious.

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

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

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

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

Bolivia – Bolivia, which used to be a coca producing country, is now cooperating on space projects with China, with Russia, with India. So there is a completely new mood! I

talked with many Africans – there was a big conference in Hamburg just a couple of months ago, where the Africans said, there is a completely new mood in Africa, there is a new paradigm: China, Japan, India are all investing, and the Europeans, if they don't shape up, they will become marginal and irrelevant. So there is a completely new optimism caused by this dynamic.

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

the way, goes for Turkey, which is now shifting and working with Russia, Iran and Syria, to bring peace to the region.

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

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

So, it's a completely new paradigm, and I'll say

something about that in a second.

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

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

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

Now, most people at least in Europe and in the United States have a very hard time to think that. They cannot imagine that governments are for the common good, because we have not experienced that for such a long time. The common idea of all the think tanks, or most think tanks, is "China must have ulterior motives"; "China is just trying to replace the Anglo-American imperialism, with a Chinese imperialism." But that is

not true! I mean, I'm not naïve: I have studied this extensively. I was in China for the first time in 1971, in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. I have seen China, how it was then, I travelled to Beijing, Tientsin, Qingdao, Shanghai, and to the countryside, and so I know what *enormous* transformation China has made in this period.

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

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

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

with military means. But then you have to create conditions where young people in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, have a reason to become doctors, scientists, teachers, so that they have a future, that that way you drive out terrorism forever!

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

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

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

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

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

Now there are a couple of elements which are also important for this new paradigm, because we are not just talking about infrastructure, and overcoming poverty. The next phase of the evolution of man is not just to bring infrastructure to all continents on this planet, but to continue that infrastructure into close space around us. This is the first time formulated in this way by the great German-

American space scientist and rocket scientist Krafft Ehrlicke, who was the designer of the Saturn V of the Apollo project. He had this beautiful vision that if you look at the evolution over a longer period of time, life developed from the oceans with the help of photosynthesis; then you had the development of ever higher species, species with a higher metabolism, higher energy-flux density in their metabolism.

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

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

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

Right

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

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

fusion power economy on Earth. Right now, we are very close to making breakthroughs on fusion power. The Chinese EAST program [Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak] has



reached, I think, 50 million degrees for plasma for several seconds. And just a couple of days ago, the stellarator in Greifswald, Germany, reached 100 million degrees for – I've forgotten how many seconds. But it means that in a few years, we can have fusion power! And that will create energy security, raw materials security, on Earth.

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

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

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

And there is lots to be found out about what is the

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

Krafft Ehrlicke at the time had said, that building an industrial center on the Moon as a stepping stone for further travel of space will be important. And you now see the shaping up of new economic platforms. The first platform, Mr. LaRouche has

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

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

And so, the first economic platform will be simply to leave the planet Earth and to go into orbit; the second economic platform of space research will be to have an industrial base on the Moon and to eventually start to produce raw materials from space. Because you will, as this continues, not always transport materials from the Earth for your space travel, but

once you have fusion as a propulsion fuel where the speed will become much larger, you will be able to take materials from asteroids, from other planets, for your production and your requirements in space. And then longer space travel between planets as the third platform, which is already visible.

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

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

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

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

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

You know, in Chinese painting, you have poetry, calligraphy and painting, in one. And for Westerners, it's a complete revelation, because this does not exist in European painting. People get completely excited because they discover that there

are beautiful things to discover in other cultures! And once you study and know these other cultures, xenophobia and racism disappears! Because you realize that it's beautiful that there are many cultures, because there are universal principles to be

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

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

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

---

# **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 håbefuldst 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 »forfærdeligt«, 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 globaliseringssystems 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, narkoafhængighed, 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](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdl0Hxg_Ubc)

Engelsk udskrift af hele talen kan læses her:

---

# **NATO-vicegeneralsekretær Gottemoeller: Vi stoppede russisk invasion af Baltiske Stater (!)**

14. jan., 2017 – NATO-vicegeneralsekretær Rose Gottemoeller, en tidligere højtplaceret embedsmand i præsident Obamas Udenrigsministerium, var i Litauen til en sikkerhedskonference den 12.-13. jan. Mens hun var der, gav hun et interview til *Baltic Times*, hvor hun faktisk hævdede, at NATO's troppedeployeringer til de Baltiske Stater og Polen havde forhindret en russisk invasion af disse lande. »Der var ingen planer om, at amerikansk militær skulle komme tilbage til Europa, før Ruslands truende opførsel over for de Baltiske Stater, over for NATO-alliancen generelt, og før den oprustning, der har fundet sted, som jeg refererede til for et øjeblik siden, såvel som også deres annektering af Krim«, sagde hun, med reference til ankomsten af en amerikansk, pansret brigade til Polen i denne uge. »Det, NATO-alliancen gør, understreger vi altid, er i proportion og afmålt og defensivt, og det er virkelig sådan, NATO går frem på en

meget, også bevidst måde, hvor vi ikke haster ind i noget.«

Som sædvanligt for NATO's vedkommende, så begyndte historien omkring marts måned, 2014, da Rusland angiveligt skulle være rykket ind i Krim (fakta er, at de aldrig havde forladt Krim, da de opretholdt flådebasen i Sevastopol), og de (NATO) udelukker således NATO's ekspansion af historien, kontroversen over missilforsvaret, den voldelige afsættelse, støttet af Vesten, at den demokratisk valgte regering i Ukraine og mange andre tegn på NATO's aggression over for Rusland over en periode på mere end 20 år. Ved at udelukke denne del af historien, kan NATO komme med det argument, at det »responderer« til russisk »aggression«, når kendsgerningen er, at de russiske forholdsregler faktisk er responser til den trussel, det ser komme fra NATO.

