

China Daily udgiver stor profil af Helga Zepp-LaRouche og LaRouche-bevægelsens arbejde

18. aug., 2017 – *China Daily's* weekendudgave har en profil i fuld længde af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, af *China Daily's* USA-korrespondent Chen Weihua, med titlen, »*Identifying with China*« (Identificering med Kina) og med en indledning, der lyder, »Helga Zepp-LaRouche ser Bælte & Vej Initiativet som opfyldelsen af sin og sin mands, amerikanske politiske aktivist Lyndon LaRouches, livslange indsats«.



Helga under sit første besøg i Kina, i 1971.

Artiklen fortsætter dernæst med at diskutere Zepp-LaRouches første, lange besøg til Kina som ung journalist under perioden med Kulturrevolutionen. »Min generation var stadig nysgerrig over for verden«, siger Zepp-LaRouche. »I dag googler de unge mennesker blot om ting fra deres søgemaskine. Jeg ville se, hvordan verden ser ud.« I interviewet fortæller Zepp-LaRouche om nogle af sine indtryk fra dengang, inklusive, at nogle af de kinesere, hun mødte, talte tysk og beredvilligt talte om deres situation. »Hun fandt, at folk var 'venlige', men sagde, 'Folk var slet ikke lykkelige'«, skriver Chen. På samme rejse, siger han, besøgte Zepp-LaRouche også Afrika og andre dele af Asien og så den enorme fattigdom. »Jeg kom tilbage fra denne rejse med den absolutte overbevisning, at verden måtte ændre sig, måtte blive forbedret«, sagde hun. Efter hjemkomsten søgte hun efter løsninger og stiftede bekendtskab med den amerikanske, politiske aktivist Lyndon LaRouches arbejde,

skriver Chen, »som er bedre kendt som ophavsmanden til LaRouche-bevægelsen«.

»Bevægelsen, der har omfattet mange organisationer og selskaber i verden, promoverer en genoplivelse af klassisk kunst og større helligelse til videnskab; den er fortalere for udviklingen af store, økonomiske infrastrukturprojekter på global skala; og kræver en reform af det globale finanssystem, der tilskynder til investering i den fysiske økonomi og undertrykkelse af finansspekulation.«

»Helga fandt, at Lyndon var den eneste, der talte om behovet for udvikling og industrialisering af Afrika og den Tredje Verden, såvel som også etableringen af en international udvikling, noget i lighed med Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB)«, skriver han. Helga Zepp og Lyndon LaRouche blev gift i 1977.



Helga Zepp-LaRouche var inviteret til at deltage på Bælte & Vej Forum i Beijing, 14.-15. maj, 2017, hvor hun deltog i flere diskussionspaneler.

Artiklen fortsætter med at diskutere Helgas og hendes mands arbejde med at forfølge disse mål sammen med den indiske premierminister Indira Gandhi og Mexicos præsident José López Portillo. Zepp-LaRouche roser Kinas arbejde med Bælte & Vej og AIIB og fortæller om nogle af sine aktiviteter om dette spørgsmål i løbet af de seneste tre år, inklusive hendes deltagelse på Bælte & Vej Forum i Beijing. »Jeg var meget glad for at deltage«, siger Zepp-LaRouche i interviewet, »for vi har kæmpet så længe for dette. Jeg identificerer mig på en måde med dette projekts succes.«

I interviewet taler hun også om betydningen af Trump-administrationens åbne holdning til Forummet, ved at sende en amerikansk delegation på højt niveau, og understreger, hvor

fordelagtigt, samarbejde omkring Bælte & Vej ville være for genopbygningen af den amerikanske infrastruktur. Hun siger, at, under sine diskussioner med afrikanske delegerede på Beijing-forummet, var det tydeligt, at de nu har et håb for fremtiden, et håb, der var svært fraværende før det kinesiske initiativ. Chen fortsætter: »Helga siger, at det, Kina gør, har berettiget det, som hun og hendes kolleger har gjort i de seneste 40 år.« Vi er meget glade» for BVI, siger Zepp-LaRouche. »Det er én ting, at en lille organisation som vores producerer ideer, men det er en ganske anden ting, at verdens største land begyndte at gennemføre dem.« Hun beklager det faktum, at hendes mand, Lyndon LaRouche, der er 94 år, sandsynligvis ikke kommer til at besøge Kina. »Han elsker Kina«, siger Zepp-LaRouche, »og han er overbevist om, at det kinesiske initiativ (BVI) lige nu er den vigtigste ting på planeten.«

China Daily USA udkommer overalt i USA. Interviewet skal efter planen også udkomme i den europæiske udgave af *China Daily* i næste uge.

<http://europe.chinadaily.com.cn/>

Xi-Putin topmøde udvikler spændende perspektiver for kinesisk-russisk økonomisk samarbejde

5. juli, 2017 – Gid andre møder mellem internationale ledere var lige så lovende for deres nationers befolkninger, som det netop afsluttede topmøde mellem Xi Jinping og Putin!

De 40 bilaterale aftaler, der blev underskrevet, drejede sig om alt fra landbrug til samarbejde inden for Bælte & Vejs globale udviklingsinitiativ, med et par private kontrakter, der også blev underskrevet på sidelinjerne af topmødet. For at støtte disse økonomiske udviklingsinitiativer, gav præsidenterne deres støtte til aftalen mellem den Russiske Direkte Investeringsfond og Kinas Udviklingsbank, for at skabe en fælles investeringsfond på næsten \$10 mia. (65 mia. yuan). Præsident Putin rapporterede, at de også havde aftalt »at fortsætte med konsultationer om den udvidede anvendelse af vore nationale valutaer i gensidige transaktioner og i investering«, og at de havde »sat sig den opgave mere aktivt at udvikle kreditsfæren og den finansielle sfære, samt samarbejdet i dette felt«.

Højteknologi og videnskabeligt samarbejde stod højt på deres dagsorden. Under deres pressekonference bagefter, nævnte Putin den succesfulde konstruktion af den første enhed af Tianwan-kernekræftværket (den største i drift i Kina, bygget med russisk teknologi) og sagde, at endnu to enheder ville komme i drift i 2018. De to præsidenter instruerede ligeledes det russiske atomenergiagentur Rosatom »om at underskrive en pakke af dokumenter om fire projekter for kernekræftværker i Kina før udgangen af 2017«, rapporterer Sputnik.

»I dag har vi særligt fokuseret på højteknologiske industrier – primært fælles rumforskning. Vi arbejder på det næste rumprogram for 2018-2022«, rapporterede Putin ligeledes.

Idet han nævnte Moskva-Kazan-højhastighedsjernbaneprojektet som blandt de fælles hovedprojekter, sagde Putin ligeledes, at de to havde drøftet »lokaliteten for rullende materiefremstilling i Rusland«.

Han rejste også spørgsmålet om voksende videnskabelige og uddannelsesmæssige bånd mellem Rusland og Kina, og der er 17.000 russiske studenter i Kina, som præsidenten ser vokse til 100.000 studenterudvekslinger frem til 2020. For eksempel

vil det første russisk-kinesiske universitet begynde at optage sine første studerende i september måned.

Under deres fælles pressebriefing understregede Putin atter engang, at deres fælles, økonomiske projekter udgør en del af deres bestræbelser for at »forbinde aktiviteterne i den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union med det kinesiske initiativ for det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte«, som de diskuterede »i dybden ... i overensstemmelse med vores idé om at danne et bredt, eurasiske partnerskab«.

Putin forklarede:

»Vi se et stort potentiale i den fælles anvendelse af den Nordlige Søfartsrute og den Transsibiriske Jernbane og Baikal-Amur-jernbanen. Dette er i vid udstrækning i overensstemmelse med vore kinesiske partners initiativer, der blev drøftet under det nylige Bælte & Vej Internationale Forum i Kina. Den kinesiske leders initiativ fortjener omhyggelig opmærksomhed og vil blive støttet af Rusland på enhver måde.

Jeg er overbevist om, at disse storstilede projekter vil resultere i intensiv handel, moderne produktion og jobs og den hastige udvikling af russiske og kinesiske områder.«

'Arg fattigdom kan absolut besejres'

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 25. juni, 2017 – På nogle få årtier har Kina udført nogle økonomiske bedrifter, der har efterladt verden i en tilstand af lykkelig forbløffelse: de har bragt 700 millioner kinesere ud af fattigdom; hævet den forventede, gennemsnitlige levealder fra 35 år til 76 år i dag; lanceret

videnskabeligt arbejde i verdensklasse omkring udforskning af rummet og udvikling af nuklear fusionskraft.

Men Kina hviler ikke på sine laurbær. Præsident Xi Jinpings regering planlægger at fjerne fattigdom i Kina – og der findes stadig 40 millioner mennesker i denne kategori – frem til år 2020. For nylig mødtes Xi med ledere af Kommunistpartiet i Kinas nordlige Shanxi-provins, hvor han sagde til dem:

»Så længe, vi gør os umage, tænker korrekt, træffer effektive forholdsregler og arbejder fornuftigt og nede på jorden, så kan arg fattigdom absolut besejres.«

Kina begrænser heller ikke sin ambitiøse plan til Kina alene. Udenrigsminister Wang Yi deltog den 21.-22. juni i en todages konference med den Afrikanske Union i Addis Abeba, hvor han erklærede, at »tæt ved 400 millioner mennesker i Afrika lever under fattigdomsgrænsen, og flere end 40 millioner kinesere har behov for at blive løftet ud af fattigdom. Kina og Afrika må gå sammen i kampen mod fattigdom og om at opnå fælles udvikling. Dette er vores ansvar over for de kommende generationer, det kinesiske og afrikanske folks fælles mål og en iboende del af menneskeligt fremskridt.«

Wang Yi rejste fra Etiopien til Libanon, hvor han understregede, at »Kina er fortalere for flere handlinger til at bremse en forværring af flygtningekrisen i Mellemøsten og finde en løsning så snart som muligt«, og tilføjede, at Kina er villig til at forstærke samarbejdet inden for rammerne af Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

Som Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale formand, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, i de seneste uger gentagende har understreget, så var Bælte & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde, der fandt sted i sidste måned, 14.-15. maj, i Beijing, – og hvor hun selv var en fremtrædende deltager – et vendepunkt i moderne historie i retning af at gøre denne plan til en global realitet. Med den forgangne uges vigtige

indikationer på USA's voksende involvering i Bælte & Vej-projektet, står vi nu på tærsklen til denne globale forandring.

EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, og hans hustru, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, har været frontkæmpere for mange af disse udviklinger, længe før de indtraf. Det var Lyndon LaRouche, der først erklærede, at USA's tilslutning til Bælte & Vej Initiativet var *nøglen* til den strategiske krise, og til dette formål skabte han det programmatisk grundlag med sine *Fire Love*. Og det var Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der, i en tale i Chongqing i 2015, først opfordrede Kina til at være med til at løse krisen med krige og emigration i Mellemøsten og Afrika, ved at bringe Bælte & Vej, eller den Nye Silkevej, ind i dette område. Det er Schiller Instituttet, der har været pionerer inden for udbredelsen af klassisk musik og kultur som grundlaget for en dialog mellem civilisationer, med det formål at begrave britisk geopolitik, én gang for alle.

Vi står nu mindre end to uger fra begyndelsen af G20-topmødet i Hamborg, Tyskland, den 7.-8. juli, hvor historiske topmøder mellem og blandt Donald Trump, Xi Jinping, Vladimir Putin, Shinzo Abe, samt andre, vil finde sted. Men, uanset resultatet af disse møder, understregede Helga Zepp-LaRouche i dag, er hele planeten nu i bevægelse under Bælte & Vej Initiativets overvældende dynamik. Et succesrigt resultat af dette initiativ er, som det har været tilfældet fra dets begyndelse, afhængigt af det enestående, strategiske og politikskabende, begrebsmæssige input, som LaRouche-bevægelsen leverer. Og det er denne bevægelses særlige ansvar, erklærede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at bruge sin organiseringsindsats til at introducere skønhed i den politiske debat.

Som Lyndon LaRouche har haft for vane at sige i årtier, så er tiden nu inde til at have det sjovt.

Foto: Præsident Xi Jinping mødes med repræsentanter, der deltager i Kinas Unge Pionerers 7. Nationale Kongres, i

Folkets Store Hal i Beijing, 1. juni, 2015. (Photo Xinhua/Ma Zhancheng)

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

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

Matthew Ogden: Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg Paul Gallagher, redaktør for *EIR's* økonomiske stof, og som har været meget aktiv i Washington, D.C., i den eskalerede kamp for genindførelsen af Glass/Steagall og resten af hr. **LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love** i Hamiltons tradition. Han har mange opdateringer til os på denne front. Og via video har vi Diane Sare, LaRouche PAC Policy koordinator for New York, med os fra

Manhattan. Hun har netop skrevet en artikel med titlen, »Gullivers rejse til Manhattan! Kun LaRouches Fire Love og Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ kan løse Manhattans infrastrukturkrise.« (EIR, 23. juni). Som vi alle ved, venter »Helvedessommeren« forude i New York City, mht. transportinfrastruktur.

Jeg vil straks begynde med nogle meget signifikante udviklinger i kampen for at bringe USA ind i den Nye Silkevej, ind i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ. For det første vil jeg rapportere direkte, at *Xinhua*, et kinesisk nyhedsmedie, rapporterer, at præsident Donald Trump i går mødtes med Kinas statsrådgiver Yang Jiechi i Det Hvide Hus, og til statsrådgiveren Yang sagde, at USA er villig til at samarbejde om projekter relateret til det kinesiske Bælte & Vej Initiativ. De to havde dette møde i Det Hvide Hus som en del af statsrådgiver Yangs besøg til Washington; dette var et møde på højt niveau. Og, iflg. nyhedsrapporter, sagde Yang til præsident Trump, at Kina var meget tilfreds med, meget glad over og satte meget stor pris på det faktum, at Trump-administrationen havde besluttet at sende en repræsentant på højt plan – Matthew Pottinger – til at deltage i Bælte & Vej Forum i Beijing i sidste måned. Vi har rapporteret, at denne repræsentant for USA var en beslutning i sidste sekund fra Trumps side, og at det var en meget god beslutning. Rådgiver Yang sagde også til Donald Trump, at Kina ville være villig til at arbejde sammen med USA om Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Ifølge det Kinesiske Udenrigsministeriums rapport om mødet, responderede præsident Trump til denne udtalelse fra rådgiver Yang ved at sige, at han – præsident Trump – ville være åben over for at samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej Initiativet og hermed relaterede projekter. Han sagde, han er tilfreds med de positive fremskridt, der er sket i de kinesisk-amerikanske relationer, siden sit møde med præsident Xi i Mar-a-Lago. Og han meddelte, at han planlægger at besøge Kina inden for det næste (nuværende) år. Dette blev bekræftet af udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson i en pressekonference, han holdt onsdag.

Præsident Trump rapporterede ligeledes, at han ser frem til igen at mødes med præsident Xi Jinping ved G20-topmødet i Hamborg, Tyskland, i juli måned. Det var første punkt, og det er naturligvis en meget signifikant udvikling.

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

Her følger resten af webcastet på engelsk:

So, I'm going to put on the screen here a picture of this meeting that occurred [Fig. 1]. As you can see, it's the 9th U.S.-China CEO and Former Senior Officials Dialogue; jointly sponsored by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the China Center for International Economic Exchanges. What the joint communiqué reports is that not only would the U.S. businessmen be interested in joint cooperation on the Belt and Road, but they would also be interested in cooperation on building U.S. infrastructure here domestically. So you can see here a direct quote from their communiqué. This is under the subtitle "Strengthening Investment Cooperation Under the Framework of Belt and Road Initiative and Through Other Means." So, here's what it says: "Investment is an important driver of China-U.S. trade relations and the growth of the two economies. There is great

potential for the two sides to further expand mutual investment.

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

infrastructure building, will considerably broaden the space for

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

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

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

In

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

smooth and efficient completion of Belt and Road projects.

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

It goes on to say: "Chinese companies and financial institutions are ready to contribute to this effort through financing and through the provision of goods and services. Chinese investment in certain areas of U.S. infrastructure development has the potential to help strengthen business relations between the two sides, and in some cases, speed up completion of the needed projects at lower cost and with greater

efficiency. Both sides agreed that the two countries can engage

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

Then it has a subtitle: "Agreed Action"

"Within the next twelve months, the CCIEE and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce will organize a conference on the Belt and Road in China or in the United States; which will allow the Chinese side to brief the U.S. side on the Belt and Road plans, including initiative content, current progress and projects that might be appropriate for U.S. company participation, including in partnership with the Chinese companies. The U.S. side will brief the Chinese side on the latest infrastructure developments in the United States and share reflections on pathways for Chinese companies to participate in U.S. infrastructure revitalization initiatives."

So, this is a very important development. And now, third, here's an article from {China Daily} which reports on a rather extraordinary forum that happened in San Francisco yesterday, which was titled "2017: U.S.-China Transportation Cooperation Forum." Before I get to the next slide, just see here, the beginning of the article. It's titled "Chinese Builders Wanted in the U.S.." The beginning of the article says, "Chinese infrastructure techniques are urgently needed to rehabilitate America's poorly maintained and in some cases dilapidated bridges and road system, industry experts from both countries agree. The fact that the U.S., the world's most economically and technologically powerful country, should import fast-train know-how from a developing China, reflects a new normal for China-U.S. cooperation and communication." Then, the article quotes Chinese Consul-General to San Francisco Luo Linqun, who gave the keynote. He said, "China and the U.S. cooperation on

the infrastructure front is posed to become the new highlight in the trade engagement between the two countries. California along with its neighboring states has especially close trade relations with China," he added. "The import and export volume between this region and China has mounted to more than \$201 billion in 2016.

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

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

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

as Helga LaRouche said when she was briefed on these developments

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

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

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

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

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

said, "on this front; and we should recognize it as such."

She

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

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

And

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

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

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

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

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

This

forced the Russians to again terminate the non-confliction hotline between the United States and Russia. You can see Steve

Mnuchin's efforts to levy new sanctions against 38 Russian and Ukrainian firms and individuals. Then you can see this F-16 that

buzzed the military aircraft that was carrying Russian Defense Minister Shoigu. All of these are very dangerous, and are obviously planned to try to derail any potential for a

positive

relationship between the United States and Russia.

One only has to read this hysterical article in the {Washington Post} today, "Obama's Secret Struggle to Punish Russia for Putin's Election Assault," which only continues this false narrative.

PAUL GALLAGHER: Not so secret.

OGDEN: Not so secret. So, that gives you a picture of where we stand, but a very optimistic picture, as Helga LaRouche

underlined; if we see in terms of the potential for this United

States New Silk Road, New Paradigm consolidation. But it's very

urgent that this happen as well. That was why I asked both Paul

and Diane to join me on the show today.

First, I'd like to ask Diane to go through a little bit of what you have in this article. As I said, it's titled "Gulliver

Travels to Manhattan! Only LaRouche's Four Laws and the Belt and

Road Can Save Manhattan Infrastructure Crisis." So Diane.

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

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

million people; at night, it's about 1.8 million. There's

something between 1.5 million and 1.8 million who commute into the city to the island of Manhattan on a daily basis. That's a very large traffic flow. Penn Station handles about 650,000 people a day; I think that's triple what it was built for. Similarly, every other major transit point, whether it's coming in from Long Island and Brooklyn across the East River, or coming in from New Jersey on the western side, everything is completely overloaded; at or well above capacity. So now, the system itself is anywhere from 70 to 100 years old, and very little maintenance or repair or upgrading has been done. We're using switching systems which were built before World War II largely; I think they've modernized one line so far, and another one will be done in a few years. It really is insane.

So, I went to this conference, because starting on July 10, since there were two train derailments in early April in Penn Station on the tracks there, they've decided they cannot put off repairing those tracks. But of course, to repair tracks, then you cannot use them while you're repairing them. They're saying they're going to have to reduce the traffic coming in from Long Island by 20%; I don't know what the percentage is from New Jersey, but it's probably something similar or greater. I know the commuter routes from Essex and Morris Counties, which include commuters coming in from Pennsylvania who go to various places and then take a train into Penn Station, that's all going to be

rerouted into Hoboken; the PATH system which is also overloaded.

At any rate, these repairs start on the 10th of July, and they're

going to be going on for at least six weeks or longer. Who really knows, frankly?

There's no redundancy. This is a system that any section of it that you shut down, if you're talking about transit points that are already functioning or not functioning I should say, at

over capacity. And you're going to add 20% more traffic, or 30%

more traffic, or 50% more traffic to it; you could have a total

breakdown of everything. None of the plans I've seen so far really are adequate. I don't know what they're going to do as they get closer; maybe they're going to have to have people come

into work on rotating shifts, people's hours are going to change,

I don't know. But at any rate, I was hoping that this conference

might address it. What I heard there – and it's not as though these speakers were completely incompetent or were not aware of

the crisis in some way – but what you saw was that people's thinking has been so warped. One, as I said in the article, by

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

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

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

So, the things that they were proposing be done, like turning Rikers Island into a part of LaGuardia Airport –

LaGuardia Airport, as people may know who have travelled into New York, is very much overloaded. They don't have the space for the number of flights that are coming in, and they're projecting that by 2030 there will be another 30 million people per year trying to fly into the city. So, how do you handle this? They said, well we need 75 more flight operations per hour. Taking over all of Rikers Island for this and a new wastewater treatment plant, only gives you an increase of 30 more flight operations per hour. So, why would you do that? What is the point of investing in something that doesn't even meet either the current needs or what you are projecting? It's really insane. So, you have that factor; and the other factor is the funding, which I think Paul may deal with more; but the idea that everything can only be done through public-private partnerships. As people know, my colleague Bill Roberts has an article in the same issue of {EIR} about the Soo Locks, where of course they figured out in 1986 that this is a key transshipment point for coal and other things in the United States; and they really needed to be repaired and modernized. So, this was approved in 1986, but they concluded that you'd only make back 75 cents on the dollar of what was invested. Clearly by Bertrand Russell-type methods, where it's all linear, because if you cause 11 million people to be unemployed, which is what would happen if this thing wasn't

done,
that's not taken into account.
Similarly, the speaker at this conference from Brooklyn,
showed pictures of the damage from Hurricane Sandy, which were
horrific; I was here in New Jersey when that occurred. We
didn't
have electricity for about two weeks; it was very damaging,
very
devastating. There were several proposals made in 2009 at a
conference in Manhattan for storm surge barriers. My favorite
was a five-mile one that went from Sandy Hook in New Jersey to
the Rockaways. So you go across the whole area before you
even
get to Staten Island, and it would have an underground tunnel
and
it would have gates that came up; but normally the ocean would
be
flowing through. I think that would cost something like \$6
billion. I can see these silly accountants with their
mathematical methods saying \$6 billion, what's the profit?
Well,
how about saving \$80 billion? \$6 billion versus \$80 billion
in
damage when you get one of these storms. But nonetheless,
they
decided not to build it, and we got what we got with Hurricane
Sandy. So, because of the way people think in terms of
worshipping money, as opposed to seeing money as a means of
credit generation, or as a means of figuring out how to
measure
the cost of an improvement that you need; which will lead
ultimately to the increase in the productivity of your
population.
What does it mean when you say we want our standard of
living to be higher? Well, that doesn't mean having seven
television sets in every room as opposed to one, or something
like that. When you say the standard of living, we mean

things

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

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

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

Americans have conducted basic scientific experiments in school;

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

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

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

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

that your life is meaningless, if everything coming after you is

going to be worse than you. So, that's the point of economy; but

none of these people was thinking that way at all. It really struck me that here we are sitting on potential complete chaos;

you already had two weeks ago, there was a subway that got stuck,

and it didn't have air conditioning because the power was out.

So you had people packed in this car, and the temperatures were getting to 100 degrees, it was like a sauna in there. No one could move for 45 minutes and they were on the brink – as you might imagine – of getting completely panicked. Happily, no one had a heart attack or other medical disaster, but it does make people nervous. A few days ago, another subway car was stalled out, so people went out the back exit and got down on the track and started walking to the station. That's extremely dangerous. What happens if you lose all order because people just panic because they don't know if they're going to reach their destination? They don't want to be stuck in a subway for hours on end. We're really on the brink of a situation like that. People would be prepared to tolerate hardship if they knew that there was a plan to actually address it. For example, if President Trump, as a result of his dialogues with Xi Jinping and President Putin, were to say "Look, we actually think the Bering Strait tunnel should be built within the next decade; and we're going to launch a crash program with China and Russia to develop high-speed rail corridors across the United States. So that Manhattan really should be connected with Paris; and that's something that will happen. I'm going to initiate that in my Presidency, and it's something that will be completed during a future administration." Now knowing Trump, he'd probably say "Well, it has to be done within my first

term.”

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

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

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

like under those circumstances? Maybe we have to consider taking

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

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

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

thinking in this way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

regard to infrastructure in North America and infrastructure in

the United States.

But on Glass-Steagall, let me just indicate, you have a very stark comparison in terms of infrastructure investment between

the United States and China. In the United States, about \$300 billion is invested in infrastructure every year, and that is, every school, every hospital, every road job, every subdivision's new sewer and water and optical fiber, and so forth – that is absolutely everything, public, private, local, Federal, amounts to about that much investment. In China, the four major state banks which provide the credit for the infrastructure breakthroughs that have been made in China, those four banks issue about \$140 billion worth of credit annually for high-speed rail in China alone. And just that form of advanced infrastructure and just that public investment by those four national banks: the Exim Bank, the China Development Bank, the other China policy banks, as they're called. That investment in just high-speed rail is half of the total investment made by the United States – public, private, in every form, on every kind of infrastructure and every public band-aide that's put on, and claimed as infrastructure, every year. In addition, those banks in China have invested and committed \$300 billion just in the three years since the Belt and Road Initiative of President Xi began to take off, and that \$300 billion invested and committed by those banks is outside China. So that's going on simultaneously with the large-scale investments in completely frontier, including things like maglev subways, in the major cities of China, and there are many, many, many major cities in China as people know.

So this is widely in the financial press in the United States and Europe, the old imperial liberal order defends itself by saying, "This credit issuance of China can't possibly be sustained. There will be a tremendous, earthshattering collapse of all of this infrastructure credit, because the banks – it has dwarfed even what the Federal Reserve has done for the banks here, and for a good purpose, and it can be sustained; it'll all blow up." There is a very fundamental difference here, though, in that China, for the last 20 years has had bank separation; it has many shadow banks, it has a lot of investment companies involved in broker-dealers, but they are completely separated from the both private commercial banking system, which they want to build up further, and also from this kind of public banking. So that these banks are not involved in the \$550 trillion derivatives exposure of the banks in London and New York. These banks are not involved in securities speculation. They are able to handle bankruptcies; they're able to handle non-performing loans when they appear in various sectors as the economy develops. So, Glass-Steagall, although they don't call that law "Glass-Steagall" in China, that bank separation is important to what they are able to do and the fact that they've been doing it now for 20 years on a level of spending nearly 9% of their GDP on new infrastructure every year, for more than 20 years.

Compare

that to the United States, which spends about 1.3% of its GDP now

on infrastructure annually. They've been able to do that, and keep it up.

Now, we've been fighting for Glass-Steagall in Washington.

It's really taken on much more of the characteristics of a good

brawl, in the recent weeks. It's become a big public fight, for

one thing, where you have on the one hand, especially for the last two months, three months, – on the one hand, you have all

the financial press and the major national {Wall Street Journal,

Washington Post, New York Times}, running all kinds of editorials

and op-eds on why Glass-Steagall is not necessary, why it's terrible, why it's completely outdated; it was only repealed 20

years ago, but it's completely outdated, practically a relic of

the Middle Ages, why it didn't have anything to do with the crash

in 2008, and so on and so forth. You have that going on, you

have think tanks in Washington, like Heritage Foundation and American Enterprise Institute running whole events which consist

of nothing but examining Glass-Steagall. I went to one recently,

at the American Enterprise Institute, where six different speakers were attacking Glass-Steagall. The only person in the

room who was fighting for Glass-Steagall was me, and I was not one of the speakers.

So you have these kinds of attacks on it, but also the sponsors. The main sponsors of the House bill, Marcy Kaptur

(D)

of Ohio, Walter Jones (R) of North Carolina, the Republican main

sponsor, have started to really fight publicly. They had a public press conference when they introduced the bill three and a

half months ago with 25 sponsors. They now have about 55 sponsors as a result of fighting for it publicly since then.

This is a much faster rate of getting sponsors onto the bill than

was the case in the last session, where eventually there were about 85 sponsors after two years of work. But in this case, the

week before last they had a congressional briefing for the staffs

of Congressmen throughout the House, about somewhere between 35

and 40 other Congressmen sent their staffs to this briefing, so

it was really quite a packed event in one of the office buildings, to take notes and report back to their Members of Congress. And not only Kaptur and Jones, but also experts from

the AFL-CIO, from the Americans for Financial Reform, from Public

Citizen; Nomi Prins, an independent, former investment banker and

author on banking, independent expert – they all testified.

And

this is causing a tremendous amount of discussion throughout the

House in particular.

On the Senate side, the leading sponsors have all made it a point to draw out the Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, and make

it clear that what he was advising Donald Trump to do during the

campaign essentially, was not the real Glass-Steagall or anything like it; but rather Mnuchin's advice to Trump during his campaign, was to talk about Glass-Steagall while Mnuchin privately was designing something which was really Wall Street deregulation like the bill that recently passed the House. So the fact that they have really broken Mnuchin down on this and made him say "No, no, no, I don't believe in anything like separating commercial and investment banking." This has also dramatically clarified issues for people in both the Senate and the House. And secondly, we have begun to get close to the mobilization of large organizations, large trade unions, coalition organizations like Public Citizen, and in this I don't mean them endorsing Glass-Steagall, I mean them mobilizing their hundreds and hundreds of thousands of members to demand this from Congress. We've come very close to getting to that stage, and in particular you saw last week a broadcast that Public Citizen ran on their Facebook page with Rep. Marcy Kaptur, in which they were motivating and calling on their reportedly 400,000 members to go after Congress to get this. So the objective is to get from the 55 sponsors now to 100 – fast. Because it's not so important in the Senate, to pile up a lot of sponsors – there are only a 100 Senators. It's very important in the House, when the leadership of both parties is against Glass-Steagall, which they are: Both the Republican and the Democratic leadership do not want to see it; the

Democratic

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

was marking up this crazy Republican deregulation bill called the

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

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

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

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

the guy who ate nothing but McDonalds food for four months and after four or five months his organs were failing, he was catastrophically obese, he was near death! And this is like saying "there was no connection, there were other factors that

brought this guy into this condition. It wasn't the McDonald's Big Macs that he was eating." That's what it amounts to to tell Americans that less than 10 years after getting rid of Glass-Steagall, the whole banking system blew up simultaneously, which has never, for all of the major banks to be bankrupt at the same time, as Ben Bernanke admitted they were, has never happened in the entire history of the United States. It took less than 10 years without Glass-Steagall to bring that about. So they also are now arguing that the period in which Glass-Steagall was in effect, which is also the period in which the biggest infrastructure investments in new infrastructure in the United States were being made, from the '20s, up through the end of the '60s and into the '70s, that that was a golden era of productivity in the United States. We had a banking system then, which concentrated not only on loaning to – but you see it in many examples of the history of that period – concentrating on making commercial and industrial loans to businesses for expansion and for participation in major projects. You don't have that kind of a banking system without Glass-Steagall; instead, you have a banking system which wants to underwrite bond issues for only the biggest corporations, with which they can play around with their stock prices and so on. And it brings the entire economy down. It gets us right back – and they're making now the right

argument and very powerful argument, that if we want to rebuild the United States, and particularly build new, frontier new infrastructure in the United States, we have to have a commercial banking system which is separated from securities broker-dealing and speculation in the derivatives markets; and which is concentrating on household lending and commercial and industrial lending to the companies participating in these great projects.

Now, public-private partnership is, again, back to Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, the conference that was held in Washington last week, SelectUSA, which was a conference trying to get foreign investment in the United States. So this is the Treasury Department; you've already given the context for this, along with what Diane reported, in terms of the imminent potential, absolutely imminent potential for large-scale investment, particularly from China in an infrastructure build in the United States. Instead, what the Treasury Secretary went there and offered was, he said: We want this kind of investment and public-private partnerships are critical.

Suffice it to say, never in the United States has a major infrastructure project or major new element of the infrastructure of the United States, {never} has such a thing been constructed with a public-private partnership, let alone by private investment alone. The Transcontinental Railroad was by no means a public-private partnership. And these things simply don't work. The investors in them want their capital back in 10 years,

and they want 10-12% rates of interest in their invested capital during that 10 years. Well, that means they want it back, if it's anything major, while the thing is still not finished, and still not being used to a full extent; and they want to absolutely rob the public taxpayers whose money is going into such a project. It simply cannot work, and it will sabotage foreign investment in new infrastructure building in the United States if this method is used.

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

Otherwise, we are really facing disaster. I'll give you an example: I went to a Congressional hearing yesterday and talked to some of the witnesses who were involved in exactly trying to organize some of the infrastructure developments that Diane indicated are so needed in the New York area. One of them is a bridge over the Hackensack River near Secaucus, New Jersey, called the Portal Bridge, which is 108 years old. It was

designed in the 19th century, completed in 1910. It has ships go under it by splitting the bridge, but opening as a drawbridge. All of the rail traffic, freight and passenger, between Florida and Massachusetts goes over that bridge – all of it! And that bridge, when they open it to get a ship go through, when they try to close it now, 9 times out 10, according to the fellow who spoke to me there, 9 times out of 10 it doesn't close properly, so that rails don't align. And they then send workers out on the concrete abutment of the bridge with sledgehammers, and they hammer at the iron trusses of the bridge to get the rails to align.

All that it would take is for them to be able to unable to get them to align, once, and as he estimated, that would be a single-point loss of potentially 10% of U.S. gross domestic product. Right there.

And then you have, in the Poe Lock, the potential failure of the Poe Lock between Lake Superior into Lake Huron, and the whole

Mesabi Iron Range, and all of the ships which are carrying all of the strategic metals, the iron, the coal coming out of Northern

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

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

So you say, "well of course, they're replacing this bridge at Hackensack," but actually, they're not! They don't have the funds! They have a plan, it's all worked out, it's

engineered,
but the replacement is not under way.
So you have here, the makings of a movie you could call it,
a suspense thriller: "The Bridge over the Hackensack River."
But
with 10% of the U.S. economy hanging on the guys banging those
rails back into place, but there is not any funding arranged
to
replace that bridge. And you can multiply that for all the
other
things that have to be done.
We're very far from the frontier, national high-speed rail
network, nuclear desalination plants, the Western water
management systems, – we're very far from the frontiers in
space infrastructure that we have to be building. We're
actually
threadbare in terms of just continuing to use, and have an
economy, what we already have.
So there's no time at all left, for these wonderful
prospects by the discussions with the Chinese now at the
highest
level, between President Trump and one of the tope people in
the
Chinese government, State Councilor Yang Jiechi, for these
wonderful prospects to be backed up by the institution which
issues credit for the United States, a Hamiltonian bank for
investment. It must be formed. It must come out of the
Congress
with the drive from the White House in order to get it done.

OGDEN: As you said, time is running out: We're five months
now into the Trump administration, and you highlighted the
role
of Steve Mnuchin: I think this continues to be a very bad
element in the Trump administration. And the kind of support
that Trump gained from his support for Glass-Steagall during
the

Presidential election campaign, is something that has now – that has to become visible. That has to become a visible, vocal, sort of element from the population, from the constituency. And I just want to put on the screen the URL that we have for the mobilization that we have for H.R.790: That's the bill that's in the House, the "Return to Prudent Banking Act" –

GALLAGHER: The Glass-Steagall bill.

OGDEN: Which was introduced by Marcy Kaptur and Walter Jones. This is the return to Glass-Steagall. As you can see, this is the website: <http://lpac.co/hr790> And I think that this goal of reaching 100 cosponsors in a very short amount of time, is a very tangible goal that we can mobilize for, along with this vision of, the United States joining the New Silk Road. But Paul, as I think you just laid out very clearly, that is impossible without Glass-Steagall. You cannot set up the kind of national credit institutions, the national banking credit institutions that would channel that kind of joint investment into this infrastructure in the United States, without this critical first step of the return to Glass-Steagall. One thing I wanted to ask you about, Paul, is just the prognosis on how close we could be to another disastrous blowout of the trans-Atlantic banking system. I know Nomi Prins did an interview a few months ago with you, where she highlighted a few of these things with the corporate debt bubble. But that's something that Marcy Kaptur cited in her testimony to the

Rules

Committee, and I think that element of urgency is also necessary

to put in here.

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

GALLAGHER: We don't know how much time, because it's impossible to put a finger on a date when a really huge and increasing unproductive debt bubble, in this case, as Representative Kaptur identified, the corporate debt bubble in the United States, when it's going to blow up. But, the size of

corporate debt in the United States has doubled in seven years,

from about \$7 to about \$14 trillion, with really the great majority of that tremendous debt expansion being used for what they call "financial engineering" by large companies: Meaning buying back their own stock, mergers and acquisitions, finding ways to increase the dividends they give to their stockholders,

increasing their own executive compensation – all of this kind of financial engineering has used in various years up to 80-85%

of this new corporate debt.

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

has stopped expanding. And this has been noted rather suddenly,

by everybody from the IMF to individual bank research teams, since April of this year, that suddenly that tremendous expansion

has stopped; as happens with an immense bubble that's about to explode, and it started to shrink. And there was a report put out by UBS bank in Switzerland about two weeks ago which caused a

certain amount of alarm, because they found that what they call

the "credit impulse," had gone negative in the last six months –

they're talking globally now – meaning that the second derivative, the rate of the rate of growth of business lending around the world had suddenly in the last six months become negative. And that is something which virtually always points to

a bubble about to collapse.

This is a very huge one, indeed. The IMF estimated that if interest rates were to go up sharply in the United States, 20% of

all the companies in the United States would default. That's way

above the rate of defaults on mortgages even at the worst 10 years ago; and the whole thing would come crashing down.

So we need the reorganization of the banking system, urgently, for that reason, also in order to make the commercial

banking side of it proof against this kind of a blowout. And so

you don't have, again, a situation in which the bankruptcy of any

investment bank, let's say, becomes, almost overnight, the bankruptcy of every major U.S. based bank as happened in late September 2008.

OGDEN: I would say, this is real policy. This is what anybody who's serious is discussing right now. And the failed decision by the Democratic Party, for example, to just be the party of resistance, is increasingly proven to be an increasingly

proven to be very ill-advised policy. And I think even Sen. Chris Murphy made some headlines this week where he said: Look,

none of my constituents are talking about "Russia," when I go

home. They're talking about jobs, drugs, poverty. They're talking about exactly what we're discussing here! Hmm, gee, maybe we shouldn't be pumping anti-Putin propaganda all day every day.

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

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

And many people are coming up to our tables and we're actually getting a very hot response, much more intense than at any period since the election, with people coming over saying, "You know, I thought I was the only one. The propaganda is so intense, I don't dare to say that I supported Trump at my workplace." We had a very strong response also in Connecticut, Long Island, Jersey and Manhattan per se, where we are getting this type of response.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OGDEN: I think it was clearly said by Helga LaRouche: We have a very significant victory to claim, I think both in terms

of the further consolidation of this idea that the United States

should join the New Silk Road, and the fact that these discussions are now going on at the very highest level between the United States and China. But also in terms of this fight for

Glass-Steagall and as Paul said, this is something that

LaRouche

PAC has been directly involved in, on the forefront of leading for year – 2008, 2009? Lyndon LaRouche's call at that time was

for a complete bankruptcy reorganization of the economy. It was

initially the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act and that became

this idea of the Four Laws.

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

OGDEN: That's right. So now we're coming up on 10 years! I think that's widely recognized, the leadership that the LaRouche

movement has played, including on Capitol Hill from the sponsors

of this legislation. So this decision now to mobilize and to really enter into a brawl, the fight is on on that front and we

have a responsibility to pour as much as we can, from around the

country, in mobilizing on that front, too.

I think that's a good conclusion for our webcast here, today. Thank you Diane, for joining us from New York, and thank

you very much Paul for joining me here.

GALLAGHER: A pleasure.

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

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



Nyhedsorientering maj/juni
2017

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

Vi deltog i debatmøder, hvor vi kunne stille relevante spørgsmål. Vi uddelte over 900 eksemplarer af Nyhedsorientering og kom i samtale direkte på stedet med mere end halvdelen af de mennesker, der tog vores materiale. Vi har bl.a. talt med folk, der har været i Kina og er meget begejstret for den udvikling, der er i gang dér. Mange af de mennesker, vi talte med, kunne huske os fra før. En dame kom op til os og sagde, »Det er jo jer, der har talt om Silkevejen, før det blev til Kinas politik«. Hun var meget

imponeret over, at Kina har vedtaget den Nye Silkevej, og hun tog vores materiale med stor interesse. En bornholmer stoppede op, da han kendte os fra før og i mange år havde støttet os. Han var glad over at se, at hans støtte har båret frugt.

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

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

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

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



Feride på
Folkemødet 2017

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

»For en måned siden var der 'Bælte & Vej Forummet' i Beijing, hvor USA havde en særlig udsending, Matthew Pottinger. Konferencen skulle konsolidere Kinas politik for Bælte & Vej, der omfatter hele verden; ikke kun Kina. Bælte & Vej er

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

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

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



Lissie Folkemødet
2017

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lissie Brobjerg fik det første spørgsmål:

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

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



Christian Folkemøde
2017

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

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

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

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



Feride diskuterer

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

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

Lissie fik nummer to spørgsmål og sagde:

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

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

I en debat hos Informationen, »Will Trump Last the Entire Presidential 4 Year Period?«, talte den tidligere amerikanske ambassadør til Danmark, Rufus Gifford, om sandsynligheden for, at Trump kunne blive afsat gennem en rigsretssag (impeachment) gennem det 25. Forfatningstillæg, eller evt. selv gå af. Han mente ikke, at det var sandsynligt, omend han ønskede det. Hvis en rigsretssag skal være mulig, kunne det være pga. 'forhindring af udøvelse af retten' (obstruction of Justice), men ellers skulle man bruge kræfterne på demokraternes mærkesager. 300 mennesker deltog, det foregik i centrum og den generelle konsensus var, at Trump er forrykt. Lissie kom op til ambassadøren bagefter og sagde, at Lyndon LaRouche havde sagt, at, hvis Comey og Co. lykkedes med et kup mod Trump, ville det føre til generel krig, og at briterne var efter Trump, fordi han vil samarbejde med Rusland, medens Obama derimod forsøgte at starte en atomkrig med Rusland. Han skyndte sig blot væk efter at han blev noget chokeret over

det, Lissie sagde.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING 13. juni, 2017: Kinas Nye Silkevej – LaRouches nye økonomiske verdensorden. Vil vi få 'LaRouchenomics'?

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/kinas-nye-silkevej-larouches-nye-okonomiske-verdensorden-vil-vi-fa-larouchenomics

v/ formand Tom Gillesberg.

Video og lydfil.

Velkommen til dette fortsatte drama, som vi forhåbentlig vil se tilbage på om et par år og sige:

»Det var dengang, verden var på kanten af at udrydde og udradere sig selv; men lige pludselig, så lyttede menneskeheden til de fantastiske mennesker, de ikke ville lytte til før; så lyttede man til de vise ord fra Lyndon LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttet og Tom Gillesberg og Jacques Cheminade. Det her er folk, som igennem årtier havde kæmpet for at få vendt udviklingen og få verden

sat på ret kurs. Og vi troede aldrig, det ville ske. Og lige pludselig, så begyndte man at lytte; og ikke nok med, at man lyttede til det her, man begyndte faktisk at gøre det.

Det var først kineserne, der for alvor så lyset og begyndte at gøre noget ved det. Men da først Kina satte sig i spidsen for dette udviklingstog, for den Nye Silkevej, så gik der ikke lang tid, så kom resten af menneskeheden med om bord, og så skete der noget. Og selv i de tidligere håbløse områder, som f.eks. New York City, hvor det var et mareridt, hvor man knap nok kunne bevæge sig fra A til B, fordi der var så mange folk, der skulle transporteres, og hele infrastrukturen var 100 år gammel; jamen, så i løbet af bare ganske få år med kinesisk hjælp, så lykkedes det faktisk at bygge en helt ny, fantastisk infrastruktur.