*Foto: NATO-vicegeneralsekretær Rose Gottemoeller, i Litauen.*

---

## **Kina og Rusland advarer Seoul og Washington om deployering af THAAD**

13. jan., 2017 – I kølvandet på et møde i går i den Sjette Russisk-kinesiske konsultation om sikkerheden i Sydøstasien, advarede Rusland og Kina om, at de har til hensigt at tage »modforholdsregler« som respons til den foreslåede deployering af Terminal High Altitude Defense System (THAAD) i Sydkorea.

Disse modforholdsregler er designet til at beskytte Kinas og Ruslands interesser og den strategiske balance i området, som de anser for truet af THAAD-deployeringen. Begge nationer har, gennem deres Udenrigsministerier, opfordret USA og Sydkorea

til at adressere disse sikkerhedsspørgsmål og standse den planlagte deployering. Ifølge TASS advarede Ruslands Udenrigsministerium om, at, ved at forfølge THAAD-deployeringen, vil Washington og Seoul »forhøje spændingerne og styrke våbenkapløbet i området, såvel som også udvide militære øvelser« og »skade den regionale stabilitet og sikkerhed«. I betragtning af det »høje konfliktpotentiale« og den »komplekse og følsomme« situation på Halvøen, understregede Ministeriet, er det afgørende at søge »fælles bestræbelser, der har til formål at finde en meningsfuld strategi, der ville vise vejen ud af det nuværende dødvande og være med til at afgøre spørgsmålet om atomvåben og andre problemer, som Korea-halvøen konfronteres med.«

*Xinhua* understregede, at de to nationer insisterede på målet med at »fjerne atomvåben fra Korea-halvøen for at sikre fred og stabilitet«.

---

## **Tysk militærekspert: Rusland har ingen planer om at invadere Baltikum, og alle ved det**

13. jan., 2017 – Pensionerede tyske oberstløjtnant Jochen Scholz sagde til Sputnik, at der er flere aspekter til USA's deployering af tropper til Polen, som alle udgør en del af et spil, der skal retfærdiggøre USA/NATO's militære opbygning og sabotagen af amerikansk-russiske relationer under den tiltrædende Trump-administration.

»For det første forsøger Obama-administrationen og

forsvarsminister Ashton Carter at lægge en snublesten i vejen for den tiltrædende præsident. For det andet skal den tyske og europæiske offentlighed have at vide, hvor farlig, Rusland er, og hvordan Rusland er en trussel mod nabolande såsom de Baltiske Stater. Det tredje punkt er, at sådanne handlinger bruges til at overtale offentligheden til at spendere flere penge på militæret«, fortsatte Scholz.

»Og, afhængig af, hvordan Rusland responderer til denne deployering, vil der måske komme et fjerde argument, der siger, 'der kan I selv se; vi forsvarer blot Baltikum, men russerne har omgående reageret og bygger offensive styrker her'«, sagde Scholz. »De ved udmærket godt, at Rusland ikke har nogen planer om det [at invadere de Baltiske Lande]. Det er en del af spillet. Man opdigter en trussel, der ikke eksisterer, med det formål at retfærdiggøre større militær tilstedeværelse og større forsvarsudgifter.«

*Foto: Pensionerede tyske oberstløjtnant Jochen Scholz til Sputnik, 12. jan.*

---

## **Moskva: Obamas seneste militære deployeringer har til hensigt at komplicere amerikansk-russiske relationer for Trump**

13. jan., 2017 – Henved 2700 amerikanske tropper (ud af forventede 3500) ankom i denne uge til Polen for at overtage de Abrams tanks og andet udstyr, der blev losset i



Bremerhaven, Tyskland, for en uge siden og dernæst sendt via jernbane til Polen. Der er allerede små grupper af amerikanske specialenhedsstyrker i hver af de Baltiske Stater, og man er ved at lægge grunden til en formation af en amerikanskledet NATO-bataljon i Polen.

Det ses alt sammen i Moskva som en provokation, ikke alene mod selve Rusland, men også mod fremtidige amerikansk-russiske relationer.

»Vi anskuer disse handlinger som endnu et eksempel på provokerende militær aktivitet tæt på Ruslands grænser inden for rammerne af en berygtet linje, der går ud på at inddæmme Rusland«, sagde talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium, Maria Zakharova i går under sin pressebriefing. Hun sagde, at formålet med disse bestræbelser er forsøget fra den afgående Barack Obama-administrations side på at »komplisere så meget som muligt situationen i de bilaterale relationer og gøre de nye, amerikanske myndigheder til gidsel for dens systematiske og temmelig fjendtligtsindede politik over for Rusland«. Rusland må tage denne amerikanske militæropbygning tæt på sine grænser i betragtning i sin egen militære planlægning, bemærkede hun. »Vi håber, at den nye amerikanske regering ikke vil handle i overensstemmelse med denne linje, som er et åbenlyst dødvande, og som fremprovokerer konfrontation mellem vore lande«, sagde hun.

Talsmand for Kreml, Dmitri Peskov, sagde ligefremt til reportere i går, at ankomsten af tropperne i Polen udgør en trussel mod Rusland.

»Ethvert land kan anse en opbygning af udenlandsk militær tilstedeværelse tæt på sine grænser som noget negativt, og vil gøre det. Det er præcis sådan, vi ser det«, sagde han. »Vi fortolker dette som en trussel mod os og som handlinger, der udgør en fare for vore interesser og for vores sikkerhed.« Peskov påpegede, at »et tredjeland er i færd med at opruste sin militære tilstedeværelse tæt på vore grænser i Europa«.

»Dette land er ikke engang selv europæisk«, sagde han og tilføjede, at størrelsen af det militære kontingent var ligegyldigt. »Om det er et tusinde eller ti tusinde, det er det samme«, understregede han.