Og Donald Trump, som man forsøgte at gøre grin med, som man forsøgte at få afsat, som man forsøgte at få fjernet med alle midler; jamen, det viste sig, at han faktisk indgik et strategisk partnerskab med Kina, med Rusland og blev til en af USA's rigtig store præsidenter.«

Og det er det, vi må håbe er fortællingen om ganske kort, for det er det potentiale, der er i tiden. Igen, man forsøger ved hjælp af 'fake news', dvs., de veletablerede mediekanaler i den vestlige verden, hele tiden at have en pseudodagsorden; hele tiden at få folk fikseret på det ting, der *ikke* er de store spørgsmål, mens de virkelige, revolutionerende, afgørende begivenheder, der sker i verden rundt omkring, jamen, dem forsøger man ikke at snakke om.

Altså, hvor mange har læst i danske medier, en udførlig rapport fra Bælte & Vej Forummet, 14.-15. maj, (i Beijing); denne verdenshistoriske begivenhed, hvor 130 nationer var til stede, og hvor Bælte & Vej Initiativet så at sige gik ind i næste fase, og hvor sågar USA, som under Obama havde gjort *alt* for at sabotere dette udviklingsmomentum, faktisk gik med om bord; at man havde Pottinger som Trumps repræsentant; at man

nu har etableret en samarbejdsgruppe, USA's Bælte & Vej Samarbejdsgruppe, som skal få integreret USA i Bælte & Vej politikken.

Tilmed i Danmark; Karen Ellemann blev sendt som Lars Løkkes personlige repræsentant: Hvor mange danskere tror I ved det? At Danmark var med på Bælte & Vej Forummet? 1 procent; 1 promille? 5 Mennesker ud af fem millioner? Det er meget få, for der har ikke været en lyd om det. Intet. Og det er ligesom måden, man forsøger at behandle det her på; man forsøger ligesom fanatisk at sige, i den gamle optik, i den gamle verden, at der ikke er sket noget; verden er, som den altid har været. ...

Seniorrådgiver i USA's Transportministerium: Vær opmærksom på Bælte & Vej

12. juni, 2017 – I en artikel med titlen, »USA's engagement i Bælte & Vej er et strategisk imperativ«, i juniudgaven af *Journal of Commerce*, advarer Tony Padilla, en seniorrådgiver for internationale anliggender ved USA's Transportministerium, om, at det er til USA's eget fordærv fortsat at ignorere Bælte & Vej. »Alt imens den Amerikanske Kongres kæmper med den bedste måde at genopbygge en aldrende, amerikanske infrastruktur på, til dels gennem, hvad der ville være en \$1 billion stor investering over 10 år, så indikerer rapporter, at det Kina-ledede Bælte & Vej Initiativ allerede har forpligtet næsten \$2 billion i løbet af de seneste tre år fra forskellige kilder, inklusive Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB), banker til Kinas politik og

multilateral og bilateral finansiering«, skriver Padilla.

Og alt imens Kongressen har afholdt høringer om infrastruktur, så bemærker Padilla, at mange af deltagerne i en reception på Capitol Hill under Infrastruktur-ugen aldrig havde hørt om Bælte & Vej. Dernæst går Padilla videre med at citere tidligere amerikanske diplomat Chas Freeman for, at projekterne er »den største og potentielt mest transformerende ingeniørindsats i menneskets historie«.

Padilla knurrer over, hvordan USA vil blive kørt ud på et sidespor af Bælte & Vej, hvis det fortsat ignorerer og klager over Kinas »aggressive merkantilisme« og citerer endda admiral Mahan og en af vore nutidige Cassandra'er, admiral James Stavridis. Men hans respons synes mindre et krigshyl end en opfordring til, at Amerika står ud af sengen og gør noget, går med i Bælte & Vej snarere end at forsøge at underminere initiativet. »At tackle disse spørgsmål kræver en portefølje af løsninger, der kunne omfatte at udføre lobbyvirksomhed for gennemskuelighed i tilbudsgivningen for kontrakter i Bælte & Vej-relaterede markeder samtidig med en fokusering på de formidable problemer mht. at flytte og levere materialer internationalt«, skriver Padilla.

»Som en magt i Stillehavsområdet med enorme økonomiske og strategiske spørgsmål, der står på spil i Bælte & Vej-området«, fortsætter Padilla, »kan USA ikke tillade sig at sidde på sidelinjen og se på, at disse infrastrukturudviklinger i udlandet går fremad. Ved at acceptere Bælte & Vej kunne USA sikre, at selskaber og investorer bliver i stand til at deltage i det, der kunne blive historiens største, økonomiske udviklingsprojekt. Men det må gå frem med forsigtighed og afbalancere fordelene ved større adgang til udviklende markeder samtidig med, at det tager en førende, komplementerende rolle sammen med vore kinesiske modparter for at være med til at udforme et transparent, gnidningsfrit og ligeværdigt handelsnetværk.« Han slutter med endnu en advarsel om, at, hvis USA ikke bliver

involveret, vil det »ultimativt gøre det muligt for Kina ensidigt at trække linjerne op for verdens næste, episke kapitel for geopolitik og geøkonomi«.

Foto: USA negligerede infrastruktur smuldrer.

Karen Ellemanns indlæg ved tematisk session om Infrastruktur-forbundethed på Bælte & Vej Forum, 14. maj i Beijing

Følgende er Karen Ellemanns tale, som blev holdt på engelsk.

Minister for ligestilling og minister for nordisk samarbejde, Karen Ellemann, blev sendt til Bælte & Vej Forum i Beijing som statsminister Lars Løkke Rasmussens særlige repræsentant. Taletid: 4 min.

Deres excellence, transportminister Li Xiaopeng; ærede kolleger,

Tak for invitationen til at tale i dag som statsminister Rasmussens særlige repræsentant for Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

Bælte & Vej Initiativet er lige så betydningsfuldt, som det er ambitiøst. At gøre over 60 lande og 70 procent af verdens befolkning mere gensidigt forbundne er ikke en nem opgave. Men, gennem at bringe lande sammen – og især gennem at bringe Asien og Europa tættere sammen – skaber vi en platform for at bringe fremgang og udvikling til alle dele af det eurasiske

kontinent.

Bælte & Vej Initiativet er en mulighed for at skabe bæredygtig udvikling i området, og for at forbinde Asien og Europa.

Danske selskaber har erfaringer og resultater inden for bæredygtige løsninger for byplanlægning, infrastruktur og energi.

Danmark er blandt verdens førende som søfartsnation og inden for vedvarende energi med selskaber, der er globalt førende, og vi ser os selv som en naturlig partner, både i initiativets dele for Bælte og for Vej.

Danmark besidder også førende ekspertise inden for vej- og jernbaneplanlægning, såvel som også andre hovedelementer for transportinfrastruktur. Disse globalt førende danske selskaber er allerede engageret i Asien, og nogle er til stede her på forummet.

Bælte & Vej Initiativet har et lovende potentiale for fremme af frihandel, skabelse af bæredygtig vækst og fattigdomsbekæmpelse i mange lande. Men vi må sikre et ligeligt spillefelt for investeringer og sikre, at investeringer er baseret på de højeste standarder for gennemskuelse.

Forbundethed handler også om at bringe mennesker sammen. Mellemløselige kontakter skaber bedre gensidig forståelse og gensidig afhængighed og fører til nye ideer og innovation, der er nødvendig for en bedre og mere bæredygtig verden for kommende generationer. Til dette formål er turisme et vigtigt redskab, og Danmark er stolt af at have sit første turismeår med Kina i år.

Jeg takker igen for muligheden for at tale på dette vigtige forum. Danmark ser frem til at deltage i den fremtidige implementering af Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

Mange Tak.

Foto: Minister for ligestilling og minister for nordisk samarbejde, Karen Ellemann. Foto fra 2010.

Lad være med at sluge den inducerede pessimisme – Den nye økonomiske verdensorden er allerede på plads

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 6. juni, 2017 – Til amerikanere og europæere, der døgnet rundt, og alle ugens syv dage, udsættes for en spærreild af rapporter om globale katastrofer, om Trump, der står over for afsættelse ved rigsretssag, om verden, der snart brænder op pga. global opvarmning og flere og flere 'fake news' – falske nyheder – og 'fake' videnskab og bevidst fremkaldt pessimisme – kom videre i teksten! Verden har forandret sig.

Momentum i vor samtids historie defineres af den enorme sejr for menneskeheden, der blev konsolideret på Bælte & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde den 14.-15. maj i Kina, efterfulgt af Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum den 1.-3. juni, i Rusland.

Disse fora gik langt videre end til at fremlægge en håbeful

vision om en fjern fremtid, men fremlagde også en kortlægning af den transformation af hele planeten, der har fundet sted i løbet af de seneste par år gennem processen med den Nye Silkevej samtidig med, at man har opnået et forpligtende engagement på vegne af det store flertal af den menneskelige race, for at fortsætte denne udvikling i et forhøjet tempo.

USA var deltager i denne proces, med præsident Trump, der sendte en seniordelegeret til Beijing, og med 300 førende industrifolk, der deltog i Skt. Petersborg. Helga Zepp-LaRouches deltagelse på Bælte & Vej Forum, og på fora og i presseinterviews i hele Kina i to uger efter BVF-begivenheden, demonstrerede anerkendelsen i Kina af, at hun og hendes mand, Lyndon LaRouche, tilbage i 1990'erne havde initieret processen med at erstatte den Kolde Krig med udviklingsprojekter, der fysisk og kulturelt forbinder nationer, ligesom den oprindelige Silkevej havde gjort det i fortiden.

I dag talte Helga Zepp-LaRouche til de amerikanske medlemmer af LaRouche-organisationen om det presserende nødvendige i at løfte befolkningen ud af det kontrollerede miljø, som er skabt af de desintegrerende politiske partier, de neokonservative og de mislykkede massemedier. Er infrastrukturen i din by ved at smuldre, som den er i New York City? Stil dig selv spørgsmålet: Hvad ville Kina gøre? Inden for et eller to år ville Kina erstatte forfaldet med nye højhastighedsjernbaner, svævetogs- (maglev-) undergrundsbaner, produktion af elektricitet ved hjælp af kernekraft og nye faciliteter til uddannelses- og sundhedssektor. Og, med initiativet for Bælte & Vej, sammen med de udviklingsbanker, de har skabt, bringer Kina denne proces til resten af verden – inklusive (hvis vi accepterer) til USA.

Dette er, hvad Franklin Roosevelt og John F. Kennedy ville have gjort. Dette er, hvad LaRouche, meget detaljeret, har foreslået hen over de seneste 50 år, siden Kennedy blev dræbt af dem, der foragtede hans vision og videnskabelige optimisme. I dag gennemgik Zepp-LaRouche, hvordan denne organisation har

udarbejdet udstrakte udviklingsprojekter for Afrika, for Latinamerika, for det Indiske Hav/Stillehavsbækkenet og for Nordamerika, og ligeledes for en tilbagevenden til Hamiltons, Lincolns og Roosevelts politikker for udstedelse af statskreditter, der ville fremme sådanne store projekter. Men dette er præcis de forslag, der i dag bliver implementeret under Kinas og Ruslands lederskab!

Der er ingen tid at spille med hensyn til at vække den amerikanske befolkning og de europæiske befolkninger til at gå med i det nye paradigme, der står lige foran dem, men som er skjult af den løgnagtige presse, og af deres egen frygt og pessimisme. Hidtil har præsident Trump nægtet at bøje sig for den nye 'McCarthy-isme', som er orkestreret af briterne og deres aktiver i USA, og som tror, at befolkningen er blevet så »fordummet«, at den vil acceptere den absurditet, at et venskab med Rusland og Kina er en forbrydelse mod amerikansk frihed og demokrati.

Det vil ikke virke. LaRouche-organisationen er, med løsningerne på hånden, strategisk placeret til at bryde igennem moradset for at bringe USA og Europa fuldt og helt ind i den Nye Silkevej, for at genindføre Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingslov og statsbankpraksis i Hamiltons tradition, og for at gå sammen med resten af verden i forceringen af den menneskelige videns fremskudte grænser og skabe en fremtid, der er menneskeheden værdig, her på Jorden, og i vore fremtidige kolonier i rummet.

Optimisme og muligheder:

USA må gå med i den Nye Silkevej.

LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 2. juni, 2017

Matthew Ogden: Temaet for aftenens webcast er: USA må afgjort tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej. Dette er den strategisk vigtigste ting, der kan ske; alt andet må ses som underordnet dette mål. Vi havde lejlighed til at tale med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche for et par timer siden, og vi har lidt nyheder; nogle bemærkninger fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som jeg gerne vil oplæse som indledning. Hun sagde, at verden hastigt bevæger sig i en meget ny og dynamisk retning. Momentum er meget klart. Tag Bælt & Vej Forum, der fandt sted for kun to uger siden, og tag dernæst Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum, der finder sted netop i disse dage; naturligvis med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin som vært. Ved denne lejlighed er den særlige gæst premierminister Modi fra Indien, og vi ser en fortsat integration mellem Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen (SCO), Bælt & Vej, den Nye Silkevej og alle disse eurasiske, økonomiske udviklings- og integrationsorganisationer.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde, vi må nu optrappe vores kampagne her i USA, for, at USA kan blive fuldt ud engageret og involveret i denne nye dynamik med win-win-samarbejde og gensidigt fordelagtige udviklingsprojekter. Hun sagde, at vi må holde fokus på dette spørgsmål; ikke lade os distrahere af noget som helst andet. Verden har totalt forandret sig. Vi befinder os i en fuldstændig ny epoke, en ny æra for civilisationen.

Hun sagde, vi i nyhederne netop har set, i de sidste 24 timer, at præsident Trump har sagt nej til denne Paris-klimaaf tale, og det er en god ting, sagde hun. For det (klimaaf talen) er

ikke baseret på videnskab. Jo, vi ved godt, at klimaet ændrer sig, men det er ikke baseret på menneskeskabt, global opvarmning. Spørgsmålet er så, hvad er årsagen? Paris-aftalen var baseret på ideologi, sagde hun; den var baseret på ideologien om grænser for vækst, befolkningsreduktion, undertrykkelse af udvikling – især i den tredje verden.[1] Sæt som modsætning den Nye Silkevej, Bælt & Vej-initiativet, der kommer fra Kina, og som bringer hårdt tiltrængt udvikling til den tredje verden, til Afrika og andre steder; som disse områder ikke har haft adgang til i generationer. Man må se, at dette er en virkelig bølge af optimisme.

Hun sagde, hold tingene optimistisk, bliv ved at være optimistiske. Det kunstige diskussionsmiljø i USA, der er skabt af nyhedsmedierne, er ren propaganda, sagde hun. De falske nyheder er ikke kun de negative rapporter – det har vi set masser af. Men, de falske nyheder er i realiteten, at man ikke rapporterer de positive og optimistiske udviklinger, der finder sted i hele verden, og som især kommer via Bælt & Vej Forum.

Vi havde lejlighed til at få en ti minutter lang briefing fra fr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i går, under en telefonkonference med hendes medarbejdere (i USA). Det var en virkelig vidunderlig og optimistisk refleksion tilbage over betydningen og virkningen af dette Bælt & Vej Forum, som hun havde mulighed for at deltage i personligt. Vi har fremstillet en slags video til jer her, hvor vi har brugt nogle billeder af Helgas besøg til Kina, og noget baggrundsmateriale, som I vil få at høre her, som gennemgår LaRouche-bevægelsens 40-50 år lange historie for denne nye, internationale, økonomiske orden, der nu er ved at blive til virkelighed. Her kommer denne ti minutter lange video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6ekspcgnkoY>

(Her følger resten af diskussionen på engelsk. Helgas briefing (videoen) er oversat til dansk, her:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=19877>)

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, I just wanted to make sure that you get a first impression from me from my trip, because I think

the worst mistake we could make would be to respond to the absolutely incredible psywar propaganda coming from the U.S. mainstream media and the neoliberal media in Europe, like Spiegel

Online with its Chief Editor piece which was really out of this

way! It is very clear that people who are primarily relying on such media have a completely, totally, 100% wrong idea of what the reality is of what's going on. And we should really get that

out of our heads and not try to swim within the fishbowl of an artificially created environment. Because, from my standpoint, the world looks very, very different.

First of all, I said this already, and I reiterate it: With the Belt and Road Forum, the world has dramatically consolidated

the beginning of the new era, and I don't think at all, that short of World War III, this is going to go away, because the majority of the world is moving in a completely liberated way. And first of all, this was the highest level conference I ever participated in. There were 28 head of state, speaking one after

the other, and obviously, the speech by Xi Jinping was absolutely

outstanding, and whoever has time to listen to it, should really

do it, because it was a very, very Confucian speech, which set the tone for the two-day conference in a very clear way. So, please listen to it when you have some time.

I think the way people have to understand what is going on, you have to really think what this organization, and Lyn in particular did for the last almost 50 years. The first time

when

Lyn in 1971 recognized what the significance of the dismantling

of the Bretton Woods system was, and then all the many, many things we did in the last over 40 years: Lyn coming back from the

Iraq Ba'ath Party celebration in 1975, when he proposed the IDB

as an International Development Bank to foster a new world economic order; the fact that we, for one year, campaigned with

this IDB proposal which then basically became part of the Colombo, Sri Lanka resolution of the Non-Aligned Movement in '76.

Then, in the end of the '70s, when we worked with Indira Gandhi

on a 40-year development plan for India. Already in '76, we published a whole book about the industrialization of Africa.

We

worked with Mexican President José López Portillo on "Operation

Juárez." We put out a 50-year Pacific Basic development plan.

Lyn had already in '75 had proposed Oasis Plan. And then naturally when the [Berlin] Wall came down and the Soviet Union

disintegrated, we proposed the Productive Triangle and the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

And all of these proposals! And just think of the many, many activities we did, conferences all over five continents, all

of this was on the level of ideas, on the level of program – but

only after Xi Jinping put the New Silk Road on the agenda in 2013, and in the four-years of breathtaking developments of the

One Belt, One Road initiative since, these ideas are becoming realized! And the genie is out of the bottle!

When you have now the Bi-Oceanic Railway discussion and the tunnels and bridges connecting the Atlantic and Pacific around Latin America, you have all these railways now being opened up in Africa – this is unprecedented! This was not done by the IMF or the World Bank. They suppressed it with the conditionalities. But with the AIIB, the New Development Bank, the New Silk Road Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the direct investment of the Chinese Ex-Im Bank, the China state bank, all of these projects are now proceeding, and they have completely changed the attitude and the self-confidence of all participating countries. Now, the way people in China look at President Trump is absolutely different than what the media are trying to say. They are very positive about Trump, in the same way that people in Russia think that Trump is somebody you can absolutely have a decent relationship with, and that is reality. And forget the media! Forget these whores in the press who are really just prostitutes for the British Empire. Don't pay any attention to what they say, and don't allow the people you are talking with to do that, either.

When Trump promised \$1 trillion infrastructure investments, this was the right thing, and we put out the right program saying the United States must join the Silk Road and that {should be our focus}, and nothing else. Everything else should be a subsumed aspect of that. This is the strategically important thing, and the fact that the head of the China Investment Corp. Ding

Xuedong

said it's not \$1 trillion but \$8 trillion, is what the United States needs, is absolutely on the mark; and you know it yourself

from the conditions of the roads and the infrastructure in all of

the United States.

So the fact that the same organization has now set up their office in New York, advising Chinese investors how to invest in

the United States, and vice versa, how U.S. investors can invest

in China; the fact that the Chinese are invited to participate in

this infrastructure conference in June; all of this is absolutely

going in the right direction.

What happened in the Belt and Road Forum and the many meetings I had afterwards – after all, I spent two full weeks in

Beijing, in Nanjing, in Shanghai but it's the fact that in the

many interviews, many quotes, and the general view is that we were treated with the highest respect possible. I mean, people

are fully aware of Lyn's significance as a theoretician of physical economy, his ideas are highly respected; and people treated me as we should be treated, namely as people who have devoted their entire lives to the common good of humanity.

And

this is absolutely in stark contrast to the shitty behavior that

we are normally getting from the neo-liberals in the trans-Atlantic region.

And you should understand that what the attack on Trump is supposed to do: Is to make – it's so difficult for him to focus

on the positive aspect, and there are quite some many of them, including his working relationship with Russia and China, which

is strategically the most important. So that, basically, he has

to defend himself instead, and everybody thinks they have to spend all the time to defend themselves.

So don't fall for it. The idea that we are losing is completely off! Mankind is on the winning track and we have to pull the American population to create the kind of ferment so that the implementation of the infrastructure program as a first

step is on the agenda, and on everybody's mind and nothing else.

Even if Europe is still in the grip of the EU Commission, I mean, if Merkel wants to be the leader of the free West, – forget it. Macron just had a very excellent meeting with Putin,

defining a cordial relationship with Russia! This is not what Merkel and Obama have been cooking up, when Obama addressed the

church day of the Protestant church, but Merkel is pretty isolated.

Just look around in Europe: Macron send Raffarin, the former Prime Minister, to the Belt and Road Forum who gave an excellent speech, why China and France have to work together. Gentiloni from Italy said China and Italy will work together on

the development of Africa. All the East Europeans, Tsipras [from

Greece], Serbia, Hungary, Czechia's Zeman, Orban [Hungary] – all

of these people were absolutely enthusiastic on the Belt and Road

Initiative. And now even Germany, it shows that the German industry is actually really getting it, that their interest is to

work on joint ventures in third countries together with China.

So

I think even Germany will change.

I have the strong conviction that by the end of this year, it will look completely different, because the development perspective is so contagious, that I think all the efforts by the

British Empire to somehow throw in a monkey wrench will not work!

So take the winning perspective, take the high ground, think strategically: And realize that what is happening in reality, in

many, many development projects around the world, is what this organization has been fighting for, for almost half a century.

I just wanted to tell you that, because the worst thing we could do, is look at it from inside the United States, from within the box, when the whole world has moved out of the box decisively, with the Belt and Road Forum, which is not going to

be stopped by anything. And that is my view I wanted to communicate.

[end video: <https://larouchepac.com/20170602/silk-road-strategy-helga-larouche-report-belt-and-road-forum>

OGDEN: As you could hear, Helga LaRouche was extremely optimistic after spending an entire two weeks in China; and her

point could not be more clear. The United States must join the

Silk Road; this must be our focus and nothing else.

“Everything

else should be a subsumed aspect of that,” she said; “this is the

strategically most important thing.”

Helga also had, among many media interviews, you could see some pictures there from her interview on the “Dialogue with Yang

Rui” show, which was a very widely watched and wonderful

interview. She had many TV interviews, many other press interviews. Here's an interview that just came out; this is from

{Shanghai Daily}, and I'm going to read a few excerpts from that

interview as well. I think it is just really a nice overview.

As

you can see, the title is "Belt and Road Initiative Instills Hope

for Peace and Development Among Nations." You can see the picture

of Helga LaRouche there. The editor's note begins the article;

it says,

"Helga Zepp-LaRouche visited Shanghai for the first time in the summer of 1971. In 1977 she married American economist Lyndon

LaRouche, and the couple have since worked together on development plans for a just new world economic order." That was

the overview that we saw in the video just now. It goes on:

"Zepp-LaRouche founded the Schiller Institute in 1984, a think tank devoted to the realization of these plans and a renaissance and a dialogue of classical cultures.

"She is an expert in European humanist philosophy and poetry, Confucius, and history.

"After attending the recent Belt and Road Forum in Beijing, she visited Shanghai, where {Shanghai Daily} reporter Wan Lixin

interviewed her."

These are going to be a few excerpts from Helga LaRouche's answers to the questions that were posed to her in this {Shanghai

Daily} interview.

So, Helga said: "I think the Belt and Road initiative signifies a revolutionary move to a new epoch of civilization. The idea of having a win-win cooperation among nations is the

first time that a concrete concept has been offered to overcome geopolitics.

“Since geopolitics was the cause of the two world wars, I think it is a completely new paradigm of thinking where an idea proposed by one country has the national interest basically in coherence with the interests of humanity as a whole. This has never happened.

“This has instilled tremendous hope among developing nations that they have the chance to overcome poverty and underdevelopment. And I think this is an initiative that will grow until all the continents are connected through infrastructure and development.” (That’s the idea of the World Land-Bridge.)

“We have always made the point that for this new Silk Road to succeed in the tradition of the old Silk Road, which was also an exchange of ideas and cultures, not just products and technology, you have to combine economic cooperation with dialogue between cultures. This dialogue must be on the highest level, so each culture has to present example of the best of their culture, like Confucianism, Italian renaissance, the German classical period, and present the best works of arts in music and poetry, paintings and other forms of art.

“Our experience is that when people get into contact for the first time with expression of such high culture from another culture, they are surprised by its beauty. And this beauty then opens the heart and souls of the people. And this is the best medicine against chauvinism, xenophobia, and prejudice, and it opens the way for the love of other cultures.

“This is in conformity with Confucian teaching that all

activity must be combined with strengthening of love for the mankind, because without that cultural component, that new Silk

Road will not flourish.”

“I think it a great honor for me to participate in this Belt and Road Forum, and I was deeply impressed by the speech of President Xi Jinping. Among all participants I spoke with there

is consensus that we are actively participating in the shaping of

history. All this means that China is right now leading the world

in terms of providing the perspective for the future.

“I think this has been recognized by many countries in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia, and even some European countries start to recognize it is in their best interests to ally with that initiative. So I think it has made clear that China is the

only country right now that offers a positive perspective to overcome the strategic bottleneck of our present times.”

“Here I would like to quote from Pope Paul VI who said that ‘Development is the new name for peace.’”

“I was first in Shanghai 46 years ago in 1971, after traveling on a cargo ship. Although it was not the best time to

be in China, it had awoken my love for China.

“I think the Chinese people are much too modest. They should feel more confident about what they have accomplished. They have

created the biggest miracle of the world, even bigger than the post-war German economic miracle. They should be very proud to be

Chinese.”

So again, that was from an interview in {Shanghai Daily} called “Belt and Road Initiative Instills Hope for Peace and Development Among Nations.”

[<http://www.shanghaidaily.com/opinion/chinese-perspectives/>

Belt-and-Road-initiative-instills-hope-for-peace-and-development

-among-nations/shdaily.shtml]

Obviously, this is just a wonderfully optimistic view of the world right now. I think it gives you a sense of what Helga LaRouche gained as an eyewitness and participant on the ground at

the Belt and Road Forum. It's what Americans are not being given; we're not being given this kind of optimistic perspective

of what the future of mankind could be, and it's very much within

our grasp. The kind of pride that she said Chinese should feel

about being Chinese, this is something that Americans desperately

to access again; this pride of being American.

With that kind of overview and our very clear sense of what our mission is, that the United States should join this New Paradigm of win-win development, I think maybe Ben can give us a

little bit of a sense of what it's going to take to get the United States back on this path to development. It's been 50 years since the assassination of John F Kennedy and the departure

of the United States from this sense of development and progress.

This embrace of this Malthusianism, zero-growth kind of population control ideology, which has brought us to the point of

just miserable economic suffering.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: As you mentioned in the beginning, Trump's announcement that the U.S. is going to pull out of this

Paris climate change agreement is a really big deal; this is excellent. To my knowledge, unless I'm missing something,

since

this whole climate change scare got going, this is the first U.S.

President who has actually kicked back against this. It started

really back with George H.W. Bush; Bill Clinton went along with

it. Despite the narrative of it being a Republican versus Democrat issue, the George W Bush administration was fully on board; they went with all this junk. Bio-fuels, global warming,

they pushed it fully. Obama pushed it further. Now, we finally

have a President who is actually kicking back against this.

This

is huge, this important; Trump definitely deserves respect and support for fighting against this thing. As many of our viewers

know, this is a huge global lobby that's been pushing this thing

from the top down for decades now.

I thought it was also important that Trump highlighted the economic effects of this. Some people just say the science says

this, or the science says that; but there's also the reality of

what is the effect on the people. What's the effect on your citizens of going with these policies? They say CO2 is terrible,

it's a pollutant, etc.; therefore, we need to go with all these

wonderful, clean energy solutions. They paint this rosy picture,

when in fact, that has devastating effects on the real-life conditions of our population. This whole Green energy fraud is

ridiculous. Given that this issue is now coming up, I think

it's

worth just highlighting a couple of points on this.

If you want to talk about the reduction in CO2 emissions and the Green energy stuff, I still think it's worth looking at what

Germany is facing right now in terms of their energy prices.

If

you want a case study in what wind and solar and exiting nuclear

and getting rid of coal and natural gas does; in Germany, just between 2004 and 2015, their energy prices went up 50% from \$0.23

cents a kilowatt-hour in U.S. values, to \$0.35 cents a kilowatt-hour. They were already in 2004, twice the rate we pay

in the U.S. on average. And over that ten-year period, in the context of a lot of this nuclear exit, CO2-reduction stuff, they

went up another 50% to now three times what Americans pay on average for energy, just as an example of what that means for real life conditions. This has been driving industries to leave

Germany, so it has an effect on industry, other forms of economic

activity as well.

In 2013, just one subsidy – this major surcharge they added to the average German's bill to pay for wind and solar – was the

equivalent of \$0.07 U.S. cents per kilowatt-hour. That alone is

60% of what we pay on average for the U.S.; just for one subsidy,

just for wind and solar.

In the context of all the propaganda that gets put out, it's worth emphasizing the idea that we can transition to some wonderful world powered by wind, solar electricity is a face; it's a fraud. We need to go in the other direction. To the

degree necessary, use coal, use natural gas, whatever; but
move
towards more advanced higher forms of energy like fission and
nuclear fusion – that's really the future. The future is
increasing energy use per capita, increasing the use of higher
qualities of energy per capita, not reduction.
I also think it's worth in the context of the debate
re-erupting right now, people are freaking out about Trump
doing
this; I think it's worth re-examining the issue of CO2. What
does CO2 do? It's now officially labelled a pollutant by the
EPA. There are all these horror stories about extreme
weather,
climate change, etc.
I just want to highlight one graphic [Fig. 1]. Tons could
be said, but I think it's just worth it for the education of
our
audience and the real facts on the issue, it's worth just
highlighting this study, comparing literally dozens of
different
computer models on the effects of CO2 increase with the
reality
that's happened just in the last couple of decades. So, what
these people did was to take 32 different computer models, all
claiming what the effects of CO2 increase were going to do to
the
global temperature. Those are all the variety of small dotted
lines rising up in the graph there. The thick red line there
is
the average of all of these 32 different computer models.
If you take the claims being made by these models and by
these fear-mongers around the CO2, they say this is the type
of
rate of temperature increase you're going to get. But if you
compare that to the actual observations indicated below in the
blue and green lines with the squares and the dots, you see
that

none of the computer models have been accurate in reality. Both satellite measurements by two different types of measurements, as well as independent {in situ} measurements with balloon systems, have shown that the temperature over the past 15 years now on average, has been relatively flat with little increase. {None} of the models showed this; none of them. So, have this in mind when you hear these scare stories about this much temperature rise is going to cause this much extreme weather, etc. They're basing it all on these models that have already shown to be ridiculous. There's another interesting aspect to the CO2 issue, which isn't discussed at all, which is this apparently secret thing that many of these fear-mongering people around climate change don't apparently know, which is that CO2 is actually a part of the biosphere, and it's actually an important part of the ecological cycle. People talk about being "pro-green": It's actually an important contribution to green on the planet. And there's been some work done, and I'd like to play a few short clips of an interview I'd done a few weeks back with a scientist who's led a great amount of effort on studying the positive effects of higher CO2 levels. This is Dr. Craig Idso, and he has spent many years and a lot of effort doing actual experiments with greenhouses, overviews of various studies, overviews of satellite measurements, and actually studying the question of what is the effect of increasing CO2 levels on plant growth and then also on agricultural activity. These clips speak for themselves, but I think this is an important part of the discussion, as being completely blacked out, which is, aside from

the scare-stories about CO₂ not being grounded in reality, there's actually a beneficial side for increasing CO₂ levels.

[start video]

DR. CRAIG IDSO: There are three main benefits from increasing carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere: The first is that it increases plant productivity for biomass of the plant. On average, what we see is that for a doubling of CO₂, something that's going to happen by the end of this century, most are basis plants, non-woody plants like crops and things like that, will experience anywhere from a 25% to a 55% increasing in biomass per yield. And that's a phenomenal result and that's something that's going to happen just because we raise the CO₂ concentration and nothing else. Second is that higher CO₂ concentrations help increase the plant's water use efficiency. Again, a doubling of CO₂ allows plants to use about half as much water as they need to produce the same amount of tissue, so another phenomenal benefit. And then the third benefit is that higher CO₂ concentrations helps to ameliorate environmental stresses. So if you have a stress from hot air temperature, maybe low light, low levels of soil fertility, those sorts of things, when you have higher CO₂ concentrations they tend to reduce or lessen that stress if not completely ameliorate it, under a doubling of CO₂. You put all those three benefits together, and what you get is a tremendous benefit to the biosphere to the growth. And we're seeing that already: We see it in tree-ring cores, you can look and look at how their water use efficiency has improved

over

time, and we see anywhere from 35% to 40% increase already, as the CO₂ concentration has increased by about 40%. So the satellites have been up measuring reflectivity of vegetation, over the entire globe ever since about the early 1980s. And what

they find consistently, whether they're focussing on a particular

region of the globe or the globe as a whole, you get anywhere from about 6% to 15% increase in biomass in that period of time.

The globe as a whole, or in total, is actually in a better off condition now than it was when those measurements began.

I did the first approximation to determine what is the net monetary benefit on crop production globally, in the past and then also projected into the future, and what I found was that over the 50-year period from 1961 to 2011, it amounts to about \$3.2 trillion on the global economy, a phenomenal benefit. And then, projecting that forward in time, as the CO₂ concentration

is going to continue to rise, from about 2012 to 2050, we expect

it to be about \$10 trillion to the economy.

And that's just really scratching the surface, because you could look at studies, for example, I'll take rice, where there's

a number of genotypes of rice, and scientists have looked at for

example, in one study I'm thinking of, they looked at 16 different genotypes of rice, and how those genotypes responded to

a doubling of CO₂, and they received values that ranged from about 0 all the way to a whopping 265%. So, if governments and

scientists focussed on those specific genotypes that we received

the greatest increase in biomass per CO₂ rise, and then grew

them, we could have this phenomenal increase in agriculture and have no problem in feeding the planet in the future.
[end video]

DENISTON: I wanted to just highlight that interview, because that needs to get out. These are astounding facts: You compare on the one side, the scare stories are not adding up. On the other side, just review what he said, that over the past 35 years, according to global satellite measurements a 6-15% increase in total biomass production to the planet, the entire planet! We're not talking about a 10th of a percent of a half of a percent, 6-15%, that's huge. And these assessments they've done on the increased crop yield, which they put in monetary terms of \$3 trillion increased value production from higher crop yields. Again, these are not models and studies; you can take a greenhouse, you can study tomato plants, this particular species, what's their yield under regular atmospheric CO2 conditions, what's their yield under this much increase? And they have hard data on this, so these are not models, this is real stuff. And then the other irony, which is an irony for some people is this water use efficiency: You actually get a highly significant boost for certain plant species in their ability to produce more biomass with less water use, and this has rather interesting implications for drier regions in particular, where water becomes a limiting factor in plant growth. And now, all of

a sudden, with higher concentrations of plant food in the atmosphere, CO2, they can grow in regions they couldn't grow in

before; they can be more healthy in regions they couldn't be healthy before. And you just take a look at places we've had water issues – California – and we have our crazy governor in California, running around pretending he's the world leader on CO2, when his state is actually benefitting greatly from the fact

there's been higher CO2 levels in the context of the recent droughts. The ironies are just all over the place.

You've really got to ask yourself, why are none of these just basic scientific facts even being added into the discussion?

All you hear is these super, extreme, incredible flimsy arguments

claiming to be science, about scare stories, and then basic, raw,

scientific data and studies and discussion – you don't hear about that in the media, at all. I think people need to let that

irony sink in, on this whole climate debate issue.

And Matthew, as you said in the beginning, the real issue is there's an ideology behind this, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche said in

our discussion earlier today: The whole climate change issue is

not really about climate change. That's the latest scare story

certain people have grabbed onto and pushed from the standpoint

of a Malthusian ideology. And tons can be said; we put out an entire report, "Global Warming Scare Is Population Reduction, Not

Science." This was put out by {Executive Intelligence Review};

if you don't have a copy of this, you should get one.

[<http://store.larouche.com/category-s/1840.htm>] Under Mr. LaRouche's direction, over decades, his organization has uniquely

put out the entire story of the origins of this, not just climate-change scare, but more broadly this whole environmentalist movement as coming from this Malthusian ideology.

And you look at the founders of the modern environmentalist movement, if you look at who these people were, these are people

that created the entire structure that pushed globally this whole

environmentalist system. We can just highlight some of the key

figures: Sir Julian Huxley, a lifelong proponent of eugenics, head of the British Eugenics Society. After World War II, after

Hitler's horrific war crimes, and crimes against humanity were exposed, and the connection to eugenics there, Huxley still promoted eugenics in his position in the UN, as the head of UNESCO at the time.

Prince Philip, whenever he gets the chance, talks about how terrible population growth is, and the fact that population growth is the number one problem on the planet. The guy whose said if he could be reincarnated, he'd like to come back as a deadly virus to reduce world population. That's his view, that's

his belief-system.

Prince Bernhardt of the Netherlands, who was actually working with Nazi intelligence, a member of the Nazi Party.

He

even helped Nazi war criminals escape after World War II.

These

people came together and started the environmentalist movement,

going back to the immediate post-World War II period, and going

into the '50s and '60s when it started to take off. This is the ideology behind this. It's not about the debates you see on the media, about this claim or that claim on supposed science of CO2. If you really want to understand the issue, it's this oligarchical, Malthusian ideology that's been campaigning for generations against economic development, against population growth, against the development of so-called Third World nations. These are people who have said we cannot allow the world to rise to the living standards of America and the West. Think of Obama travelling to Africa, telling students in Africa, if you all had air conditioning and cars the planet would boil over, so that's not an option. And that's the issue. I think what Helga said, in response to Trump's pulling out of the Paris climate agreement, is, that's the issue. This is an expression of the old Malthusian, geopolitical paradigm, and what we're seeing emerging with everything around this Belt and Road Forum summit, everything that you just went through, Matthew, is the future. That's the future. So Trump's dumping this climate change thing is completely coherent with the idea of the United States bucking this past, geopolitical, zero sum game, Malthusian ideology, and getting towards building the future again. And I would say, from our work, the next steps in the energy issue is going hard with fusion, nuclear fission as needed along the way. But the key is not only cheap energy, in using coal, natural gas, etc., but what are the future energy sources that are going to allow not only nations around the world to come up to the same energy use that we have in the U.S. now, but even

higher levels and including in the U.S. How can we actually increase the total energy-flux density of the global economy in totality? That's the future. The entire history of the development of mankind has always been intimately connected with and tied to these kinds of increases in energy-flux density. That's got to be the next step in this thing.

OGDEN: I think that idea, the increases in energy-flux density is the key. It unlocks the entire mystery of this whole discussion. If you go back to that history that Helga Zepp-LaRouche walked us through, about the 40, 45-year history of the LaRouche movement's fight for a new, international economic order, that was paralleled by a 45-year history of a fight against this kind of Malthusianism, the idea of "limits to growth" and overpopulation and these kinds of things that have become ingrained. This was paralleled, in fact, we saw all those reports about the great development of India, the development of the Pacific Basin, the development of Africa, the development of Latin America, all of these reports mapping out a blueprint for the development of the planet; but also, there was a book that was published, called {There Are No Limits to Growth}! And this was a book by Mr. LaRouche [1983] and it is rooted so deeply in his unique approach to economic science, the idea that, no, in fact, we are not living in a closed system. This is not a closed economic system, this is not even a closed biological system, but that in fact, the very fact that mankind has a voluntary, creative capability as a species, allows mankind to move into progressively higher and more efficient economic systems.

Because we're not based on one sort of limited resources regime.

And we've seen this throughout history: If you just take the empirical view of human history, mankind has progressively moved from one resource base to another resource base, through discoveries, through new technologies, and each one of those resource bases is defined by a higher energy-flux density, more

powerful forms of "fire," as you could call it, a Promethean idea of what mankind is capable of.

You take that idea of economics, and this is really Mr.

LaRouche's unique contribution, and you say: OK, the fact that that debunks the entire idea of limited resources, that very fact

itself overthrows the entire idea which has been at the basis of

geopolitics for at least the last 50 years. What was the justification for saying, "no we have to limit the access of these countries in the Third World to these limited resources, so

that the developed countries – the United States, Western Europe

– can have access to them?" This was literally the basis of our

national security strategy in the 1970s and the 1980s. But when

you say, there's no such thing as "limited resources," it overthrows that entire idea of geopolitics.

And I think that really serves as the scientific basis for a new idea of "win-win" cooperation, as counterposed to the idea of

a zero-sum game, where, if some countries win that means other countries lose. No. In fact, {all} countries can win and development is an unlimited potential.

DENISTON: I don't think it can be stressed enough, this is an entire paradigm shift we're talking about. I think Helga's

point about this being the end of the geopolitical perspective, people have to realize that's what's on the table. And that's why it's so important she came back from China with this report.

Because we have to get Americans to understand the depth of this revolution that's happening right now, and the importance of the

United States jumping on board with this, immediately.

Because

this is a historic shift: If you get the United States onboard

now with Russia and China and the nations allied with them, that's it. We can have the future, we can create the future we

want with that alliance. The British will be forced to go along

with that global alliance – they can put up as much of a fight as they can, as we're seeing, with this crazy propaganda campaign

in the United States, but people have to realize how vulnerable

the British Empire actually is, and that we have this perspective

before us. Because this has happened, this is moving right now

OGDEN: OK! Wonderful. I think that what Helga

Zepp-LaRouche's point was, stands: The United States must join

the New Silk Road. This is the primary strategic focus and everything else must be subsumed, as subsumed factor of that.

This is our focus, and nothing else.

So we need to escalate that campaign, obviously, and watch for very dramatic and rapid developments around the globe!

Thank you very much, Ben, for joining me here in the studio

today, and thank you all for tuning. That's the conclusion to our broadcast today: Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. We'll make that video that we showed you earlier, of Helga Zepp-LaRouche's remarks available as a standalone, and your task for this weekend is to spread that around as far as you can. Thank you very much, and good night.

[1] Se vores omfattende dossier: Stop den Grønne Kult Feature

'VERDEN SER MEGET ANDERLEDES UD FRA KINA' Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche. »Tænk ud over kassen!«

Torsdag, 1. juni, 2017 – Under en telefonkonference med medarbejdere diskuterer Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter af det internationale Schiller Institut, sin seneste rejse til Kina, hvor hun var inviteret til at deltage i det historiske Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, 14.-15. maj, 2017. Zepp-LaRouche fortæller, hvor dramatisk anderledes, verden ser på Trumps præsidentskab, i modsætning til de hysteriske, vestlige mainstream-medier. »Tænk ud over kassen; resten af verden er allerede trådt frem og går fremad.«

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Jeg vil gerne sikre mig, at I får et førstehåndsindtryk af min rejse fra mig, for jeg mener, den absolut værste fejltagelse, vi kunne begå, ville være at

respondere til den absolut utrolige psykologiske krigsførelse, der kommer fra de amerikanske mainstream-medier og de neoliberale medier i Europa, såsom *Spiegel Online*, med dets chefredaktør-indlæg, som *virkelig* var helt ved siden af alting! Det står helt klart, at folk, der primært baserer sig på disse medier, har en komplet, 100 % 's forkert idé om, hvad kendsgerninger er i det, der foregår. Det bør vi virkelig få ud af hovedet og ikke forsøge at svømme inden i fiskeglasbowlen med et kunstigt skabt miljø. For ud fra mit synspunkt, så ser verden meget anderledes ud.