*Foto: Talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium Maria Zakharova under en af sine ugentlige briefinger til pressen.*

---

## **Amerikanske marinesoldater ankommer til Norge**

11. jan., 2017 – Et forstærket kompagni amerikanske marinesoldater lander i Norge i denne uge, i hælene på ankomsten af tanks og andet udstyr til den 3. brigade, 4. infanteridivision, til Bremerhaven, Tyskland, i sidste uge. Marinesoldaterne vil blive i en seks måneders rotation, hvilket gør det muligt for dem at deltage i en langt mere intensiv træning, især i et arktisk miljø, end det ellers ville være muligt. Senere på vinteren vil de deltage i en fælles amerikansk-britisk-norsk øvelse ved navn Joint Viking. De vil også få mulighed for at komme til De baltiske Lande.

Marinesoldaterne vil være baseret på Flyvestation Værnes lige uden for Trondheim i det centrale Norge, hvor de har adgang til at benytte et forud deployeret lager af tanks, lastbiler og andre køretøjer, der er i depot i grotter med aircondition.

Depotet stammer tilbage fra 1982, men dette bliver første gang, udenlandske tropper er blevet udstationeret på norsk jord, siden nazisternes besættelse under Anden Verdenskrig.

*Foto: USA har deployeret enorme mængder militært udstyr til*

*Norge, hvor det er i depot i grotter med aircondition. Foto fra februar, 2016.*

---

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

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

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

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

Og det tredje indslag i aften forfølger vores igangværende understregning af en intensivering af forståelsen af Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske opdagelser; og det vil omfatte en gennemgang ved Rachel Brown af en artikel, som hr. LaRouche offentliggjorde for nogen tid siden, med titlen, »In Defense

of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton« ([http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/2017\\_01-09/2017-02/pdf/32-42\\_4402.pdf](http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/2017_01-09/2017-02/pdf/32-42_4402.pdf)) , som hun komplementerer med en gennemgang af noget af materialet fra hr. LaRouches opgradering og fordybelse af ideen om, ikke infrastruktur (i sig selv), men om økonomiske platforme. Disse tre dele vil udgøre vores udsendelse for i aften.

For at indlede vores første del, kan vi referere til et indslag på LaRouchePAC's webside i dag. Titlen er, »The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia« (indholdet er dækket i Tom Gillesbergs indledning til Nyhedsorientering januar, læs: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17270>), og det handler direkte om de efterretninger, som vi vil få klarhed over i aften. At de, som virkelig intervenserer i amerikansk politik, ikke er de russiske efterretningstjenester, men snarere direkte er britisk efterretningstjeneste. Det 35 sider lange – hvad man vel må kalde et falsk dossier – om Trumps angivelige forbindelser med Rusland, og som blev citeret af CNN tidligere på ugen i en nyhedshistorie; og som dernæst blev offentliggjort eller lækket af Buzzfeed. Det afsløres nu, at dette blev forfattet af en fremtrædende, angiveligt pensioneret MI-6-efterretningsmand ved navn Christopher Steele; han blev først hyret af operatører fra det Republikanske Parti, der var modstandere af Trump i primærvalgene, og som dernæst blev hyret af Hillary Clintons kampagne for at udføre politisk kontra-research om Donald Trump. Det skulle bruges, ikke som en efterretningsfil, men til at tilsværte Trump under valget. Så dette er slet ikke en efterretningsrapport, som den blev præsenteret for at være af visse amerikanske medier, der lækkede den; men den var snarere blot en politisk misinformationsfil, der, som vi ser, kommer direkte fra britiske efterretningsoperatører. Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump brugte igen her til morgen twitter til at udfordre dette. Han sagde: »Det viser sig nu, at de falske anklager imod mig blev sammensat af mine politiske modstandere

og en mislykket spion, der er bange for at blive sagsøgt. Totalt fabrikerede fakta fra foragtelige politiske operatører, både Demokrater og Republikanere. Falske nyheder. Rusland siger, at der intet findes; det er sandsynligvis udgivet af 'efterretningstjenester', vel vidende, at der intet bevis findes, og aldrig vil findes.«

Det, der står klart, er, at efterretningssamfundet har erklæret krig mod USA's nyvalgte præsident, der vil blive indsat om under en uge fra i dag. Dette er en situation uden fortilfælde; og briternes rolle er klar, som det ses af denne mand, Christopher Steele. Som jeg sagde, så, på trods af den narrativ, at det skulle være russerne, der kører en eller anden enorm indflydelses-kampagne for at forsøge at intervenere i og influere de amerikanske valg, så begynder det at se ud som om, at den virkelig misdæder her, var briterne.

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

**Jason Ross:** Det er den 10. januar, 2017; jeg er Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC. Vi er meget glade for i dag at have Ray McGovern med os i studiet, en veteran, der har været i CIA i årtier, og

som i 2003 var medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Mange tak for at være med os i dag, Ray.

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

**Ross:** Lad os springe direkte til ét af de store spørgsmål, vi hører så meget om i medierne i øjeblikket – spørgsmålet om den angivelige russiske hacking af de amerikanske valg. Jeres gruppe, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, udstedte en pressemeddelelse den 12. december, der sagde, at alle beviser pegede på en læk snarere end et hack. Siden da er to rapporter kommet frem; en fra DHS (Department of Homeland Security) og en, der hovedsagligt er forfattet af ODNI, Director of National Intelligence, og som siger, at her er beviset. Vi ved, Rusland gjorde det. Det var tvivlsomt, hvor brugbar denne rapport var. Og for et par dage siden var du så medforfatter af en kronik i *Baltimore Sun* sammen med William Binney, hvor du gentog dit standpunkt; at alle beviser peger på, at dette er en læk snarere end et hack, og under alle omstændigheder er der ikke blevet fremlagt nogen beviser for, at det skulle være et hack. Hvorfor har du dette standpunkt?