For det første, som jeg allerede har sagt, og nu gentager: Med Bælt & Vej Forum har verden på dramatisk vis konsolideret begyndelsen af en ny æra, og jeg tror slet ikke på, at dette vil forsvinde, med mindre Tredje Verdenskrig skulle indtræffe; for størstedelen af verden bevæger sig på en fuldstændig frigjort måde. Først og fremmest var dette den konference på det højeste niveau, jeg nogensinde har deltaget i. Der var 28 statsoverhoveder, der talte efter tur, og Xi Jinpings tale var selvfølgelig fuldstændig fremragende, og I bør absolut lytte til den, hvis I har tid, for det var en meget, meget konfuciansk tale, der på en meget klar måde satte tonen for denne todages konference. Så lyt til den, når I har tid.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mx_mE951GzI]

(Engelsk udskrift af talen her:
http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-05/14/c_136282982.htm)

Måden at forstå, hvad det er, der finder sted, er virkelig at tænke på, hvad denne organisation, og Lyn[don LaRouche] i særdeleshed, har gjort i de seneste næsten 50 år. Første gang, da Lyn i 1971 erkendte betydningen af nedtagningen af Bretton Woods-systemet, og dernæst alle de mange, mange ting, vi har gjort i de seneste mere end 40 år; da Lyn kom hjem fra det irakiske Ba'ath Partis jubilæum i 1975, og han foreslog den Internationale Udviklingsbank (IUB)[i], der skulle formidle en ny, økonomisk verdensorden; den kendsgerning, at vi, i et helt

år, førte kampagne for denne IUB-idé, som dernæst blev en del af Den Alliancefri Bevægelses Colombo-resolution i Sri Lanka i 1976; dernæst, da vi i slutningen af '70'erne arbejdede sammen med Indira Gandhi om en udviklingsplan over 40 år for Indien.[ii] Allerede i '76' udgav vi en hel bog om Afrikas industrialisering.[iii] Vi arbejdede sammen med den mexicanske præsident, José López Portillo om »Operation Juárez«.[iv] Vi udgav en 50-års Basal Udviklingsplan for Stillehavsområdet.[v] Lyn havde allerede i '75' foreslået Oasis-planen.[vi] Og så, selvfølgelig, da [Berlin]Muren faldt, og Sovjetunionen gik i opløsning, foreslog vi den Produktive Trekant[vii] og den Eurasiske Landbro.[viii]

Alle disse forslag![ix] Tænk blot på de mange, mange aktiviteter, vi lavede, konferencer på alle fem kontinenter, alt dette var på idé-planet, på program-planet – men først efter, at Xi Jinping satte den Nye Silkevej på dagsordenen i 2013, og med de åndeløse udviklinger i de fire år, der er gået, med Ét Bælt, én Vej (OBOR), er disse ideer nu ved at blive til virkelighed! Lampens ånd er sluppet ud!

Når vi nu ser diskussionen om den Bi-oceaniske Jernbane [Sydamerika] og tunneller og broer, der skal forbinde Atlanterhavet og Stillehavet omkring Sydamerika, og vi ser alle disse jernbanestrækninger, der nu åbnes i Afrika – dette er uden fortilfælde! Det var ikke IMF (Den internationale Valutafond) eller Verdensbanken, der gjorde det! De undertrykkede det med deres 'betingelsespolitik'. Men, med Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB), den Nye Udviklingsbank ('BRIKS-banken'), den Nye Silkevejsfond, den Maritime Silkevejsfond, de direkte investeringer fra Kinas Exim Bank, Kinas statsbank, skrider alle disse projekter nu fremad, og de har fuldstændig ændret alle de deltagende landes holdning og selvtillid.

Måden, hvorpå man i Kina ser på præsident Trump, er absolut anderledes end det, medierne forsøger at sige. Kineserne er meget positive mht. Trump, på samme måde, som man i Rusland

mener, at Trump er en person, man absolut kan have et anstændigt forhold til, og dét er virkeligheden.

Glem medierne! Glem disse presse-horer, der faktisk ikke er andet et Det britiske Imperiums prostituerede. Lad være at lytte til, hvad de siger, og giv heller ikke de mennesker, I taler med, lov til det.

Da Trump lovede \$1 billion i infrastrukturinvesteringer, gjorde han det rette, og vi fremlagde det rette program, da vi sagde, at USA må tilslutte sig Silkevejen, og dét, og intet andet, bør være vores fokus. Alt andet bør være et underordnet aspekt af dette. Dette er, hvad der er strategisk vigtigt, og det faktum, at chefen for China Investment Corp. Ding Xuedong sagde, det er ikke \$1 billion, men \$8 billion, som USA har brug for, rammer absolut plet; og I ved det selv fra den forfatning, som vejene og infrastrukturen i hele USA befinder sig i.

Så det faktum, at samme organisation nu har åbnet et kontor i New York, hvor de rådgiver kinesiske investorer om, hvordan de skal investere i USA, og vice versa, hvordan amerikanske investorer kan investere i Kina; det faktum, at kineserne er inviteret til at deltage i denne infrastruktur-konference i juni; alt dette går absolut i den rigtige retning.

Det, der fandt sted i Bælt & Vej Forum og de mange møder, jeg havde bagefter – jeg tilbragte trods alt to fulde uger i Beijing, i Nanjing, i Shanghai – mange af disse ting rapporterer jeg ikke om, for det er blot ting, der er i gang, men det er det faktum, at, i de mange interviews, de mange citater og det generelle synspunkt – I kan spørge Kasia og Stefan Tolksdorf, eller Bill Jones, for den sags skyld – vi blev behandlet med den største respekt. Jeg mener, folk er fuldt ud bevidste om Lyns betydning som en teoretiker inden for fysisk økonomi; hans ideer er højt respekterede, og folk behandlede os, som vi burde blive behandlet, nemlig som mennesker, der har helliget hele deres liv til menneskeheden

almene vel. Dette står i absolut stærk kontrast til den dårlige behandling, vi normalt får fra de neoliberale i det transatlantiske område.

Man bør forstå, hvad disse angreb på Trump går ud på, hvad de skal gøre; det er for – det er så vanskeligt for ham at fokusere på det positive aspekt, og dem er der en hel del af, inklusive hans arbejdsrelation med Rusland og Kina, som rent strategisk er det vigtigste; så han grundlæggende set i stedet må forsvare sig, og alle mener, de må bruge al deres tid på at forsvare sig. Tænk blot tilbage, for de af jer, der var her dengang, hvordan vores liv som organisation ændrede sig efter angrebet i 1986. Frem til dette tidspunkt var vi alle positive, vi vandt primærvalg i Illinois, vi overvejede at skabe tre, private universiteter, for vi havde et netværk af henved 100 professorer, der ønskede at gennemføre Lyns ideer i form af et pensum i universiteter.

Og efter angrebet i 1986[x], udført af det samme apparat, der nu går efter Trump, måtte vi bruge alle disse penge på advokater, og vi måtte forsvare os, og det ændrede fuldstændig organisationens liv, og det er, hvad de nu forsøger at gøre imod Trump!

Så lad være med at falde for det. Den idé, at vi er ved at tabe, er *helt* forkert! Menneskeheden er på vej fremad, og vi må få den amerikanske befolkning til at skabe den form for grobund, så gennemførelsen af infrastrukturprogrammet som første skridt kommer på dagsordenen, og på alles tanker, og intet andet.

Jeg ville blot sige dette, for ud fra indledende diskussioner, jeg havde i dag, fik jeg indtryk af, at folk ligger for meget under for det, og selv om Europa stadig er i EU-kommissionens greb, jeg mener, hvis Merkel ønsker at være leder af det frie Vesten – glem det. Macron har netop haft et meget fremragende møde med Putin, der satte betingelser for en hjertelig relation med Rusland! Dette er ikke, hvad Merkel og Obama

havde lagt op til, da Obama talte på den protestantiske kirkes kirkedag, men Merkel er temmelig isoleret.

Se jer omkring i Europa: Macron sendte Raffarin, den tidligere premierminister, til Bælt & Vej Forum, og som holdt en fremragende tale om, hvorfor Kina og Frankrig må samarbejde. Gentiloni fra Italien sagde, at Kina og Italien vil samarbejde om Afrikas udvikling. Alle østeuropæerne; Tsipras [Grækenland], Serbien, Ungarn, Tjekkiets Zeman, Orban [Ungarn] – alle disse personer var absolut entusiastiske over Bælt & Vej-initiativet. Og nu, selv Tyskland; det viser, at tysk industri faktisk er ved at fatte det, at det er i deres interesse at samarbejde om joint ventures i tredjelande, sammen med Kina. Så jeg tror, selv Tyskland vil skifte mening.

Det er min faste overbevisning, at, ved dette års afslutning, vil det hele se helt anderledes ud, for perspektivet for udvikling er så smittende, at jeg tror, at alle Det britiske Imperiums bestræbelser på at smide en svensknøgle [i maskineriet], ikke vil virke!

Så sats på vinderperspektivet, sats på det bedste perspektiv, tænk strategisk: Og indse, at det, der finder sted, i mange, mange udviklingsprojekter i hele verden, i realiteten er det, som denne organisation har kæmpet for i næsten et halvt århundrede. Det ville jeg blot fortælle jer, for det værste, vi kunne gøre, er at se på det inde fra USA, inde fra kassen, når hele verden på afgørende vis er trådt ud af kassen, med Bælt & Vej Forum, der ikke lader sig standse af noget som helst. Og det er mit synspunkt, som jeg ønskede at videreformidle.

(Herefter følger Spørgsmål og Svar, i uddrag, med den efterfølgende diskussion på engelsk)

Diane Sare: Jeg ved, du skal skåne din stemme, men vil du have en diskussion?

Zepp-LaRouche: Hvis folk har uafklarede spørgsmål, hold jer

ikke tilbage.

Spørgsmål: Hej, Helga, her er Mindy. Dette er ganske klart og det er godt at høre det fra dig, på en måde, for vi ser på, hvad vi gjorde på Beijing-topmødet, kineserne her kender CIC, og dernæst det forestående juni-topmøde og G20-topmødet i juli, hvor Putin og Xi og Trump vil være til stede; og vores rolle, og Lys og din rolle har været – vi har opnået meget, og nu skal vi bare gå fremad for virkelig at bringe USA ind i et optimistisk syn og knuse denne fjende og satse på det, på meget kort tid.

Zepp-LaRouche: Præcis. jeg mener, potentialet absolut er til stede, diskussionerne mellem Xi Jinping og Trump er meget gode; udnævnelsen af den nye ambassadør [til Kina] Branstad udgør nu en yderligere kanal. Der er den igangværende kommission, der blev oprettet på Mar-a-Lago, med fokus på økonomien, og vi bør forstærke dette. Jeg mener, det er vigtigt, at vi får hele landet ind i en fornemmelse af en kampagnemobilisering, for vi vil ikke overlade denne kamp til de britiske agenter, der forsøger at ødelægge denne chance for at få USA ind sammen med denne udvikling.

Det fordrer virkelig, at vores organisation er fuldstændig klarhjernet og simpelt hen viser folk vejen. Og vejen er, at USA går med i Silkevejen. Vi må få veje bygget, ved I nok. Vi må få havne og nye byer. USA befinder sig i en forfalden tilstand, det ved I alle, og kineserne har absolut indikeret, at de har til hensigt og er villige til at investere. Tag blot det faktum, at Detroit's Symfoniorkester nu turnerer i Kina, jeg tror, det er i fem byer, de giver koncert – Detroit, af alle steder! Så den rette hensigt er der, og vi bør blot forstærke den.

Giv ikke folk lov at være pessimistiske i blot ét enkelt sekund! Fortæl dem, at pessimisme er en sygdom. Det bør ikke tolereres.

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche sammen med værten og den anden gæst på Tv-showet Dialog med Yang Rui under sin deltagelse i Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, 14.-15. maj, 2017.

Q: It's Margaret Scialdone, I have a question about – right after the Beijing conference we had initiated a petition that went along with a marvelous little video by Jason, and the

petition was called "Suck It Up and Move On" – a petition to Congress. I found it very refreshing. I thought it had the right

kind of bite to it. So I think it sort of dwindled, it hasn't been pushed or anything like that; but I'm wondering if we should

have a renewed initiative to really use this attitude to mobilize

people. Or, if you think that we ought to come out with a new wording, or new title or something like that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I have not seen the video, or if it's the one I saw, my memory is overshadowed by many, many impressions,

so – maybe it would be good to make a short new one, because I

think this video was made before the Belt and Road conference? Am I correct?

Q: It was done, I think two days after it.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: If it kept to what I just expressed before, then we should use it, and if not, it should probably be updated.

But if you say it's already in there, then use it, and maybe make

another one in the next days, but go with it now.

SARE: I think it definitely could be updated. This dynamic is completely new, and it is foreign to Americans, the sense that

you're conveying. I think that Americans would have a very hard

time imagining anyplace where Trump is viewed with respect and optimism. And if there's billions of people in China, Russia, and otherwise, who think that, Americans don't know it.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: What people say is that they're very, very happy that it's not Obama or Hillary, because they knew perfectly

where this would have led to. So people – and the fact that Xi

Jinping and Trump got along well is really important. It's not

only important for Trump to say to his supporters in Harrisburg,

that Xi is "great guy" and he gets along well with him, it's also

the other way around. When Xi Jinping gets along well with Trump, then this is very important for all the Chinese.

Q: Hi, this is Susan Director. I think that what you're saying today, Helga, could be made into a very powerful audio to

post on the website, today. Because, the intensity of your presentation is the kind of thing that will lift people up and pull them into action.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Then put it on! Tiramisu! Tiramisu! Pull me up!

Q: This is Evelyn in Houston, and it struck me, when Robert Mueller was appointed as a Special Prosecutor, who also headed the Get LaRouche task force, that the best flank on the attack on

Trump and also on the economic question, would be for us to call

again for the exoneration of Lyn. Because it was the same network, that attacked him, and for the same reasons, because they

don't want Trump to go with Lyn's policies.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yes, I agree. That is one of the moral

stains on the history of the United States, and it absolutely should be done. I fully agree. Remember that Ramsey Clark said

that Lyn's case was the worst violation of justice in U.S. history. I think people can find the exact formulation of what

he said and use it. And I think it's very useful, because it {is} the same network.

But while we should say it, I still think we should focus on the positive thing, because it is the same network, and we should

do it, but more importantly, or not more importantly, but the angle with which to go about it is to say, the world has moved in

a completely different direction, and what the mainstream media

are doing is sort of the last battles of a war which they have been lost already by them. Maybe you could find some appropriate battle from the Civil War – aren't there some battles where the British were still making some noises but they

were defeated, I mean, the Confederates –

SARE: In the War of 1812, they had surrendered but people were still fighting in different places long after, not knowing somehow.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Yeah, why don't you use that as an image?

SARE: That's a nice image!

If there's nothing else, I think this is excellent. I think we can put this to good use. We should get this up on the website, and then we'll have a lot to talk about on Sunday, after our success.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: OK, very good!

[i]

http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1998/eirv25n32-19980814/eirv25n32-19980814_020-1975_larouche_calls_for_intl_dev.pdf

[ii] <http://wlym.com/archive/fusion/fusion/19800505-fusion.pdf>

[iii] <http://wlym.com/archive/fusion/book/1980IndustrializeAfrica.pdf>

[iv] <http://archive.larouchepac.com/node/31620> og http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1986/eirv13n35-19860905/eirv13n35-19860905_018-ibero_americas_strategy_to_defeat-lar.pdf

[v]

http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1983/eirv10n35-19830913/eirv10n35-19830913_018-a_50_year_development_policy_for-lar.pdf

[vi]

<http://www.schillerinstitute.org/economy/maps/maps.html#Oasisplan>

[vii]

http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1990/eirv17n31-19900803/eirv17n31-19900803_031-the_economic_geography_of_europe.pdf og

<http://www.schillerinstitute.org/economy/maps/maps.html#Triangle>

[viii] <http://archive.larouchepac.com/node/14728>

[ix] En omfattende online oversigt, 'LaRouche's 40-Year Record'; A New International Economic Order, kan studeres her:

<https://larouchepac.com/new-economic-order>

[x] Helga henviser her til de falske anklager om bedrageri imod Lyndon LaRouche, som var politisk motiverede. LaRouche blev idømt 15 års fængsel, men løsladt i 1994. Tretten af hans medarbejdere blev ligeledes idømt fængselsstraffe på falske

anklager.

Kinas ambassadør til Tyskland forklarer potentiale for kinesisk-tysk samarbejde

Torsdag, 1. juni, 2017 – Aftenen før et forum for tyske erhvervsfolk i Berlin i dag, hvor også premierminister Li Keqiang og den tyske kansler, Angela Merkel, deltog, sagde Kinas ambassadør til Tyskland, Shi Mingde, til kinesiske medier, at »de to nationers varefremstillingsindustrier er særdeles komplementære. Kina er et stort vareproduktionsland, alt imens Tyskland er et stærkt ditto. En ny runde med industriel revolution tager fart og vinder momentum ... hvilket har bragt en mulighed uden fortilfælde for strategisk samarbejde«.

Shi sagde, at der er 8000 tyske selskaber, der opererer i Kina, med et totalt investeringsvolumen på mere end €60 mia. (\$67mia.), mens henved 2000 kinesiske foretagender opererer i Tyskland. Disse selskaber bliver en væsentlig styrke i promoveringen af samarbejde, sagde han. To stærke nationer, der går sammen, vil få en effekt langt ud over deres grænser, sagde Shi.

Han nævnte potentialet for byggeri i alle lande under Bælt & Vej-initiativet. Dette refererer til det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, der tilsigter at øge forbindelserne mellem Asien, Europa og andre områder. Han nævnte også muligheden for globale standarder for intelligent varefremstilling. Forummet under Lis besøg forventes at skabe nye, innovative måder at samarbejde på, i

feltet såsom smart-varefremstilling, elektriske transportmidler og innovation, der kommer fra unge mennesker.

Hubertus Troska, et medlem af Daimler AG's bestyrelse, med Kina som ansvarsområde, sagde, at trenden med forbundethed (konnektivitet), selvkørende fartøjer, 'sharing' og elektrisk mobilitet er i færd med at revolutionere bilindustrien, »måske intetsteds hurtigere end i Kina«. I et nedskrevet interview med *China Daily* sagde Troska, »På linje med Kinas økonomiske udviklingsplan vil vi møde både muligheder og udfordringer frontalt med yderligere innovationer og opgraderet varefremstilling«.

Foto: Kinas ambassadør til Tyskland, Shi Mingde, giver her interview til Xinhua på Kinas ambassade i Berlin, Tysklands hovedstad, 29. maj, 2017. Kina og Tyskland kan gå frem med opgradering af deres eksisterende samarbejde under de nye, internationale betingelser, sagde Shi i interviewet. (Xinhua/Shan Yuqi)

Kinas succes påvirker kamp om infrastrukturinvestering i USA

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 31. maj, 2017 – Præsident Donald Trump kan være tæt på endnu et betydningsfuldt skift, væk fra »globaliseringens« døde æra – denne gang er det et amerikansk exit fra Barack Obamas nulvækst »Paris-aftale« – og han er fortsat udsat for ubarmhjertige angreb fra efterretningsstaten. Med endnu et stort, tysk medie, der bringer mord på Trump på banen, denne gang *Der Spiegel*, raser 'globalisterne' for at blive af med ham.

Men amerikanerne stemte for et fundamentalt skift i økonomisk politik for atter at gøre Amerika til en stor, *industriel og teknologisk* nation. Og nu bliver truslen mod Trump fra den såkaldte »deep state«, »staten i staten«, måske modsvaret af udfordringen med de dybe huller i vejene, og de dybe, økonomiske huller, som millioner af amerikanere er faldet ned i.

Det rapporteres, at Trump-administrationen midt i juni til Kongressen vil cirkulere et udkast til amerikanske investeringer i ny, økonomisk infrastruktur og anmode om, at der vedtages love om det hen over sommeren. Og endnu, mens den investering, Trump vil anmode om, synes at blive stadig mindre end de \$1 billion, han talte om under sin valgkampagne, så bliver modforslag fra Demokraterne stadig større.

På vegne af den Demokratiske Progressive Gruppe og valgkreds og fagforeningsgrupper, der støtter dem, fremlagde henved et dusin Demokratiske kongresmedlemmer den 25. maj et krav – i form af en kongresresolution, ikke lovgivning – om mere end \$2 billion i direkte, statslig infrastrukturinvestering hen over 10 år, med betragtelig fokus på højhastigheds-jernbaneprojekter og nye projekter for vandveje og vandkontrol. Dette fulgte i kølvandet på et lovforslag om \$1,25 billion som statsbevillinger til ny infrastruktur over kun fem år, introduceret af kongresmedlem Brian Higgins (D-NY).

Der er to faktorer, der fremmer disse forslag: det alarmerende sammenbrud af offentlig infrastruktur i større byer og stater; og så entusiasmen hos dem, der kender til Kinas utrolige Bælt & Vej-infrastrukturplatforme og de offentlige tilbud fra Kina og Japan om at investere i en opbygning af infrastruktur i USA.

Beijings Bælt & Vej Forum den 14.-15. maj var en forbløffende succes. Schiller Instituttets stifter Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der gav en præsentation om »Verdenslandbroen« under topmødet og i

årtier har arbejdet på spiren til dette Bælt & Vej-initiativ, beskrev forummet som at deltage i udformningen af verdenshistorien til det bedre. Lyndon LaRouche, ophavsmanden til ideen fra 1989 og fremefter, sagde i dag: »Vi har etableret noget på globalt plan, og det er godt.«

Kinas udstedelse af produktiv kredit for at styrke andre nationers økonomier så vel som sin egen, har været unik i verden i et årti, og en politik, der både er konfuciansk og i Hamiltons tradition. Politikken i traditionen efter Hamilton mærkes i Amerika som et potentiale.

En sigende artikel i *Asia Times* den 29. maj havde titlen, »OBOR: Hvordan infrastruktur overtrumfer politik«. Den lægger ud med at diskutere Japans »overraskende« vending mod Kinas initiativer, Bælt & Vej og Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB). Men dernæst, efter en gennemgang af viften af projekter for jernbaner, havne, elektricitet osv. i mange asiatiske lande, vender artiklen sig mod USA.

»For USA er Kinas OBOR-initiativ blevet en multidimensional udfordring, der påvirker nationale anliggender, såvel som international politik. Kinas fokus på multilaterale udviklingsprojekter har fremhævet et ubehageligt, nationalt spørgsmål for Trump: den amerikanske, civile infrastrukturens affældige tilstand, og Kongressens modstand mod at bevilge de nødvendige midler til at gøre noget ved det ... Amerikas næststørste by, Los Angeles, er indbegrebet af Amerikas smuldrende infrastruktur. På trods af, at byen håber at sikre sig rettighederne til at være vært for 2024-Olympiaden, holdes byen tilbage pga. dens gennemhullede veje med trafikpropper, et aldrende telekommunikationssystem og manglen på pålidelig, offentlig transport. Borgmester Eric Garcetti kom endda med en dybtfølt bøn til Trumps transportminister, Elaine Chao, om at forcere en pakke på \$1,3 mia. til byens undergrundsbane – men det står ikke klart, om administrationen vil føje ham.

»Garcetti går måske til Kina for investering.«

Det viser sig, at Kinas største producent af togvogne, CRRC Corp., allerede bygger 64 nye togvogne til Los Angeles' undergrundsbane, og også til andre byer. Dette er kontrakter, der er udbudt til selskaber: men Kinas præsident Xi og ledere af statsbanker har gjort det klart, at Kina selv kunne investere i kreditydelse til store, nye infrastrukturplatforme, såvel som at være med til at bygge dem; det samme gælder for Japan.

Dette fordrer en statslig, amerikansk kreditinstitution. Ved de Progressive Demokraters begivenhed, understregede EIR-repræsentanter over for de tilstedeværende behovet for en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition, som den centrale kilde til kredit, der kan gøre disse projekter mulige.

Foto: Shenzhen-strækningen af Guangzhou-Hongkong Højhastigheds-jernbanen under konstruktion. Maj, 2011. (Foto: Alancrh / wikimedia commons / CC BY-SA 3.0)

'Fremtiden fødes i dag: Integration og infrastruktur' til at løfte verden op

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 30. maj, 2017 – 1.-3. juni træder Skt. Petersborg Internationale Økonomiske Forum (SPIEF) sammen, under værtskab af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, der for to uger siden var æresgæst på Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde (BVF) i Beijing, og som netop i går i Paris førte strategiske forhandlinger med præsident Emmanuel Macron. I går gav TASS en forhåndsvisning af mødet i Skt.

Petersborg, under titlen, »Fremtiden fødes i dag: Integration og infrastrukturprojekter i Eurasien«. Den rapporterer om den kendsgerning, at en opbygning af nationer nu er ved at komme sammen – EAEU (Eurasisk Økonomisk Union), SCO (Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen) og Bælt & Vej-initiativ (BVI), plus tre nationer i BRIKS – for at fremme storstilede projekter, der udføres ud fra et »globalt standpunkt«, til alles fordel. Der sættes fokus på specifikke projekter, såsom Vostochny Cosmodrome (Kosmodrom Øst), som Japan er interesseret i at deltage i; og den »Østlige Polygon« – det fjernøstlige program for forbundethed – konnektivitet – som involverer den Transsibiriske Jernbane, Baikal-Amur Hovedlinjen, regionale grænseovergange og havne.

Mødet i Skt. Petersborg er nu den optimistiske »nye norm« i Eurasien, ledet af Kina og Rusland; og billedet er ved at blive fyldt ud for andre dele af verden. I Afrika finder den storstilede åbning af Nairobi-Mombasa-jernbanen sted, hvis 480 km ses som den første strækning i den fremtidige, østafrikanske, længdegående jernbanekorridor. »At forbinde nationer og give mennesker fremgang«, lyder mottoet på den nye, kenyanske linjes lokomotiver.

Uvidende om denne kendsgerning om denne globale omgruppering for udvikling – eller værre endnu, med had til den – er de politiske kræfter, der er sat i gang imod dens succes, og som for størstedelens vedkommende kommer fra den depraverede, britiske imperieflok. Der er et grelt misforhold mellem virkeligheden og så atlanticisternes forslag. Fra Europa kommer der fortsatte angreb mod præsident Trump og mod de amerikanske vælgere, der indsatte ham i embedet, og mod Trumps modstand mod 'grønt' folkemord og NATO-geopolitik. Mandag fortsatte kansler Angela Merkel i Berlin de bebrejdelser imod USA, som hun havde udtalt efter sidste uges G7-møde. I en tale på en konference for bæredygtig udvikling sagde hun, at hun fortsat er en »overbevist atlanticist«, og at man ikke kan stole på USA; »vi europæere må virkelig tage skæbnen i egne

hænder«, især mht. klimapolitik. I dag krævede hun, at Europa er »pro-aktiv i internationale anliggender«. Den tyske udenrigsminister Sigmar Gabriel angreb Trumps »snæversynede« politikker, der har »svækket« Vesten og EU-interesser.

Her til morgen svarede Trump igen i et tweet, men sammenhængen går langt videre end til øje for øje. På spil står præsidentskabets eksistens, USA's integritet som nation, og om USA – meget snart – vil stille sig på linje med det nye paradigme, med Verdenslandbroen/Ny Silkevej. Faren og bestikkeligheden ved angrebene på Trump fremgår af en artikel i *Spiegel Online* fra 20. maj, »Tiden er inde til at komme af med Donald Trump«. Med en hysterisk tirade imod Trump (ingen moral, ingen mål, ingen strategi, ingen hjerne, osv.), gennemgår artiklen, hvordan man kan afsætte ham, med reference til det uhyggelige »Game of Thrones«. Artiklen opfordrer medierne til at »fortsætte med at sige det, som det er: Trump må fjernes fra Det Hvide Hus. Hurtigt. Han er til fare for verden«. Oversat betyder det, at man erkender, at et partnerskab mellem USA, Rusland og Kina er en dødbringende trussel mod Det britiske Imperium.

Sandheden er, at mennesker kan formås til at tænke og overvinde disse beskidte operationer, uanset, hvor uophørlige og farlige, de måtte være. Vi har meget specialarbejde at udføre. En stor udfordring er sammenbruddet og nødsituationen i New York Citys transportsystem. Knap seks uger fra i dag truer massivt kaos, når nogle af toglinjerne mellem Manhattan og Long Island og New Jersey indskrænkes pga. hastereparationer. Dette sker i sammenhæng med, at hele metropolregionens infrastrukturbase er affældig. LaRouche Manhattan Projekt går frem på basis af en overordnet plan, sammenhæng og frem for alt et krav om national handling for en tilslutning til den globale omgruppering for en Ny Silkevej.

Diane Sare fra LaRouche PAC Politiske Komite har en artikel i det næste nummer af *EIR* (2. juni), der slutter således:

»New York City og de dermed sammenhængende områder har en høj tæthed af kapable mennesker, hvis der fandtes et forceret program for at uddanne dem. Det er de spørgsmål, som USA's befolkning omgående må overveje, og ikke, om Jared Kushner havde et møde med den russiske ambassadør (hvilket under alle omstændigheder sikkert ville have været en god idé).

LaRouches Fire Love angiver det nødvendige, forcerede programs medvirkende faktorer. Vi må nu samle en komite af eksperter, der kan udfylde detaljerne, og hermed transformere den måde, New Yorkere tænker på, mht. den aktuelle katastrofe. Husk, at, på kinesisk, er symbolet for krise og muligheder det samme.«

Foto: Kenyas præsident Uhuru Kenyatta indviede i dag, den 31. maj, officielt den 472 km lange jernbanestrækning med standardspor mellem havnebyen Mombasa ved det Indiske Ocean og Nairobi, hvor han kørte med Madaraka Expressens første, regulære afgang. (foto: www.railwaygazette.com)

POLITISK ORIENTERING 31. maj, 2017.

**Trump skaber ravage i G7 –
Vil han lade USA gå med i et
strategisk
partnerskab med Kina og**

Rusland?

Se også 2. del her.

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

Video 2. del:

»Velkommen til disse ufatteligt spændende tider, hvor verden i den grad flytter sig, og hvor centrum for den historiske proces i den grad er flyttet over til Kina. I betragtning af, at der er 1,4 mia. kinesere og den tusindårige, gamle kultur, man har dér, er det egentlig ikke så mærkeligt, fordi der er et fundament, specielt også med hele den konfucianske kultur, som midlertidigt, igennem et stykke tid, blev holdt nede pga., at udefra kommende, kolonialistiske kræfter kunne manipulere kineserne til at ødelægge sig selv, grundlæggende set – det var briterne meget gode til. Men, nu har Kina fundet sig selv, og dermed er Kina i gang med at indtage sin naturlige plads på verdensscenen. Det var, hvad vi så med dette verdenshistoriske topmøde, som fandt sted den 14.-15. maj, det såkaldte Bælt & Vej Forum, i Beijing, hvor 29 stats- og regeringschefer og 130 lande, 50 internationale organisationer med FN's generalsekretær i spidsen, og omkring 1500 delegerede, diskuterede, hvordan – hvor går vi nu hen i næste fase af dette gigantiske projekt, Kina har sat i gang, som allerede nu, i de projekter, man er blevet enige om, er 30 gange større end Marshallplanen i sin tid var det ... «

Lyd:

Professor Wang Yiwei giver interview til det danske Schiller Institut i forbindelse med DIIS-arrangement om Bælt & Vej og Norden

København, 18. maj, 2017 – Følgende interview blev gennemført efter seminaret, »Kinas Ét Bælt, én Vej-initiativ og mulighederne for Norden«, der var arrangeret i fællesskab af Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS) og Kinas Ambassade i Danmark. Wang Yiwei er professor ved Skolen for Internationale Studier, direktør for Instituttet for Internationale Anliggender, og direktør for Centret for Europæiske Studier ved Renmin Universitet i Beijing. Han er forfatter til bogen: »The Belt and Road: What Will China Offer the World in Its Rise«, fra 2016 (Bælt & Vej: Hvad vil et fremvoksende Kina tilbyde verden). Han var til stede ved den officielle præsentation af den kinesiske udgave af *EIR's* rapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets stifter, på et symposium, der var sponsoreret af Chongyang Institut for Finansielle Studier, den 29. september, 2015, på Renmin Universitet. Chongyang er også medsponsor af rapporten på kinesisk.

Schiller Instituttet (Michelle Rasmussen): Professor Wang, der har netop, i sidste weekend, fundet en meget historisk begivenhed sted i Beijing. Som Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale leder, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, sagde, så er dette en historisk begivenhed; dette er et faseskifte for menneskeheden hen imod etableringen af en ny, økonomisk

verdensorden. Hvilken betydning har denne konference i Beijing, efter Deres mening?

Dr. Wang Yiwei: Det er måske lidt hårdt at kalde det »den ny, økonomiske verdensorden«, for dette har været den økonomiske verdensorden i mange år, men den trængte til en reform, bestemt; men det er ikke at opbygge en ny orden, for omkostningerne forbundet med opbygning af en ny orden er meget høje, og der er måske ikke behov for at få en fuldstændig ny orden. Vi gør denne orden mere bæredygtig, mere inkluderende, mere afbalanceret og til større fordel for folkeslagene i Bælt & Vej-initiativet (BVI). Men, jeg mener ikke, det er for at bygge en ny orden.

SI: De fortalte mig før, at De var til stede under pressekonferencen på Renmin Universitet, da den kinesiske udgivelse af vores rapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, blev udgivet, og som har cirkuleret. Hvad er, efter Deres mening, de grundlæggende ideer i BVI, og hvorfor er det vigtigt, at Europa og USA nu beslutter sig for at tilslutte sig, i stedet for at være imod det, af geopolitiske årsager?

Dr. Wang: Det drejer sig faktisk ikke om geopolitik. Det går videre end som så. Geopolitik gør verden splittet og splittet, adskilt og adskilt. Vi ønsker at gøre verden forbundet, gensidigt forbundet, hvilket er ånden i Ét Bælt, én Vej (OBOR). Verden lider meget, fordi der er for mange, separate organisationer, og så mange lande. Før Første Verdenskrig var der kun 40-50 lande i verden, og efter Anden Verdenskrig, 60 eller 70, og nu er der flere end 200 lande. Det enkelte land kan blive for småt, især i Europa. Så hvordan skaber man det større marked? Jeg mener, at gensidig forbundethed (konnektivitet) giver håbet om, at dette mål kan nås. Det er den grundlæggende [idé]. Og ikke kun inden for kontinentet, men også interkontinentalt. BVI er den mest ambitiøse plan for forbundethed under FN.

SI: Hvad ser De som principperne for økonomisk udvikling? De har talt om, at Kina lagde vægt på at løfte hundrede millioner af mennesker ud af fattigdom. Hvordan kan man gøre dette, under BVI?

Dr. Wang: Præsident Xi holdt hovedtalen til Bælt & Vej Forum og sagde, at udvikling er nøglen til at løse alle former for vanskelige problemer. Ikke kun for udviklingslandene, men også for de udviklede lande. For eksempel, så rejser befolkningen i Europa sig nu, pga. de vanskeligheder, de lider under, pga. globalisering efter den globale finanskrisen. At give flere jobmuligheder for ungdommen, at lukke svælget mellem rige og fattige, og svælget mellem Nord og Syd. Den europæiske stil fokuserede oprindeligt på fordeling af rigdom i form af bistand til de afrikanske og andre lande, men den kinesiske fremgangsmåde fokuserer ikke kun på bistand, men på investering – industrialisering. Jeg mener, at BVI virkelig er den klogeste [kan ikke høres – måske »verdenskontakt«]. Som vi kinesere siger, »At give dig en fisk er ikke vigtigt. At lære dig at fiske er det vigtigste.«

SI: Fr. LaRouche sagde i sine bemærkninger på Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, at det er meget vigtigt nu at gå videre til det næste skridt, nemlig videnskabeligt samarbejde omkring ideen om rumrejser, om at udvikle kernefusion, om de banebrydende felter inden for videnskab og også inden for kultur, for at fremme menneskelig kreativitet som drivkraft for økonomisk udvikling, som Xi Jinping siger, »innovation«. Hvad mener De om det?

Dr. Wang: Det er meget vigtigt, for i dagens verden er der milliarder af mennesker, der går med i [organisationer?], industrialisering. Sanktionerne, som tilhørerne nævnte pga. universelle værdier, universalisme, faktisk baseret på millionerne, de titals af millioner – den europæiske erfaring i en kort periode, men Silkevejen er 2000 år gammel, og den europæiske verdensdominans er kun 500 år gammel, eller 200 eller 300 år gammel. Med et titals af millioner af menneskers

erfaring, hvordan kan man arbejde for nutidens verden med flere end 7 mia. mennesker? Verden er så forskellig og kompleks. Vi har brug for ny tænkning, en ny arbejdsmodel, samarbejdsmodel for at matche den dynamiske, forskellige og udviklingsmæssige virkelighed. Som jeg sagde, så er den kinesiske erfaring den, at søge sandhed gennem kendsgerninger.

Kendsgerningerne er så komplekse, men med sandheden kan man også tilpasse sig den nye verden, ikke kun I [Europa] udgør standarden, de bedste. Det, der er godt i praksis, er det bedste.

SI: Hvad ville De sige til folk i Europa og USA om, hvilken fremgangsmåde, vi skal anvende for den fremtidige økonomiske udvikling, hvis vi ser på de næste 10, 50 eller 100 år. Hvilke er de principper, der kan gøre det muligt for os at få denne økonomiske vækst?

Dr. Wang: Gensidig forbundethed. [Mellem] udviklingslande, mindre udviklede lande, fremvoksende lande, fremvoksende markeder og de udviklede lande. Jeg mener, dette er, hvad vi behøver. Hvis vi bygger mere infrastruktur i Afrika, Bælt & Vej-landene, er det også godt for Europa og amerikanerne at investere i. Det vil være til gensidig fordel. Og Kina deler sine erfaringer om høj effektivitet, om infrastrukturbyggeri, der er til fordel for lokalbefolkningen, især de fattige, ikke lave [kan ikke høres], ikke længere skabe en [spekulations]boble, som jeg sagde.

SI: Mange tak.

Videoen med interviewet kan ses her:

Den omgrupperede orientering

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 29. maj, 2017 – Verden ser meget anderledes ud, når den anskues fra Kina, end den gør fra USA eller Europa, lød Helga Zepp-LaRouches kommentar, da hun vendte hjem fra sin deltagelse i Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, der fandt sted 14.-15. maj. Kina befinder sig i en udvikling, der foregår i et forbløffende tempo, og deler nu denne succesfulde model med hele planeten, gennem Bælt & Vej-initiativet. Som en opstigende kraft i hele planetens økonomiske og kulturelle udvikling har Kina et optimistisk og forhåbningsfuldt syn – og ikke den pessimisme og fortvivlelse, der har hersket i det meste af Europa og USA, siden mordet på John F. Kennedy.

Der foregår nu en global omgruppering, bemærkede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, med fornuftige regeringer, der bringer deres nationer om bord i Bælt & Vej-initiativet. Kun de dumdristige vil blive stående udenfor og 'kigge ind' sådan, som Angela Merkel nu gør med Tyskland.

Præsident Donald Trump må nu handle hurtigt for at sikre, at USA bliver en del af denne omgrupperede orientering. Han valgte klogt at sende en personlig toprådgiver, Matt Pottinger, som sin repræsentant til Bælt & Vej Forum. Nu må han forhandle Amerikas fulde deltagelse i alle aspekter af dette Nye Paradigme, inklusive investering af billioner af dollars i genopbygningen af Amerikas totalt ødelagte infrastruktur. Trump må handle hurtigt for at skabe reel, fysisk-økonomisk forandring – det er, hvad de millioner, der stemte på ham, venter på. Han må handle hurtigt, for at genindsætte FDR's Glass/Steagall-lov fra 1933 for at skabe den nødvendige bank- og kreditramme for en sådan massiv indsats for genopbygning – dét er mandatet, han fik ved præsidentvalget i 2016. Den idémæssige køreplan for, hvordan disse politikker skal implementeres i USA, har Lyndon LaRouche gentagende leveret – senest i sine **Fire Love (til USA's – og**

verdens – omgående redning).

Præsident Trump bør ikke tillade, at han presses eller distraheres bort fra denne hastedagsorden, af disse tendentiøse og grundløse anklager, der slynges ud mod hans regering, den ene efter den anden. Det er netop *formålet* med disse, af briterne påbudte operationer, at de skal forhindre præsident Trump i at vedtage de nationale, og internationale, politikker, som Det britiske Imperium i den grad frygter. At fordømme og afsløre disse løgne er selvfølgelig nyttigt, og endda nødvendigt. Men, denne eneste måde, hvorpå disse beskidte operationer på afgørende vis kan begraves, er at gøre præcis dét, som briterne er mest bange for; og begynde at bygge infrastrukturen og andre store projekter, *nu*.

En mere passende hyldest til John F. Kennedy i hundredeåret for hans fødsel, end netop atter at hellige vor nation disse politikker, eksisterer ikke.

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche på Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, den 14.-15. maj, 2017.

**Onsdag 31. maj kl. 19:
Politisk Orientering v/ Tom
Gillesberg
på vores kontor, eller via
Skype;**

Kom og vær med

NYHEDSORIENTERING MAJ/JUNI 2017: Skelessættende Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing

Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing den 14.-15. maj, hvor 130 lande havde takket ja til præsident Xi Jinpings invitation, Ruslands Putin var æresgæst, men hvor også USA sendte en vigtig delegation, kan meget vel være starten på en sådan ny, retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden, hvor alle nationer får adgang til udvikling. Trump taler stadig godt med Xi Jinping og forbereder at løse krisen med Nordkorea. USA og Rusland samarbejder i Syrien. Krigsfraktionen i Vesten fortsætter heksejagten på Trump, og medierne skriger »Watergate« uden, at der er substans. Kan medierne sammen med efterretningstjenesterne få afsat Trump? Eller vil Trump rense op i overvågningssamfundet? Trump skal have gang i infrastrukturprojekter, men pengene vil ikke komme fra Wall Street. Vil vi se Glass/Steagall og LaRouches tre andre love blive gennemført, så USA kan overleve det bankerotte finanssystem og blive stort igen? Vil USA og Europa gå med i dette nye, globale paradigme? Præsident Trumps afvisning, ved NATO-topmødet i Bruxelles den 25. maj, og ved det efterfølgende G7-topmøde i Italien, af at lade USA under hans ledelse fortsætte den gamle, vestlige politik, kan være startskuddet til en helt ny verdensorden, hvor USA samarbejder tæt med de tidligere fjendebilleder Kina og Rusland.

Dette er en redigeret udgave af en tale, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets formand i Danmark, holdt den 17. maj 2017. Se og hør talen inklusive den efterfølgende diskussion på www.schillerinstitut.dk.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler for forum i Kinas største forlag

24. maj, 2017 – I en tale for et publikum på mellem 100 og 200 mennesker i forlaget Phoenix Press Publishing Groups hovedkvarter i Nanjing, Kina, gav Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets præsident, en tilbagemelding om sin deltagelse i Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing.

»Bælt & Vej har indsprøjtet optimisme i mange lande«, sagde Zepp-LaRouche, »og dette momentum kan ikke standses«, men at bringe det til at bære den fulde frugt »bliver ikke let«. Umiddelbart efter topmødet, fortsatte hun, optrappedes angrebene mod Bælt & Vej, kombineret med angreb mod præsident Trump, der havde sendt en delegation på højt niveau til BV-topmødet. »Angrebene var baseret på de absurde anklager om aftalt spil med Rusland i valget«, sagde hun.

»Efter den Kolde Krig, ønskede briterne og deres amerikanske allierede at skabe en unipolær verden«, sagde hun. »Og i deres bestræbelser herpå, har de ødelagt Mellemløsten og efterladt det i ruiner.« Dette fremskyndede flygtningekrisen, den generelle reaktion imod »globalisering« og fremvæksten af højrefløjbevægelser. »Bælt & Vej«, sagde hun, »vil virkeliggøre skabelsen af Verdenslandbroen, som vil forbinde

alle kontinenter. Dette er noget, vi har kæmpet for i over 40 år«, sagde hun.

Dernæst beskrev hun den kamp, som hun og hendes mand, Lyndon H. LaRouche, jr., har ført for at bygge en ny, økonomisk verdensorden: LaRouches forslag om en International Udviklingsbank, kampen for den afrikanske udviklingsplan og det latinamerikanske initiativ med samme formål, med samarbejdet med den mexicanske præsident, José López Portillo [1976-82], samt de hundredevis af seminarer på fem kontinenter, som Schiller Instituttet har afholdt, med krav om en Bælt & Vej-udvikling.

»Transformereringen af Bælt & Vej til at blive til en Verdenslandbro vil for første gang rent politisk virkeliggøre en reel fremtid for alle mennesker, der lever på denne planet, og vil etablere former for regeringsførelse for verden.« Men, for fuldt ud at realisere dette, sagde hun, »må man også studere min mands ideer med hensyn til spørgsmålet om økonomi«.