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

Bush, Cheney og de andre sagde alle sammen, »Åh, det var en frygtelig fejltagelse.« Det var ikke nogen fejltagelse; det var slet og ret bedrag. Da vi så dette finde sted, dannede vi en lille gruppe – vi var fem til at begynde med – og vi begyndte at gå offentligt. Vi udgav tre memoranda før krigen,

hvor vi advarede præsidenten. Vores første memorandum blev udgivet samme dag, som Colin Powell (udenrigsminister 2001 – 2005) holdt sin tale – den 5. februar, 2003 – og vi gav ham et C- for indhold. Og vi advarede præsidenten (George W. Bush), »Efterretningerne bliver manipuleret, og de bør virkelig udvide kredsen af Deres rådgivere«, sagde vi mod slutningen, »til at omfatte andre end dem, der tydeligvis er opsat på at få en krig, for hvilken vi ikke kan se, der skulle være nogen tvingende grund, og de utilsigtede konsekvenserne af hvilken sandsynligvis vil blive katastrofale.« Den kendsgerning, at vi havde ret, fryder os ikke; der var et par andre personer, der sagde det samme, men der var ingen, der kom igennem til de etablerede medier.

Hvis vi spoler lidt frem, så ser vi, at de daværende NSA-folk ikke alene var rystede over, hvor mange penge, der blev smidt ind i programmer, som de vidste, aldrig ville virke; men de var også oprørte over et billigere program, som de selv havde udarbejdet – som blot kostede \$330 mio. at indføre. Det andet program, som general Hayden støttede, kostede \$3 mia. med et 'b'; så der var ingen sammenligning. Bortset fra, at det ene ikke fungerede; det gjorde dette her. Grunde til, at jeg nævner dette, er, at dette havde masser af beviser for, hvad der ville ske under 11. september; det lå i det. De gik tilbage og så efter; de lukkede dette hovedprogram ned, og da Tom Drake, som stadig var ansat der, gik ind og så efter, så fandt han masser af beviser, der ville have – hvis det var blevet omdelt – forhindret 11. september. Så man var dobbelt oprørt, og Bill Binney havde været teknisk direktør i NSA før han trådte af kort tid efter 11. september. Han tilsluttede sig så os, som så mange andre vidunderlige folk har gjort; og da dette kom på nettet online, dette her med den russiske hacking, så var det mest naturlige for mig at sige, »Hej, Bill. Vi har brug for et memo fra dig; vi har brug for, at du laver et udkast. For du designede de fleste af disse systemer, og du ved, hvad Ed Snowden har afsløret. Disse billeder? De ser virkelig interessante ud for os, men vi har brug for

nogen, der kan gennemgå dem for os.« Så sagde han, »Helt i orden«. Så gav han os et udkast, og det, vi typisk gør, er, at vi cirkulerer det blandt de fem, seks eller syv personer, der har særlig interesse i det, eller særlig erfaring; og mellem os fandt vi ud af det rigtige. Vi var én af de første, der kom ud af starthullerne og sagde, »Jo, dette er en spand (lort)! Hvorfor? Af tekniske grunde.« Der var masser af andre grunde, men nogle folk – til deres ære, mener jeg – de er teknisk orienteret, og de vil vide, »Er dette muligt? Kunne russerne have gjort dette?« Svaret er, »Ja, men NSA ville have vidst besked med det.«

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

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

Hvad gjorde præsidenten så? Han slog ned på sanktioner; han smed 35 diplomater ud. Alt sammen ud fra hvis udsagn? John



Brennans. Hvordan fik så *New York Times* al denne information? John Brennan. Det ved vi, fordi *Wall Street Journal* blev lidt sur over det, og de siger, »Ja, det er John Brennan, der taler med de andre fyre; han taler ikke med *Wall Street Journal*.« Hvad har vi så? Vi har en præsident, der tager en chance på lemfældigt grundlag og forårsager en endnu større fare, mere aggressiv kritik, flere spændinger i vore relationer med Rusland. På baggrund af hvad? Lad mig sige det sådan; jeg vil måske sige det sådan: Jeg sad og så på nogle YouTube-klip; og jeg faldt over et af Christiane Amanpour, der sendte fra London. Hun er i færd med at interviewe Lukyanov, en af de russiske guruer. Hun siger, »Hr. Lukyanov [imiterer Amanpours stemme] De siger, at der absolut *ingen* beviser er, *ingen*, siger De. Jamen, når der ikke findes beviser, hvorfor har USA's præsident så smidt sanktioner på Rusland?«

**Ross:** Den er god.

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

*(Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet):*

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

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast January 13, 2017

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

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our regular Friday evening webcast from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). I'm joined in

the  
studio today by Megan Beets from the LaRouche PAC Science  
Team;  
and via video by two members of our LaRouche PAC Policy  
Committee  
– Michael Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California;  
and  
Rachel Brown, joining us from Boston, Massachusetts.

We have a three-part show for you today. The three  
segments  
will obviously be interrelated, but they will feature first a  
clip from a feature interview that our friend and colleague  
Jason  
Ross did with Ray McGovern, a veteran CIA professional analyst  
for 30 years, and now the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence  
Professionals for Sanity. We have a second segment which  
features a clip from a breakthrough presentation that Helga  
Zepp-LaRouche made in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday to an  
audience comprised of a large cross section of the  
international  
diplomatic community. And then a third segment tonight which  
pursues our ongoing emphasis on deepening the understanding of  
Lyndon LaRouche's economic discoveries; and that will include  
a  
review by Rachel Brown of a paper that Mr. LaRouche published  
a  
while ago, called "In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander  
Hamilton", complemented by a review of some of the material  
from  
the last few years of Mr. LaRouche's upgrading and deepening  
of  
the idea of not infrastructure, but economic platforms. So,  
that  
will be our three part show from this evening.

To begin our first part, I think that we can refer to  
an  
item that's posted on the LaRouche PAC website today. The

title

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

Not Russia"; and this goes directly to the intelligence that we're getting clarity on today. That the ones who are in fact interfering in US politics, are not the Russian intelligence services, but rather, directly, British intelligence. The 35-page – I guess you could call it dodgy dossier – on Trump's supposed connections with Russia that was cited by CNN earlier this week in a news story; and then published or leaked by BuzzFeed. This is now being exposed as being authored by a prominent supposedly-retired MI-6 officer, a man named Christopher Steele; who was hired first by Republican Party operatives who were opposing Donald Trump in the primaries, and

then was rehired by Hillary Clinton's campaign to do political opposition research on Donald Trump. To be used not as an intelligence brief, but to politically smear Trump in the election. So again, this is not an intelligence report at all,

as it was represented by certain US media outlets that leaked it;

but rather merely a political disinformation brief, coming directly from, as we see, British intelligence operatives. President-elect Donald Trump took to twitter again this morning

to call this out. He said, "It now turns out that the phony allegations against me were put together by my political opponents and a failed spy afraid of being sued. Totally made-up

facts by sleaze-bag political operatives, both Democrats and Republicans. Fake news. Russia says nothing exists; probably released by 'intelligence', even knowing there is no proof and never will be."

What is clear is that the intelligence community has declared war on the President-elect of the United States, who is

due to be inaugurated in less than one week from the present moment. This is an unprecedented situation; and the role of the

British in this is clear, as can be seen by the role of this character Christopher Steele. As I said, despite the narrative

that the Russians were running some huge influence campaign to try to interfere and influence the American election, it's beginning to look like the real culprit here was the British.

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

a clip of this interview that we did with Ray McGovern. As I said, he's a 30-year veteran analyst with the CIA; he was a Russia or Soviet Union specialist at the time he was there.

He's

responsible for preparing national intelligence estimates and the

Presidential daily brief. Now, since his time at the CIA, he has

become the co-founder of an organization called the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, which now has about 50 members, retired intelligence specialists who recently put out a

statement seriously calling into question the narrative being put

out about Russian influence and Russian hacking. The full interview will be available beginning on Sunday on the LaRouche

PAC website and the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and we have released other excerpts of this interview over the past few days.

This excerpt you're about to see is the very beginning of the interview, which was conducted by Jason Ross, with Mr. Ray McGovern.

JASON ROSS: Hi! Thanks for joining us. It's January 10,

2017; I'm Jason Ross here at LaRouche PAC. We are very happy to have in the studio today Ray McGovern, multi-decade veteran of the CIA and the co-founder in 2003 of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Thanks very much for coming today, Ray.

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

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

McGOVERN: Well, I need to tell you something about Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity first. We established ourselves when we saw that our colleagues – the colleagues with whom we had worked – had let themselves be suborned into creating, into fabricating intelligence for the express

purpose

of deceiving our elected representatives out of their Constitutional prerogatives to declare or otherwise authorize war. That was before Iraq; and that's as bad as it gets.

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

the President. Our first one was on the day of Colin Powell's speech – the 5th of February, 2003 – and we gave him a C- for content. And we warned the President, "The intelligence is being

manipulated and you really should widen the circle of your advisors," we said at the end, "beyond those who are clearly bent

on a war for which we see no compelling reason, and from which,

we believe the unintended consequences are likely to be catastrophic." We take no delight in the fact that we happened

to be right on that; there were a couple of other people saying

that, but nobody got into the mainstream media.

So, if you fast forward now, you see that the NSA people who

were in place at the time, not only were appalled at how much money was being thrown at programs that they knew would never work; but were outraged when they found out that a cheaper program that they devised themselves – which only cost \$330 million to emplace. The other one that General Hayden went for,

cost \$3 billion with a "b"; so no comparison. Except that one didn't work; this one did. The reason I mention that, is this had plenty of evidence what was going to happen in 9/11; it was

in there. They went back and they looked; they closed that main program down, and when Tom Drake, who was still employed there, went in and looked, he found plenty of evidence that would have – had it been shared – prevented 9/11. So, double outrage here, and Bill Binney had been the technical director at NSA before he left shortly after 9/11. So, he joined us, like so many other wonderful people have; and when this went viral, this business about Russian hacking, it was the most natural thing for me to do to say, "Hey, Bill. We need a memo from you; we need you to do a draft. Because you know, you designed most of these systems, and you know what Ed Snowden has revealed. Those slides? They look really interesting to us, but we need somebody to take us through them." So, he said, "Sure." So, he gave us a draft, and what we typically do is, we circulate it around the five or six or seven people who have special interests in that, or special experience; and we got it right together. We were one of the first ones off the block saying "Yeah, this is a crock! Why? For technical reasons." There were plenty of other reasons, but some people – and I think it's to their credit – they're technically oriented, and they want to know, "Is this possible? Could the Russians have done this?" Well, the answer is "Yes, but NSA would know about it."

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

But

NSA traces {all emails on this planet}. If they go abroad, they

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

Now, add to that the ironclad coverage they have of the Ecuadoran embassy in London, where Julian Assange is; and I'm sure that they monitor his colleagues as well wherever they happen to be. So, let's say the Russians hack, and they got it to Julian, they got it to one of his associates. "Well, OK, Russians are really bad people," people say; "Show us the messages." "Oh, we can't; we don't have the messages. But we'll look at it." Now, they got the President, before he went on vacation to Hawaii, to impose sanctions based on this elusive evidence that they can't show us. These memos – my first reaction was to laugh at them, but this a very sad thing to see what the intelligence community has become; very, very sad. Because this is an important issue.

So, what did the President do? He slapped on sanctions; threw out 35 diplomats. All on whose say-so? John Brennan's. Now, how did the {New York Times} get all this information? John Brennan. We know that because the {Wall Street Journal} was a little ticked off about it, and they said, "Yeah, it's Brennan that's talking to these other guys; he's not talking to the {Wall Street Journal}." So, what do we have here? We have the



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

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

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

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

ROSS: That's good.

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

"Mr. McGovern, if you say there's no evidence of weapons of mass

destruction, why did Bush and Cheney start a war on Iraq?"

Well,

same answer; same answer! It's a really bad flashback, because

what they need to do, is come up with the evidence. My strong view is that they're not going to do that; not because of sources

and methods, but because there isn't any.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, that's part of a much longer interview, and part of it has already been posted on YouTube under the title "Sources and Methods Versus National Interests";

and you can expect the full interview to be posted and available

coming Sunday, the day after tomorrow.