Fr. Zepp-LaRouche gennemgik dernæst de altafgørende kulturelle aspekter af Bælt & Vej og behovet for, at alle de forskellige kulturer bringer alle deres bedste præstationer frem, med det formål at bruge disse til at skabe en dialog mellem kulturer blandt nationerne i Bælt & Vej. Dernæst gennemgik hun betydningen af Friedrich Schiller i tysk og vestlig kultur, og betydningen af Konfucius i kinesisk kultur, idet hun foretog en konkret sammenligning mellem Schillers og Konfucius' værker, hvor hun viste den nære lighed i disse to, store tænkere ideer, der var skilt af næsten 2000 år.

Efter fr. Zepp-LaRouche havde Bill Jones, chef for *EIR's* Washington-kontor, en fremlæggelse, hvor han viste en power point-præsentation, der beskrev LaRouche-organisationens kamp fra tidspunktet for Nixons ophævelse af Bretton Woods-systemet. Han beskrev Romklubbens angreb i 1970'erne og udgivelsen af bogen »Grænser for vækst«, der havde til hensigt

at transformere en fremskridtskultur til en dødskultur, med den internationale indsats for Økonomisk Nulvækst og Befolknings-nulvækst. Han skitserede Lyndon LaRouches og LaRouche-organisationens reaktion på Nulvækst-bevægelsen, LaRouches krav om den Internationale Udviklingsbank (IUB) og det efterfølgende krav om IUB og en Ny, økonomisk Verdensorden ved den Alliancefri Bevægelses Colombo-møde i 1976, og gennem Guyanas udenrigsminister, Fred Willis, i FN's Generalforsamling.

Jones beskrev den kamp, som LaRouche førte for at bringe præsident Ronald Reagan, der havde vedtaget LaRouches idé om Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI (Det strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ) som et fredsforslag sammen med Sovjetunionen, ind i en arbejdsrelation med de progressive ledere i udviklingssektoren, såsom den mexicanske præsident López Portillo og den indiske premierminister Indira Gandhi. Disse bestræbelser førte dernæst til en reaktion fra vicepræsident George H.W. Bush, der intrigerede for at få LaRouche og flere af hans medarbejdere fængslet på falske anklager. Valget af præsident Bill Clinton bragte LaRouche ud af fængsel og tilbage i en rådgivende rolle, med præsident Clintons forsøg, om end mislykket, på at gå i retning af en ny finansarkitektur. Skabelsen af Bælt & Vej-initiativet (BVI) og Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB) repræsenterer således den type strukturer, som LaRouche og hans bevægelse har forsøgt at frembringe i over fire årtier, forklarede Jones.

Dernæst fulgte professor Bao Shixiu, professor i militærvidenskab, der skitserede Bælt & Vejs strategiske betydning for Kina og viste, hvordan det vil gøre det muligt for landet at overvinde de traditionelle vanskeligheder, det har haft med andre lande, inklusive Indien og Japan. Professor Bao understregede LaRouche-parrets skelsættende rolle med at bringe dette initiativ frem i forreste front, og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches fortsatte kamp for at overvinde modstanden mod

det, fra finanseliten i London og New York. Professor Bao fremlagde også både Bælt & Vejs økonomiske og strategiske implikationer for Kina, som ville være med til at sikre et harmonisk klima i området og i verden, der igen ville gøre det muligt for Kina og alle andre lande at fortsat udvikle sig.

Tilhørerne viste stor interesse, især for Helga Zepp-LaRouches forslag om en dialog mellem kulturer og en større grad af interesse i Friedrich Schillers værker blandt personalet i Phoenix-forlaget, af hvilke nogle syntes at have fået et ret stort kendskab til den tyske kulturs værker.

Foto: Som præsident for Schiller Instituttet var Helga Zepp-LaRouche inviteret til at deltage i det netop afsluttede Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, den 14.-15. maj, hvor hun deltog i rundbordsdiskussioner mellem tænketanke. Her ses hun som tilhører under forummet.

**Lad os komme videre!
Nu skal landet genopbygges!
LaRouche PAC Internationale
Webcast,
26. maj, 2017.**

Matthew Ogden: Vi befinder os nu lidt under to uger efter det verdenshistoriske Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, Kina. Som resultat af dette ekstraordinære topmøde har de forskellige dele af verden nu indledt processen med at konkretisere og konsolidere det, der blev diskuteret på dette forum; og de befinder sig i processen med at bygge det mest ambitiøse og

langt det mest vidtrækkende infrastrukturprojekt i verdenshistorien – det såkaldte Ét Bælte, én Vej; det økonomiske bælte; den Maritime Silkevej. Dette nye paradigme, der repræsenteres af dette fredelige, samarbejdende win-win-udviklingsprogram med storstilede projekter og reel, eksponentielle eksplosioner i menneskelig produktivitet, er nu ved at blive den fremherskende dynamik på denne planet. Vi har en meget spændende rapport fra Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der, som det er vore seere bekendt, deltog personligt i dette Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing; hvor hun deltog i flere plenarforsamlinger og rundbordsdiskussioner. Hun er fortsat med at holde private møder i Kina, siden topmødet sluttede. Så sent som i går holdt hun endnu en fremtrædende tale i Nanjing.

(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet. Hele Helgas tale vil kunne læses på dansk her på hjemmesiden i løbet af weekenden.)

So, let's take a look here; this is what Helga LaRouche had to say. She was a featured speaker at a conference of several hundred people at the Phoenix Press Publishing Group headquarters, which published the Chinese version of the New Silk Road Special Report. It was a report-back from her attendance at the May 14-15 Belt and Road summit. So, here's a view of beautiful Nanjing; this is where she was speaking yesterday. As you can see, a very modern and high-tech Chinese city. She said the following:

"The Belt and Road has injected optimism into many countries, and the momentum is unstoppable. But bringing it fully to fruition will not be easy," she said. Then she elaborated a little bit on that; she said, "Immediately after the Beijing summit, the attacks against the Belt and Road

escalated;

combined with attacks against President Trump, who had sent a high-level delegation. The attacks were based on the absurd charges of collusion with Russia in the election.”

“After the Cold War, the British and their American allies wanted to create a unipolar world. In doing so, they have destroyed the Middle East and left it in a shambles”; which she

said contributed to the refugee crisis. And she said, “The Belt

and Road will bring about the creation of the World Land-Bridge,

which will connect all continents.” This is something that we,

the LaRouche movement, have been fighting for, for over 40 years.

She concluded saying, “Transforming the Belt and Road to a World

Land-Bridge will realize politically for the first time, a real

future for the people living on this planet; and will establish

forms of governance for the world.” She made a very important point, which we’ll take up. “But to fully realize this, you must

also study the ideas of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, on the question of economics.”

In addition to Helga, other speakers at this conference were: Bill Jones, the {EIR} bureau chief for Washington, DC; and

a very distinguished gentleman, Professor Bao Shixiu, who’s a professor of military science.

That’s the kind of optimism, you get a sense of the real optimism that’s being expressed by Helga LaRouche; and that’s what the world looks like to the rest of the world for anyone who

is not reading the hysterical American and European press. On

the other hand, for your average American citizen, the very words

“New Silk Road”, “One Belt, One Road”, “Belt and Road Initiative”, these phrases are almost like a foreign language. It’s practically unheard of, with hardly a mention of this incredible development in world history that occurred over the last two weeks. Hardly a mention of this in the mainstream press

aside from propaganda about how this project is just some sort of

front for a so-called “new Chinese imperialism” or other lying distortions of what the implications of this idea, of this vision, is.

So instead, while your average American is sitting in the sweltering heat in Penn Station, waiting for a train which has been delayed for two hours because of some track derailment, or

literal disintegration of the track, while he’s sitting in his car for hours in a traffic jam waiting to go through the Lincoln

Tunnel, or stuck in traffic on 495, or sitting at home looking for a job to pay off hundreds of thousands of student debt that

he spent to get a degree that has earned him nothing. What is the average American forced to listen to on the radio, or on CNN,

or while he’s reading the esteemed headlines in the so-called venerable press, the mainstream media, the {Washington Post} or

the {New York Times}? Nary a mention of the new high-speed, vacuum tube magnetic train that is being developed by China, or

the new rail routes that are being opened in Africa, or the literally hundreds of great infrastructure projects that are being built practically overnight along the routes of the New Silk Road. But rather, what are you reading? Page after page after story after article of McCarthy-ite scare stories about

evil Russian spies who have supposedly infiltrated and subverted the entire Trump administration, lurking behind every desk in the West Wing. Literally smuggling hidden microphones into the Oval Office itself; the inner sanctum of the Trump administration. They're reading John Brennan repeatedly tell a Congressional hearing "I don't do evidence"; as he increasingly begins to sound like a character out of a "Doctor Strangelove" movie. Here's a quote from John Brennan: "I know what the Russians try to do. They suborn individuals and they try to get individuals, including US individuals, to act on their behalf; wittingly or unwittingly." In other words, any American who has some contact with Russia or Russians, may be a spy or a mole, whether he or she knows it or not. Subversion, or possible subversion, is everywhere; trust no one. There's John Brennan for you. Now, Americans should ask themselves, why are we being subjected to an endless, round-the-clock, literally nonstop narrative of so-called collusion between Russian spies and the Trump campaign, when even John Brennan himself was forced to admit in that same hearing, under rigorous questioning from members of Congress, that no, in fact, he has absolutely {no} evidence of collusion, cooperation, or coordination. Let's take a look:

ALICIA CERRETANI [on video]: On Tuesday, Obama's CIA director, resident thug, and coup plotter John Brennan testified in front of the House Intelligence Committee. His testimony was then used by the crazed media to flame the ongoing coup against

the President for yet another day.

Who is this guy? Well, after his stint as CIA station chief in Riyadh, Brennan became George Tenet's gopher at the CIA, and

then authored the intelligence assessment that claimed Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. Credible guy, right?

He

became Obama's CIA director in 2013, and regularly joined Obama

for the infamous Tuesday kill sessions. He helped overthrow the

duly-elected government of Ukraine using neo-Nazis, and helped Obama encircle Russia and China with US military forces, setting

the stage for World War III.

On Tuesday, Brennan told Congress that based on his intelligence experience (like the Iraq war intelligence assessment), when he observed contacts between Trump campaign personnel and Russian personnel he thought they might be nefarious, even if the Trump campaign personnel were "unwitting".

This has justified a full, unprecedented FBI investigation of a

Presidential campaign and all that has followed.

And just like the Iraq war, his "judgment" is not based on "evidence". As he explained, he "doesn't do evidence." Listen to

these exchanges:

REP. TOM ROONEY: But with regard to the main question at hand, in your experience with the Russians trying to involve themselves in our election, did you every find any evidence, as

the ranking member spoke of collusion, while you were the Director, did you find direct evidence of collusion between the

Trump campaign and Putin in Moscow, while you were there?

JOHN BRENNAN: Mr. Rooney, I never was an FBI agent, I never was a prosecutor, so I really don't do evidence. I do intelligence throughout the course of my career.

REP. TREY GOWDY: When you learned of Russian efforts, did you have evidence of a connection between the Trump campaign and Russian state actors?

BRENNAN: As I said, Mr. Gowdy, I don't do evidence. We were uncovering information and intelligence about interactions and contacts between US persons and the Russians. As we came upon that, we would share it with the Bureau.

GOWDY: So, was it contact that you saw, was it something more than contact? What is the nature of what you saw?

BRENNAN: I saw interaction, and was aware of interaction. But again, it raised questions in my mind about what was the true nature of it; but I don't know. I don't have sufficient information to make a determination whether or not such cooperation or complicity or collusion was taking place.

REP. MIKE TURNER: But if someone left this hearing today, and said that you had indicated that those contacts were evidence of collusion or collaboration, they would be misrepresenting your statements, correct?

BRENNAN: They would have mis-heard my response to the very good questions that were asked of me. I'm trying to be as clear as possible in terms of what I know, what I assess, and what I can say.

TURNER: So, you would say that's a misrepresentation of

your statement, yes?

BRENNAN: I would say that it was not an accurate portrayal of my statement, absolutely; it was inconsistent with my remarks.

TURNER: So, let me go to the next step. If someone saw what you saw, and only what you saw, with respect to those contacts, if they looked at the intelligence that you saw, where you said it might have been benign, might not have been benign, and then they characterized what they saw as having been evidence of collusion or collaboration, they'd be misrepresenting the intelligence, would they not?

BRENNAN: I don't know what else they have seen that could corroborate or –

TURNER: If they saw only what you saw, they would be misrepresenting the intelligence, correct?

BRENNAN: I presume they would be misrepresenting what it is that I saw. Again, I don't know –

TURNER: Thank you. I appreciate that, because I do believe that there are members of this committee who deserve that counsel. Because your specificity gives us an understanding of what we're reviewing, and I do believe there are those who reviewed some of the information that you have seen, and represented to the public absolutely incorrectly and misrepresented it.

CERRETANI: It's time for Americans to see the world as Brennan and his cohorts see it. Their establishment has their panties in a bunch, not over Trump-Russian collusion, but because

Donald Trump said he is ready to work with Russia and China on terrorism and economic development, ending the miserable years under Bush and Obama which Brennan so faithfully served. Trump needs to keep his promise; end the regime change wars and focus on rebuilding the economy. And the same goes for our Senators and Congressmen: Suck it up, move on, and back Trump up on rebuilding the country.

OGDEN: So, as you can see, we have a petition on that subject which is available on the LaRouche PAC website. It's called "It's Time to Rebuild the Country"; the website is lpac.co/rebuild. This is a petition which you can sign and you can circulate.

So, to take up that question – "It's time to rebuild the country" – I'm joined by Jason Ross as I mentioned earlier; who

spent the last week in New York City, conducting meetings with some top engineers and discussing what must be done to form a task force, a national action force, to address what is rightly

being called an infrastructure emergency. It is expressing itself very acutely in New York City, but it's a general problem.

Before I bring Jason on, I want to show a couple of headlines to

give you a flavor of what New Yorkers are experiencing right now.

Here's the first: "Nothing Can Save New York City Commuters from

a Summer of Hell"; "Long Island Railroad Riders Could Be in for a

'Summer of Agony'|"; "MTA Taking on 'Crushing Debt' for Expansion

Projects”; “New York Governor Urges Trump to Provide Emergency Funds for Penn Station”; and “If You Want to Understand America’s

Infrastructure Problem, Just Look at New Jersey!”

So, Jason, why don’t you give us a flavor of what’s going on up there in New York?

JASON ROSS: Sure! I can say a bit about what’s going on up here, and then I think the really important aspect is about where

the solution can come from. Some people like to look for local

solutions, which in the case of New York is simply not possible

here. In terms of what the region is facing, I’ll just give a couple of examples. One is New York Penn Station, which is where

the New Jersey Transit trains come in from New Jersey, it’s where

the Long Island Railroad trains come in from the east, and also,

Amtrak trains use it. It serves about 700,000 passengers every

day, busiest train station in the United States. The tunnels that go under the Hudson River from the west side of Manhattan,

are over 100 years old. They received damage during super storm

Sandy, and without repair, they’re expected to potentially fail

anytime within a decade or so. But it’s unpredictable; they could fail sooner. Basically, it’s a ticking time bomb.

Were one of these tunnels to fail, there would literally be probably about 100,000 people unable to get to work in the morning, or get home, or run their errands or do whatever they’re

doing. 100,000 people. That’s an awfully large number of

people. Also related to this, Matt, you had mentioned the “Summer of Hell” for Long Island Railroad commuters. Coming out of Penn Station to the east, are tunnels that cross the East River. Of the four tunnels, there are two that are going to be undergoing repair and maintenance. During that time, the availability of trains is going to be decreased; this is the “Summer of Hell”. This is going to be a major bottleneck for commuters. Then coming up in 2019, the L train, which crosses the East River and heads to Williamsburg and Brooklyn, is going to be closed down for over a year. That tunnel needs such major maintenance; again, an over 100-year old tunnel serving the busiest metro system in our nation. When that is closed for over a year, that’s going to cause major disruptions. The thing is, this is not an accident; it’s not as though these things were unforeseen. Due to decades of under-investment, the infrastructure of New York City, the largest, most important city in the United States, is really at catastrophic levels. Even the planned outages are going to be very debilitating, and were something to occur to the Hudson River crossing heading into Penn Station from the New Jersey side, you would have an absolute disaster. You’d have to change the bridges and tunnels to be buses and carpools only, for example. Major disruption, very major disruption. What I think this shows us, in addition to the \$100 billion to \$1 trillion that would be required to really revamp the system in New York, to standardize the types of sizes of the trains, or have platforms that can operate on both New Jersey Transit and Long Island Railroad trains; not to get into all the detail on

this. Let's talk about what would make it possible. You opened up the show discussing Helga LaRouche's visit to the Nanjing, following her participation in the Belt and Road Forum in Beijing two weeks ago. This Belt and Road Initiative outlook, the types of financing that are involved in this, the funding, the way that this infrastructure is being conceived and put together; this is something that's absolutely essential in the United States. Infrastructure isn't little bits and pieces that get put together to make individual commuters or the movement of goods easier. What it is, is a platform as a whole, required for a certain level of productivity. So, we require both an increase in the productivity of the United States, productivity in the sense of producing things. Producing something for the future, as exemplified by scientific research or high-technology manufacturing, by the space program. These are things that are incredibly productive in achieving a greater potential for the future. When you say what is the platform on which a higher level of productivity can exist, then the answer to that question is things like national rail upgrades; very high-speed rail, for example, along the eastern coast of the United States, throughout the country. A large investment in revamping in the New York City metro system, for example; but far beyond that. Nationally, rail; power plants. Upgrading our very old power plants to new, higher technology, more efficient and safer nuclear power plants; fourth generation nuclear power plants. The kinds of upgrades that are needed are on a scale that is so large, that it requires a commitment from the nation.

This, I think, gets to the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, the proposal that he's made for what's necessary for real economic recovery in the United States. With Glass-Steagall in place and the potential to actually direct the economy in a productive direction, you're going to need a national banking approach. We're going to need the ability to finance large investments in infrastructure in projects that will not bring a return. This is the biggest problem people have in understanding this. You're thinking about value in terms of money. Does the New York subway pay for itself? Do people pay enough in fares to pay for the system? These kinds of things really miss the point, because they ignore the qualitative incommensurable change in productivity that's made possible by an infrastructure platform as a platform.

As Mr. LaRouche considers it, in creating a synthetic environment, an artificial environment, a manmade, nurturing, improved, better environment around us; where our surroundings, the world that we live in, is, to an increasing degree, one of our own creation. The resources that are resources to us in our daily life, or on a national economic scale, are not those of 2000 years ago. They're not the resources of good land for agriculture – although of course, we use that; or of resources that are sitting around. Fish in the ocean or the river that you can catch. They're resources that are underground; they're resources that are very hard to separate from each other. Separating out rare Earth elements for their use; mining aluminum ore and creating aluminum with a process that requires a great

deal of electricity. The ability to use the resources of the future to increase our power as a species; that's the real key direction that infrastructure must be approached from. The way to avoid the bit by bit, piece by piece, piecemeal user fee approach to infrastructure financing, is to acknowledge its unique role in the economy as something that's of governmental responsibility and something whose returns are inherently indirect and should not be looked for in terms of direct money made by them via user fees. It's just a completely wrong way to look at these things. The way to make this possible is going to go far beyond Donald Trump's proposals for investing \$1 trillion in infrastructure over the next decade via a process that pulls in private money via PPPs (public-private partnerships) and the like. What's required is not annual appropriations, not private financing, but an ability to have national credit over a longer term loans via a national banking approach to make it possible to build these 5-, 10-, 25-year programs at rates that are affordable. So we can put in place this necessary physical environment; create the platform that we would want to live in, where we're able to move efficiently. Where new areas for, for example, affordable housing open up, when you've got a better transportation system. You don't have to live quite so close to an expensive city center to be able to get a job there. You can enjoy more of your time when you have an efficient and productive infrastructure platform.

So I think overall, New York City is a case study. You'd say that if this can happen in New York, and you think about the importance of New York City and the nation, the importance of the businesses that are located there; you'd say that there is enough of a pull that this should never have been possible for this to occur in New York City. But it has, and it's just an illustration of a dramatic underinvestment nationwide; and something that has to be reversed in this way that Mr. LaRouche has been very unique and very correct in proposing for the United States.

OGDEN: Well, Jason, you have unique perspective, because not only have you spent the last week up in New York, but you've had the opportunity to travel to China. Maybe you could just tell us a little bit; just a personal eyewitness view. What's the difference between being an American walking around the streets of New York City right now with crumbling infrastructure, versus being in China, walking around Beijing with a blossoming high technology commitment to modern infrastructure?

ROSS: Well, some people might say it's an unfair comparison, because the metro system in Nanjing is basically brand new; it's a decade or two old. And in Beijing, there's been significant expansion of the lines. But the fact is, that even older cities – take Seoul, South Korea; they've had major upgrades to their subway system. They put in the screen doors in

the stations so you don't have trash or people falling on the tracks; it makes it safer, it makes it possible to air condition

the stations. These are the kinds of things that New York could

have retrofitted; but if you look at the situation today, you've

got the interesting aromas in New York subways. You've got the

famously unreliable performance. In contrast to that, the Chinese, for example, high-speed rail network, where you're able

to go an equivalent distance as that between here and Chicago –

meaning Beijing to Shanghai – you can go in five hours in China.

That same trip by rail here in the United States takes 19 hours.

Or, take New York to Washington. It's kind of insane for somebody looking from the outside, to see these two major cities

of the United States separated by travel really takes hours.

It's a little under three hours even with the "high-speed" Acela;

which is isn't very high-speed. By road, you're looking at more

than five hours. This would be a one, one and a half hour travel. It's really a question of how we're thinking about ourselves; the fact that these kinds of terrible conditions are

being tolerated. And the fact that of these stupid, stupid economic policies that have made this possible, continue to be tolerated.

Mr. LaRouche has pointed to the post-Kennedy shift in orientation of the United States, away from a future orientation,

away from investments in the future, away from physical

productivity towards finance. You can have all of the exotic investment derivatives that you want, but that's not going to get you home any quicker if the train is late, or because a bunch of trash on the tracks caught on fire and delayed the subway line.