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

MICHAEL STEGER: In all of this discussion, apparently some people are not pulling back over so-called "Trump's ties to Russia." What this whole situation now makes clear, is that the entire attack on the Trump campaign and the President-elect's policy towards Russia, has been the target explicitly of British Intelligence the entire time. The report that was released, this 35-page dodgy dossier, starts in June once Trump consolidates the nomination, essentially, for the Republican Party, and doesn't stop until mid-December of this just past year. And so, it's clear that British Intelligence were the ones pushing this the entire time. It's clear that Christopher Steele was close friends with now-head of MI-6, Alex Younger. The British media are panicking. A former Secretary General of the NATO, a British Lord, came out and said this is a total panic. We could be sleepwalking into a complete catastrophe.

It's clear the British had an explicit intent to manipulate the U.S. elections, to fabricate false intelligence on a major candidate, to drum up a conspiracy – so-called "hacking" by the Russians to disrupt U.S. foreign policy and U.S. interests – against the welfare of the American people. To those who know history, and know Mr. LaRouche's role in the last 40-50 years of American politics, this role of British Intelligence, includes people who represented British outlooks, like Henry Kissinger, a public advocate of British foreign policy against the American

outlook; the British hand, not just in an attempt to destroy and manipulate the Presidential election and alter U.S. foreign policy changes, but the direct role of the British in support of the terrorists in Syria, via Saudi Arabia, and other nations; the direct role of the British, such as David Cameron, who just high-tailed it out of Downing Street and the British Parliament, because he was directly exposed in a fraudulent-led campaign against Libya; the false intelligence of Tony Blair on the Iraq war, which Ray McGovern was just referring to.

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

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

in the United States, one towards Russia, potentially towards China – to end the threat of nuclear world war.

They're also attempting to disrupt what could be a very important – as I think we'll see from Helga Zepp LaRouche's clip – relationship between the U.S., China, and Russia, on an economic policy; and, as we know it to be very important that we'll get to later as well, a fundamental change in U.S. financial policy. This British nexus is targeting the Trump campaign and targeting this entire change in U.S. policy. This is British imperial tactics. This is what they do; they are at the source of it. If there's going to be a Congressional investigation of any foreign nations' or foreign agents' involvement to manipulate U.S. democracy, I think first and foremost, it has to be the United Kingdom.

RACHEL BRINKLEY: The fact that on page 15 of these 35 pages, it attacks LaRouche by name, saying that there were Trump factions travelling to meet with Putin factions, as part of this alliance in the summer of 2016. They cite LaRouche directly in this report as having representatives that went to Russia as part of this discussion; which did not happen. As this was authored by the British, this is just the British Empire freaked out about LaRouche's policies taking over, and the potential of a United States/Russia/China alliance, especially the Russia/U.S. cooperation.

I think it is notable that if you have the United States, Russia, and China working together, there's no problem on the

planet that can't be solved. That's an unstoppable alliance. I think the British are desperate, and that's what we're seeing.

OGDEN: That's exactly what Helga LaRouche presented at this conference that happened in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday. This was an extraordinary conference, and I'm going to play a clip of her opening speech to you right now. This was a standing-room-only capacity audience that included 17 diplomats, a cross-section of the entire planet, including seven ambassadors. She delivers her analysis of what we've really seen behind this showdown, as we've been discussing, of the British and American intelligence establishment vs. the incoming President-elect. She highlights, towards the end of these excerpted remarks – and again, this is only an excerpt, in bits and pieces – the whole speech contains a lot more substance in terms of what you just said, Rachel.

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

In what you're about to hear, she touches on what must

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

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

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

The fact that Hillary did not win the election was  
{extremely} important for the maintenance of world peace. And

I think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the fact that he said ... that he will normalize the relationship between the United States and Russia, is, in my view {the most important step}. Because if the relationship between the United States and Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I think there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world. And if that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world peace is in extreme danger.

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

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

possibly imagine, just on and on unbelievable...

And then naturally, you have the reports by the different

U.S. intelligence services, Clapper, Brennan, Comey from the FBI.

They all put out the fact that that it was Russian hacking of the

emails of the DNC and Podesta which would have stolen the election, because they would have shifted the view of the Americans to vote for Trump.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie Sanders!

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

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

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

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

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



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

[T]here is one indicator which shows if a society is doing good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first time for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment. There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

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

I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about... But there are other interesting elements, for example: Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion into the renewal of the infrastructure in the United States. That

is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in North Carolina, that he would implement the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and {only} if you have a Glass-Steagall law in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure....

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

and it's exactly what she ended with there in that excerpt.

Right now, we must have the most urgent mobilization; there are no excuses for delay from {any} elected representative for an immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall. We have now launched and are in the midst of a national mobilization; we've talked about this on previous broadcasts. But as you can see on the screen right now, we're circulating a petition which is collecting signatures; it needs to more rapidly accrue signatures. But it's accessible at [lpac.co/trumpsotu](http://lpac.co/trumpsotu); and again, this is a petition which originated from some citizen-activists in Ohio, who are associated with the "Our Revolution" movement, people who had been associated with the Bernie Sanders campaign during the primaries. But who have now taken it upon themselves to rally behind the initiative that LaRouche PAC has led; that we must have Glass-Steagall, and we must hold Trump to his word, when he called for a 21st Century Glass-Steagall at that speech in Charlotte, North Carolina. As I said, this has bipartisan support, and there are no excuses for delay. The only way this is going to happen, is if citizens across the United States decide to participate in this LaRouche PAC campaign and sign your name onto this petition: [lpac.co/trumpsotu](http://lpac.co/trumpsotu) – State of the Union.

Now, we did have a day of action in Washington this week.

The Congress is now officially back in session; they've been sworn in and business is underway. There was participation

from

many states up and down the East Coast in person.

Representatives coming in from Virginia, from Maryland, from Pennsylvania, from Connecticut, from New Jersey, from New York.

But there was also a lot of other participation from across the

country in terms of pressure being put on representatives to meet

with members of the LaRouche PAC. There was a unique representative from the Manhattan Project, Mr. John Sigerson, who's the director of the Schiller Institute Chorus in New York

City; who's been participating in some of the recent choral activities there, including the memorial at the Bayonne, New Jersey 9/11 Teardrop Memorial, where members of the Schiller Institute Chorus were joined by the PDNY Honor Guard and the Honor Guard from Bayonne, New Jersey to honor the tragic loss of

the Alexandrov Choral Ensemble from Russia. This is just one example of the kind of power that the music program from the Manhattan Project, from New York City, has been able to play to

shape the political dialogue in the United States and also across

countries. In this case, the potential for a far-improved relationship between the United States and Russia. So again, this was a day of action in Washington, DC, but the mobilization

has to continue. We are in a countdown; it's now a 7-day countdown until the inauguration. Then shortly after that, we will have the State of the Union; and again, this petition is to

insist that Trump put a premium on highlighting the necessity for

a return to the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act during that State

of the Union. This has to be one of the number one agenda items of the first 100 days.

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

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

We have officially, you might say, entered into a Dark Age; a mini-Dark Age has begun in the United States. Now, this can be

reversed. But the level of drug addiction has more than tripled under Obama's Presidency; the level of opiate addiction, the abuse of drugs like marijuana has skyrocketed under an Obama-supported legalization campaign. Which is of course, backed by the same drug cartels which are providing the financial backing to the banking institutions. This was Obama's program.

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

That's where Glass-Steagall comes in; and this is what really has to be captured. And why it's not simply Glass-Steagall, but the full Four Laws. I think Megan and Rachel can say more, because we're currently working on a project to make this clear. But the role of fusion and the space program really captivate the fourth law in what direction our country has to take to reawaken a sense of optimism, a sense of development within the American culture. To break out, not just of disrepair

– breaking down of bridges, bad roads – we all know the bad roads and highways, especially on the East Coast. But that's not what we have to emerge from. Building better roads isn't escaping from the clutches of a Dark Age; something greater has to capture the real spirit of human identity and creativity.

Now, this is why it's so important to identify this global phenomenon; because the steps of the Four Laws: Glass-Steagall immediately; shut down this Wall Street banking cartel and basically a drug operation. The second is the public credit of a national banking system, which Paul Gallagher elaborated last night; we could say more on. To consolidate, aggregate the US debt that exists, as well as other financial resources towards the most important projects of development for the country; the most advanced levels of infrastructure, or the broader physical platform of industry and production. And of course most importantly, the fusion and space program.

This phenomenon globally is just somewhat breathtaking; and Mrs. LaRouche touches on it directly. The Transaqua project in Africa is something that we've been promoting for decades; this is something which begins to take the sub-Saharan area of Africa from the great lakes near the eastern part of Africa towards West Africa and Nigeria, up into the southern border of the Sahara Desert. It begins to look at how we use major infrastructure projects of water transportation, the refilling of Lake Chad, and

the development of this central African area. There's also a major rail line, which is not initiated – it's been inaugurated;

it's now running from Ethiopia to the coastline of Djibouti. This rail line is one of the key continental rail passages that

the Schiller Institute and {EIR} have been fighting for, for decades; to begin to integrate the full potential of Africa's people and its resources and its industrial capacities into an integrated economic breakthrough. A real shift in the productivity and lifestyle and scientific potential of Africa. Those things are now unfolding; these are coming from largely Chinese investments, Chinese engineering companies are directly onboard.

The same is true from another project, and I think it's worth just highlighting, because we have gotten reports recently

that it's practically shovel-ready. This is Kra Canal. All this contention over the South China Sea that everyone's heard about;

and the Americans remain, I'm sure, still somewhat confused. What's the big deal about a couple of islands in the South China

Sea? As the President of the Philippines said, we're not going

to eliminate humanity over a couple of fishing spots in the South

China Sea. The real question is the Kra Canal; this is something

explicitly that the British Empire has prevented by diktat, to shut down. Matt, you and others have been involved in video production specifically on this project and the role of the British to shut this down over centuries to eliminate this project. The Chinese have said that they are ready to begin



the

development of the Kra Canal. The Thai government, with a new king, seems favorable; the military, the prime minister seem favorable. The question of Japan's collaboration is something that goes back to the 1980s; with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche directly involved in this project. The people we worked with then, in Thailand, are again promoting and advocating for its initial construction today.

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

But there are major development orientations taking place that are gripping mankind. There was an offer today, apparently, in the {Hindu Times} in India from a Chinese journalist, which said "Will Donald Trump Participate in the Silk Road Conference in China?" I think that really is the potential which we've got today.

So, the Glass-Steagall fight, this question of the United States deciding that we're going to build our nation again, we're going to shut down this Wall Street racket and take on this kind of potential; that's really what has to be ignited. And there's no reason Donald Trump should not take that up at the inauguration and the State of the Union.

BRINKLEY: Right! And on this question of the murder policy of Obama, there's an attempt now to cover it up and make him the cute President and Joe Biden getting an award. No, this is

flat-out murder, and if this mass movement across the world is properly educated, it won't be stopped.

So, there was discussion recently around infrastructure, as Helga brought up, from Trump. It's still not to the level of LaRouche's conception of infrastructure. For example, here's what Speaker Paul Ryan said about infrastructure: "In the spring budget, we believe we will be able to address the infrastructure issue." The chairman of the Republican study committee, Mark Walker, says "I don't know that we've settled on \$1 trillion. If it's \$1 trillion in infrastructure, that is something we'd have to say, 'There's a portion of this that we're not comfortable with and come back to the table.'|" And then Sam Graves, the head of the Transportation Subcommittee, says "We just simply can't afford it," adding that "It can't all be done through public-private partnerships as the President-elect is talking about."