OGDEN: One thing about that. First of all, infrastructure goes far beyond just transport infrastructure. Obviously there's the power production and what you can provide in terms of energy density towards manufacturing and all of the agricultural technology that is involved in a modern infrastructure platform for a nation. But one question I think is interesting, and we discussed it a little bit. We take for granted that the idea of faster transport is just a modern idea and that we should have faster transport between cities. That sort of stands on its own, it is true. But what role does that play in terms of the science of economics? Productivity and what does that allow us to do economically that we couldn't do before without this kind of high-speed transport?

ROSS: Well, let's also take it on the level of the Belt and Road, where some of these areas, it's not just going from moderate to high speed transit; it's going from a two-week voyage through the mountains by road to one that only takes a few days in the location I'm thinking of right now. But think of the value of land in a certain area. What is the value of a piece of

land? It depends on what the surroundings are, what is the environment; including, very importantly, probably most important

these days, the created environment – the constructed environment. That nurturing, synthetic, artificial, manmade human environment that we've created. If you've got an area, and

now you've got access to high-speed rail, you've built several fourth-generation, a very highly efficient nuclear power supply.

You know it'll be on 24 hours a day; the rates are reasonable. You've got a water supply system backed up by desalination to ensure that it's always available; and you've got an efficient to

get people, employees, and goods around. The value of that area

has now just dramatically increased; not just in financial terms,

like the rent would be higher on a piece of land there, if you owned a building. But it actually is more productive. You can

move things around more quickly; you can go from a prototype design to creating goods more rapidly. You're able to waste less

time having whatever it is that you're producing or working on just being in transit going from place to place.

Think about it. When you're shipping things, say you've got a type of production facility and you're shipping things by ocean

and you're counting on a certain number of car parts arriving every week. Well, there's always a certain number that are just

sitting out in the ocean in transit; it's just wasted inventory

basically. So physically, those are maybe a small type of improvement to look at, but the type of economy that's made possible as a whole. You could do the best urban planning you

want, you could have a wonderful system in some area; but if that area didn't have electricity, it doesn't matter how well things are laid out. It doesn't matter how clean the water is around it, how perfect the weather; you're simply going to be limited in terms of what processes you can engage in. Transportation, energy, access to resources. I think the real way to look at it right now is we have to keep in mind, whenever we're talking about infrastructure or platforms, we have to talk about nuclear fusion. Because that's really the thing you've got to keep in mind. How will our relationship to other people, land area, resources, how is that going to change with the development of commercial nuclear fusion? Where the price of energy will come down dramatically; where our ability to process resources will be dramatically eased. How is that going to change the productivity, the value of every person, the value of the platform of constructed environment that we've got? You have to always keep that in mind. What's the next level going to be? I'll say one more thing. You brought up agriculture. Think about the important role of space infrastructure in agriculture today. The ability of GPS positioning; the ability to get a very good sense of conditions on the ground of agricultural conditions, of weather, of location; and the way that changes the way you approach to fertilizing, taking care, harvesting of the field. So, the space program, where our space infrastructure is

playing a major role here.

So, what are the next levels of infrastructure going to be? Let's keep that in mind.

OGDEN: I think that's the key. It's vision; it's where are we going next. Where is the world in the next 50 years? Can we imagine a new platform of human existence which is incommensurate with the one that we currently have? It's very important to look backwards in history and say, prior to the discovery of nuclear fission, what was possible and what was not possible? Prior to the development of widespread electricity? So, if you look at the incommensurate changes over time that the human species has gone through, can you imagine what the next incommensurate leap is going to be? I really do think that that is the beauty of this Belt and Road Initiative. Go back 40 years, go back as I think Helga mentioned in the remarks that I quoted in the beginning; go back to when Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche were first campaigning for this idea of a new international economic order around the International Development Bank. This became this vision of this productive linkage between East and West, uniting Eurasia; it was known as the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This was the vision for the New Silk Road that now in 2013 was adopted by the Chinese government and is now a reality. Forty years ago, would you have even imagined what has now become possible because of what China has committed itself to? It requires those types of visionaries at every stage of history to say where do we go to next; what is the next leap that

mankind has to take? I do think, as we've discussed, the next leap is moving mankind into near-Earth space and then beyond. We have to become an extraterrestrial species; not just one that makes expeditions with two-man, three-man capsules to the Moon and back. But actually building up an infrastructure as we have here on Earth, to create these kinds of artificial environments in space. You project that vision of the future back onto what we should be doing here on Earth, and a lot of these things just become kind of obvious. We shouldn't have trains derailing coming in and out of Penn Station, if we're actually a species worthy of colonizing Mars.

ROSS: Right. You're talking about looking back to the past to look at something having been a breakthrough originally. Some of the equipment that's currently operating in the signalling in the New York subway is from the 1930s, when those relay boxes and things like this go back to the Roosevelt administration. And they're still in use; thankfully, still working for the most part.

OGDEN: Do they use Morse Code to signal when the train's coming into the station?

ROSS: There are rude levers and things like this.

OGDEN: I thought it was unique that in this speech that Helga made in Nanjing, as I mentioned, she was speaking to the Phoenix Publishing House, which published the Chinese version of the "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge" special

report; which is the {EIR} Special Report from two years ago, and now this is circulating in Chinese. But she was sort of giving a report back on what's the progress that we've made; what are the breakthroughs that we've made so far; what do we have to do next?

It was this remark that she made that to fully realize all of this, you must study my husband's science of economics. It really is true. Beginning to understand these things not just from the standpoint of transport corridors and train tracks and

highways and these types of very necessary projects; but to understand it from above in terms of the science of human productivity and how the human mind harnesses new technologies and uses them to build these increasing platforms of human existence. You already have the world engaging in a process of

which they're not even quite conscious of what they're doing. It's necessary to become fully conscious of what this process actually is, in order to carry it forward to the next level.

Let me ask you one more political question, Jason. On the ground there in New York, how are people responding to, on one side this 24-hour nonstop news cycle barrage about Russian spies

and so on; and then on the other side, being told that there's this incredible process that's underway, this breakthrough that

happened in China that they're not even being told about?

What's

people's response to that?

ROSS: I don't know how different it is from other places, but overall, people are getting really sick about hearing about

Trump-gate and Russia. People are really sick of it. Either

that, or they're going along with it and they kind of listen to it. But what really gets through to people is when you're discussing thinking about the future. This is what people really do respond to. They say, "OK, what are we going to do? The election happened. What's our future going to be?" If your favorite historical figure ever were the President of the United States right now, what would be the policies you'd want to get implemented? OK, let's start making those things happen. The potential to do this in a very new way, both shocks some people or seems impossible to others; but I attended a forum about US-China economic relations the other day, and one of the things that came up was one of the presenters was going through various studies about the economy in China. About how the middle class is exploding, how poverty is diminishing very rapidly; the percentage of the population that's actually poor is going down very quickly; and about the level of optimism. There was a chart of optimism among different nations; it measured as survey questions. "I think my children will have a better future than I do." And in all segments of China, this was very positive in all segments of China. For the middle segments of China it's 60-70%; even a majority in the lower income segments as well. There's just this tremendous sense that things are getting better, things are moving forward; the next generation will have it better. Then on this chart, you have the United States, way down here

almost at the very bottom, along with the Western European nations. So, I just think – I know this gets away from asking how people respond here, but it's a very important point, I think. In keeping with the shift of the center of gravity in the world, the importance economically and politically, away from the trans-Atlantic and towards Asia where everyone is expecting the majority of the growth in the world economy in the next decades. Along with that, you have this sense of happiness and optimism in that part of the world. In these old, sour nations. It's also changing in Europe, but in the trans-Atlantic, the government leaders can say whatever they want, but if you actually ask people what they think about what their future looks like, it's very grim. The contrast between these two outlooks – you had asked earlier about New York versus China – as a personal anecdote, that was one of the huge differences that I saw; was this overwhelming sense of optimism from people in China. It's getting better. We can absolutely have that sense here as well, by making it a reality; by throwing off the stupid ideas that are holding us back. By throwing off this slavish adherence to Wall Street and London; by tolerating the avowed supremacy of finance over actual human contributions. It's a choice we have to make.

OGDEN: Exactly! That was exactly the point that Helga made in her speech in Nanjing; she said "The Belt and Road has

injected optimism into many countries, and the momentum is unstoppable. But, to fully bring it into fruition, it will not

be easy.” So, we have our work cut out for us here in the United

States. I think this idea of a task force of engineers and real

qualified minds who are going to put their minds to work on how

to construct this vision for how the United States can join this

New Silk Road dynamic; it’s a very important one.

I’d like to put on the screen one more time the address to

the petition: This is “Congress: Suck It Up and Move On!

It’s

Time to Rebuild the Country”; lpac.co/rebuild. I encourage you

to sign that petition and to circulate it, and to become involved

in what you just heard from Jason. Spread the news about this dynamic of optimism that is sweeping the world, and the

possibility that this is something that could happen here in the

United States.

Thank you so much, Jason; it was a pleasure talking to you from your remote location. I’d like to thank everybody for tuning into our webcast here today. Please stay tuned for more

news from Helga Zepp-LaRouche; we’ll keep you updated as her travels continue. We’ve got some definite breakthroughs that we

can be expecting over the coming days. So, thanks for joining us, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Kinas udenrigsminister: Bælt & Vej-initiativ er middel til industrialisering af Afrika

24. maj, 2017 – Under forløbet af sin rundrejse til fire afrikanske nationer – Mauretanien, Kap Verde, Mali og Elfenbenskysten – understregede Kinas udenrigsminister Wang Yi, at Kina søger at styrke samarbejdet med afrikanske nationer inden for rammerne af Bælt & Vej-initiativet, rapporterer *Xinhua*.

Under en pressekonference den 22. maj i Abidjan, Elfenbenskysten, understregede Wang, at Afrika og Kina »kan kombinere de 10 største planer for samarbejde mellem Kina og Afrika, foreslået af Xi Jinping, med Bælt & Vej-initiativet« og få dem til at komplementere hinanden. *Xinhua* understregede, at Afrika er ivrig efter at gå bort fra metoden med »ensidig metode til vækst« med eksport af råmaterialer og opnå økonomisk uafhængighed gennem industrialisering. Kina ses som den mest pålidelige partner til opnåelse af dette mål.

I sine bemærkninger understregede Wang, at Afrikas vækst også er afgørende for udviklingslandenes overordnede styrke, og dette er i både Kinas og Afrikas interesse. Han påpegede det mangeårige venskab mellem Kina og Afrika og betydningen af infrastrukturprojekter, som Kina var med til at bygge for årtier siden – Mauretaniens »venskabshavn«, bygget i 1980'erne, er et eksempel – og som stadig er i fuld drift. Det, der plejede at være kendt som »fattigdommens trekant« i det sydlige Mauretanien, er nu kendt som »håbets trekant«,

takket være veje og anden infrastruktur, som Kina var med til at bygge.

I går præsenterede den kinesiske generaldirektør for det Kinesiske Udenrigsministeriums departement for planlægning af politik, Wang Yajun, i Addis Abeba i den Afrikanske Unions hovedkvarter, en bog om byggeriet af Tanzania-Zambia-jernbanen (TAZARA), med titlen, »Et monument for kinesisk-afrikansk venskab«, som blev indviet i 1976. En rapport på Folkerepublikken Kinas Statsråds webside bemærker, at TAZARA-projektet dækker et område på 1860 kilometer fra Dar es Salaam i Tanzania i øst og til New Kapiri Mposhi i det centrale Zambia i vest. Det kendes som »Frihedens jernbane« og »Venskabet jernbane« – færdigbygget på fem år og otte måneder.

Foto: En jernbanebro på TAZARA-jernbanestrækningen mellem Tanzania og Zambia.

Bælt & Vej sætter dagsordenen i verden

23. maj, 2017 – Efterklange fra Bælt & Vej Internationale Forum for Samarbejde, der fandt sted i Beijing den 14.-15. maj, mærkes fortsat i alle hjørner af globen, med 'ordet', der kommer ud, om, at der findes et alternativ til geopolitik og økonomisk kollaps, og som allerede er i gang, og hvor alle inviteres til at deltage.

Hongkongs *South China Morning Post* pegede i sin lederartikel i dag på Bælt & Vej som »en måde, hvorpå Kina og Japan kan udbedre deres bånd«. Dette er en måde, hvorpå den nødvendige tillid kan opbygges for at etablere «en vedvarende forbedring»

i de kinesisk-japanske relationer, der ellers hænger fast i »uløste historiske spørgsmål«, som yderligere kompliceres af Japans »tilnærmelse« til Taiwan.

»Afsløringen af et personligt, forsonligt brev fra den japanske premierminister Shinzo Abe til præsident Xi Jinping, der blev overleveret på vegne af Abe efter det nylige Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing, er derfor en udvikling, vi hilser velkommen«, skrev *SCMP*. Abes brev siges at have foreslået, at der bør arrangeres gensidige statsbesøg mellem de to ledere. *SCMP* indikerede, at, alt imens japanske forretningsfolks entusiasme for Bælt & Vej er en faktor, så kan Abes brev også være blevet afstedkommet af forbedringen i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer, som det indikeredes af (senior-nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver til præsident Trump i asiatiske anliggender) Matthew Pottingers deltagelse i forummet og skabelsen af en amerikansk Bælt & Vej arbejdsgruppe på regeringsniveau.

»Bælt & Vej-planen kunne blive et udgangspunkt for Kina og Japan for den fortsatte normalisering af deres relationer ... Hvis den kan blive medvirkende til at bane vejen for forhandlinger mellem Japan og Kina, ville det være en bonus for området«, konkluderer *SCMP*.

Det er også i Europas interesse at deltage. I sin seneste artikel i *Forbes*-magasinet, lovpriste den entusiastiske tilhænger af den Nye Silkevej, Wade Shepard, der har rejst langs Bælt & Vej i to år som forberedelse til en bog om projektet, Bælt & Vej-initiativet for »dets pågående tilsidesættelse af de etablerede, geopolitiske splittelser i verden«. Monarkier, demokratier, diktaturer, teokratier og selv »borderline konkursstater« er velkomne, så længe, de er indstillet på at »komme hen til bordet og gå til sagen i praksis«. Wade foreslår, at Europa holder op med at bekymre sig om gennemskueligheden af Kinas markeder. »Bælt & Vej-initiativet gør Europa relevant igen, én trans-eurasiske jernbanelinje, ét finansielt distrikt og én havn ad gangen ...

Bælt & Vej-initiativet tilbyder ligeledes Europa økonomiske og infrastrukturelle muligheder, som ellers ikke ville eksistere, muligheder, som, hvis de blev udnyttet korrekt, kunne være med til at få Europa tilbage på sin sokkel.«

Udelades skal heller ikke det Kinesisk-britiske Erhvervsråd (CBBC), som er »henrykt« over de udsigter, der kommer fra BV-forum i Beijing, som det deltog i, rapporterede sino.uk.com i går. CBBC rapporterer, at det vil udarbejde fællesrapporter med det Kinesiske Akademi for International Handel og Økonomisk Samarbejde (CAITEC) »om Bælt & Vej-initiativet (BVI) for at sikre, at britiske selskaber får den bedste placering til at drage fordel af et af de mest omfattende, globale forretningsinitiativer i moderne historie. BVI-visionen er i færd med at blive til virkelighed, og Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing i denne weekend demonstrerer Kinas ambition for BVI«.

Selv de, der er fikseret på at tjene penge, er ved at vågne. Europæiske banker bør gå med i dette projekt, skrev Alicia Garcia-Herrero, der er associeret til den europæiske økonomiske tænketank BRUEGAL og det spanske monarkis Royal El Cano Institut, i en artikel, udgivet på brinknews.com, og hvis titel opsummerer artiklens argument: »Kina kan ikke alene finansiere Bælt & Vej«.

På lignende vis skrev en Tony Boyd i *Australian Financial Review*, (»Opportunities for Business in China's One Belt One Road«), at den australske »regerings lunkne respons til Kinas massive Bælt & Vej-infrastrukturplan ikke bør afholde australske erhvervsfolk i at komme med deres egne, omfattende strategier for engagement«. Kina har »en plan« og mulighederne er der »for bankfolk, byggefirmaer, infrastrukturinvestorer, konsulenter, firmaer for professionelle tjenesteydelser, managers af aktieinvesteringer og eksportører. Foretagender må forstå de finansielle og økonomiske implikationer af et budget for koordineret infrastruktur, der spænder over op til 65 lande«, skrev Boyd.

Er fred i Mellemøsten endelig muligt?

Leder Fra LaRouche PAC, 24. maj, 2017 – Præsident Trumps historiske besøg til de hellige steder for de tre religioner af Bogen (Den jødiske Bibel, den kristne Bibel og Koranen, - red.), sluttede i dag i Vatikanet. Udskrifter fra både Vatikanet og Det Hvide Hus rapporterer, at samarbejde omkring fred i Mellemøsten var det centrale diskussionsemne – »fremme af fred i verden gennem politisk forhandling og dialog mellem religioner«, som Vatikanet udtrykte det.

Forskellen mellem den aktuelle situation og så alle de mislykkede bestræbelser under tidligere præsidenter er den kendsgerning, at den britiske opsplittning af verden i Øst og Vest, den »frie verden vs. gudløs kommunisme«, skabt af briterne efter præsident Franklin Roosevelts død, er i færd med at blive smadret af samarbejdet mellem Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping. Den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt har tjent som den primære styrekabine for denne opdeling af verden, og det samme har Nordkorea i Asien. I begge tilfælde ville briterne og deres naive fjolser i USA og Europa træffe alle tænkelige forholdsregler for at *forhindre*, at der kommer en løsning på disse betændte kriser, på trods af den kendsgerning, at deres eksistens var grobund for et terroristkaos og konstant truede med at blive gnisten til udbruddet af atomkrig.

Nu er en ny, økonomisk verdensorden på plads, hvilket demonstreredes af det succesrige Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde i Beijing, den 14.-15. maj. Alt imens Kina og Rusland var hoveddrivkraft bag denne proces, så sendte præsident Trump en højtplaceret repræsentant, skabte en

»Bælt & Vej Komite for USA« for at følge op på forummet samt inviterede Kina til at deltage i planlægning og byggeri af den desperat nødvendige genopbygning af den smuldrende, amerikanske infrastruktur.

Med præsident Trump, der har kurs mod Bruxelles på torsdag til et NATO-møde (de anti-russiske fanatikere holder vejret i forventning om, hvad Trump vil sige), så fremlagde den russiske forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu i dag et ekstremt positivt syn på det amerikansk-russiske samarbejde i krigen mod terror i Syrien.

»Vi taler med dem 'på alle tider af døgnet'«, sagde Shoigu om det amerikanske militær, »både nat og dag, og vi mødes ved forskellige lejligheder«. Chefen for den amerikanske generalstab, general Dunford, beskrev i sidste uge det tætte samarbejde med russerne og syrerne, selv om amerikansk lov forbyder egentlige fælles militære deployeringer.

Det er det nye, globale miljø, baseret på samarbejde, i hvilket præsident Trump opfordrer Islam, Jødedom og Kristendom til at komme sammen for fred. Med hensyn til terrorisme sagde Trump søndag i Riyadh, ved et møde med ledere fra næsten 50 islamiske nationer, at det ikke er en konflikt mellem religioner, men mellem godt og ondt.

I samme ånd bryder muligheden for fred ud på Koreahalvøen. Den nyligt valgte præsident for Sydkorea, Moon Jae-in, promoverer åbenlyst en genindførelse af 'Solskinspolitikken' for økonomisk samarbejde med Nordkorea, både for fælles udvikling og for at etablere den nødvendige tillid for en aftale for at afslutte Nordkoreas atomprogram, til gengæld for en fredsaftale og løfte om ikke-aggression fra USA.

Præsident Moons udsending til Rusland, Song Young-gil, holdt dybtgående diskussioner med Ruslands minister for udvikling i Fjernøsten, Alexander Galushka, i sidste uge. Song sagde til det sydkoreanske nyhedsbureau, *Yonhap*: »Minister Galushka

foreslog, at det trilaterale samarbejde mellem Syd- og Nordkorea og Rusland, og som har befundet sig i et dødvande pga. atomspørgsmål, nu fremsættes af hver nation, og det gik jeg ind på.« Dette har været kernen i Lyndon LaRouches forslag mht. Korea i de seneste tyve år. Ligesom tilfældet er i Mellemøsten, så er den Nye Silkevej også her den platform, på hvilken fred endelig kan etableres.

Kinas ambassadør til FN, Liu Jieyi, sagde ved Sikkerhedsrådets møde om Nordkorea tirsdag, at »der er intet til hinder for en dialog i den aktuelle situation – det kræver politisk vilje.«

»Alle skridt fremad i Koreakrisen er sket gennem dialog«, sagde han – og han kunne have tilføjet, at alle skridt fremad blev saboteret af krigspartierne i Vesten, først Bush og Cheney og dernæst Barack Obama.

Disse geopolitiske spil kan og må lægges i graven for evigt, og Imperiets ild må slukkes. Tiden er inde.

Foto: USA's præsident Donald Trump havde udstrakte drøftelser med Pave Frans under en privat audiens i Vatikanet, 24. maj, 2017. Her beundrer han med fr. Trump Michelangelos store vægmaleri, Dommedag, i det Sixtinske Kapel i Vatikanet.

Schiller **Instituttet**
interviewer
dr. Wang Yiwei i København om

Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing

København, 18. maj, 2017 – Efter seminaret »Kinas Ét Bælt, én Vej-initiativ og mulighederne for Norden«, der var arrangeret i fællesskab af Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier (DIIS) og den Kinesiske Ambassade i Danmark, gennemførte Schiller Instituttets Michelle Rasmussen et interview med Wang Yiwei, professor ved School of International Studies; direktør for Institute of International Affairs, samt direktør for Center for European Studies ved Renmin Universitet i Beijing. Han er forfatter af bogen, »The Belt and Road: What will China offer the World in its Rise?«, fra 2016 (Bælt og Vej: Hvad vil Kina tilbyde den fremvoksende verden?)

Wang Yiwei deltog ved præsentationen af den kinesiske udgave af EIR's specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, som blev præsenteret af Schiller Instituttets stifter og præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved et symposium, sponsoreret af Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies, der også er medsponsor af den kinesiske udgivelse, den 29. september, 2015, på Renmin Universitet.