They're still looking at this as an issue. LaRouche developed this concept. Helga LaRouche made the point that 2017 should be the year of the rejuvenation or flourishing of LaRouche's ideas. He wrote a paper in 2010 called, "What Your Accountant Never Understood; the Secret Economy". He goes through a universal history of the greater concept of infrastructure. He starts with the question of transoceanic travel; navigation across the oceans. He says, "For example, look back to the approximately hundred-centuries of the Earth's last great glaciation. While some part of the human population had remained mired in the habits of life of some fixed, relatively narrow regions free of glaciation, great transoceanic

maritime cultures were also developed. The requirement of a stellar mapping for navigation for the existence of maritime cultures, gave us the stellar notion of the efficient existence of a functional form of an ontologically-actual universe; as echoed by such great residual artifacts as the Great Pyramid of Giza, and by the physical science of spherics. Now, into this so-called Platonic long cycle, into the Pythagorean predecessors of Plato."

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

fully unite the United States as a single territory. This was followed by Bismarck in Germany and Mendeleev in Russia. That was the next advancement.

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

Next, he says, "Changes such as those, illustrate a general principle which will be expressed in certain nearby Solar System locations. Now, we're going to go to the next step, such as our

Moon and Mars, when they will have come to be considered later, as within the bounds of our presently still-young, new century's plausible instances of work and habitation. Typical problems to be overcome for the purpose of human transport and dwelling in nearby solar space, and later beyond, must look to such future developments already foreseeable for later in the present century. We should then recognize that the development of basic economic infrastructure had always been a needed creation of what is required as a habitable development of a synthetic, rather than a presumably natural, environment for the enhancement or even the possibility of human life and practice at some time in the existence of our human species."

So, he's bring up, one, this long-term conception; he says later, three generations – 75 years – should be our orientation for space. We have the questions of habitation and transport as fundamental challenges; and this is the idea of the next phase.

But in general, also this last question of synthetic versus natural; that these various new modes of habitation and travel were based off of new discoveries that created a whole new platform of existence, of habitation, of travel, where mankind could reach through these advances. And those were all creations of the human mind in the likeness of the Creator. Infrastructure is not just making a bridge or something to get from here to there; it's the question of a new advancement, of a new principle

that is applied throughout your entire society. So, it's not an add-on to your economic policy as Paul Ryan was saying. "We'll get to that; we'll figure out how to fit it in the budget." It's the beginning of your notion of economy.

MEGAN BEETS: Yeah Rachel, I think what you just put forward here from Mr. LaRouche's overview and what you were just saying, it's a way of thinking that most Americans have forgotten about. People have lost touch with the kind of big thinking about long sweeps of human history, and I think that that way of thinking – the idea that we can consider 50-100-year cycles of human progress in general – flies in the face of the biggest British Empire lie which has dominated for some time. The idea that human growth is bad; human progress is bad; population growth destroys the Earth and it's bad. We have to hold back technological progress; we have to go backwards. Instead of towards nuclear power, we have to go backwards towards solar power, wind power; and reduce our impact and our presence on the Earth. That lie is exactly what's being threatened with both the rise of the New Paradigm being led from Eurasia and the potentiality of Mr. LaRouche's ideas; which are really the most advanced version of the American System ideas of Hamilton, Franklin Roosevelt, and Lincoln, of putting the creative power and really the responsibility of the creative human mind to change nature. To alter nature to better support human life; alter the biosphere to higher levels of productivity, as we do

by  
improving agriculture, for example.

I just think that what you're bringing up here really is the crucial point; that our common interest as mankind is man's progress. That right now dictates that we can't accept anything lower than a long-term dedication to the highest forms of technological advance and growth; which is nuclear fusion power and its companion, a space program. The colonization of the Moon and eventual colonization of Mars. That would really be a beautiful renaissance expression of the American people working with the rest of the world towards the uplifting of humanity toward our real, true potential.

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

role

that Hamiltonian credit should play in facilitating all of that.

So, that said, that's the crucial insight and understanding

that you need to fight with us right now for the necessary policy

revolution here in the United States. This all revolves around

the initiation of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws.

Michael

went through them, but it's Glass-Steagall, number one. We need

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

an initiation as Franklin Roosevelt did it, of Federal credit

using that Hamiltonian national banking system to raise the

productive powers of labor of the workforce as a whole. And this

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

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

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

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

address is: [lpac.co/trumpsotu](http://lpac.co/trumpsotu) – all one word – trumpsotu for

State of the Union. If you've already signed this, then it's a

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

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

on this petition. We are increasing the number of signatures,

but it has to increase at a much more rapid rate. It's a perfect



opportunity to help us increase the outreach of the LaRouche Political Action Committee. Then, number two; immediately subscribe, if you haven't already, to the LaRouche PAC daily email list. For two reasons: 1. in the 7-day countdown between now and the inauguration, you need to have the daily marching orders and the daily updates. This is a very fast moving situation, as you can see from the intelligence situation that we presented at the beginning of this show. Then after that, in the critical first days of the new Presidency, as things change very rapidly, you need to have the insight that only LaRouche PAC can uniquely provide you. And then, another reason is, as we develop more crucial and unique, exclusive content like what you got a taste of here today, especially this interview with Ray McGovern, the veteran CIA intelligence analyst and the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, you will receive a notice in your email inbox and this is material that you can't afford to miss. You really need to know as soon as we publish it and as soon as we make it available. So again, you can look for the full interview that Jason Ross did with Ray McGovern to be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and our YouTube channel on Sunday, the day after tomorrow. And you can also look forward to the full speech that Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered at this very important, breakthrough diplomatic seminar in Stockholm, Sweden.

So, thank you very much for tuning in tonight. I

think this  
was a successful broadcast, and I'd like to thank Megan,  
Rachel,  
and Michael for joining me in the discussion. Please stay  
tuned  
to [larouhepac.com](http://larouhepac.com) and good night.