

Helga Zepp-LaRouche om 'Besked fra Biden- administrationen: Atomkrig er en reel mulighed'

6. februar (EIRNS) –Følgende er en oversættelse af Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedartikel i det tyske tidsskrift Neue Solidarität, nr. 6, den 11. februar 2021:

Forholdet til Amerika vil ikke være let endnu et stykke tid fremover. I betragtning af de forskellige strategidokumenter mod Rusland og Kina samt udsagn fra førende militærofficerer lyder præsident Bidens meddelelse i hans første udenrigspolitiske tale – "Amerika er tilbage" – som en skjult trussel. Under hans ledelse sagde han, at de dage, hvor USA vil "lægge sig fladt ned", når de står over for Ruslands aggressive handlinger, er forbi, og Kinas aggressive tvangsforanstaltninger vil blive imødegået. Titlen på hans tale var "Amerikas plads i verden", og ifølge Biden er denne plads overalt i verden. Regeringer såvel som ansvarlige borgere overalt i verden skal straks begynde at reflektere over, hvordan de vil reagere på de erklæringer om politisk hensigt, der er hørt i forbindelse med Bidens tiltrædelse.

De mest chokerende udsagn kom fra adm. Charles Richard, chef for den Amerikanske Strategiske Kommando, der skrev i februarudgaven af USA Flådeinstitutets Proceedings:

"Der er en reel mulighed for, at en regional krise med Rusland eller Kina hurtigt kunne eskalere til en konflikt, der involverer atomvåben, hvis de opfatter, at en konventionel krigs nederlag ville true regimet eller staten. Derfor må det

amerikanske militær flytte sin hovedantagelse fra 'brug af atomvåbner er ikke mulig' til 'brug af atomvåbner er en meget reel mulighed' ... ”

Det burde være klart, at admiral Richard her taler om 3. verdenskrig, hvilket sandsynligvis ville betyde tilintetgørelse af menneskeheden. Som MIT-atomvåbenekspert Theodore Postol blandt andet gentagne gange og overbevisende har hævdet, er den afgørende forskel mellem konventionelle krig og en atomkrig faktisk det, at en atomkrig ikke forbliver begrænset. Men NATO's utopiske fraktion mener tværtimod, at en begrænset atomkrig kunne blive "vundet". Og hvilke "regionale konflikter" kunne man overveje? En konflikt ved den russiske grænse på grund af Aegis-baserede missilforsvarssystemer i Polen og Rumænien? Eller vedrørende det østlige Ukraine, hvor Europa bliver krigsskuepladsen? En konflikt mellem Israel og Iran eller en eskalering af spændingerne omkring Taiwan?

Admiral Richards uhyrlige bemærkninger skal betragtes på baggrund af adskillige forskellige strategiske papirer og doktriner, hvor det meste perfide er et dokument udgivet af Atlanterhavsrådet den 28. januar. Dokumentet er underskrevet "Anonym", som er "en tidligere senior regerings embedsmand med dybdegående ekspertise og erfaring med at beskæftige sig med Kina," ifølge beskrivelsen i forordet af Frederick Kempe, lederen af Atlanterhavsrådet. Dokumentet på 85 sider, der er beskrevet som et af de vigtigste, Rådet nogensinde har offentliggjort, har titlen "Det længere telegram: Hen imod en ny amerikansk Kina-strategi (The Longer Telegram: Toward a New American China Strategy)", i eksplicit henvisning til dokumentet "Lang telegram (Long Telegram)" fra 1946, der også blev offentliggjort anonymt i sin tid af George Kennan, hvor han opfordrede til en inddæmningspolitik mod Sovjetunionen.

Denne nye anonyme forfatter opfordrer åbent til et kup imod præsident Xi Jinping og hans "indre kreds" for at erstatte ham med oppositionsledere inden for det kinesiske kommunistparti. Da styrtningen af hele det kommunistiske parti med sine 91

millioner medlemmer ikke har nogen chance for at få succes, siger han, at den amerikanske strategi skal forblive "laserfokuseret" på Xi Jinping og sigte mod at opsplitte CCP-ledelsen, hvor højtstående partimedlemmer er uenige i Xis politiske retning og hans uendelige krav om absolut loyalitet. Man skal hjælpe disse kredse i CCP-ledelsen med at komme til magten, der i modsætning til Xi Jinping ikke ønsker at implementere deres egen kinesiske model for en international orden, men vil underkaste sig den USA-dominerede verdensorden. Xi har ifølge "Anonym" til hensigt at projicere Kinas autoritære system over hele verden og udgør ikke længere et problem kun for den USA-ledede liberale internationale orden og amerikanske forrang, men et alvorligt problem for hele den demokratiske verden.

Lad os forstille os følgende tænkeeksperiment. Hvordan ville den tyske regering reagere, hvis en førende russisk tænketank offentliggjorde en undersøgelse, der opfordrede til at kansler Merkel og hendes inderkreds skulle væltes med laserlignende præcision, for at hjælpe med til, at en fraktion i CDU, der ville være underordnet Moskvas interesser tager magten, mens chefen for de strategiske våben samtidig talte om, at en atomkrig er sandsynlig? Der ville være et hidtil uset oprør i hele Tyskland! Det bør ikke overraske nogen, at chefredaktøren for Kinas Global Times, Hu Xijin, reagerede på artiklen af admiral Richards med en opfordring til Kina om, at opbygge et atomarsenal på 1.000 atomvåben for at gøre Kinas anden-strejke-kapacitet troværdig.

Både i Atlantic Council-dokumentet og i det officielle papir fra USA's Udenrigsministeriums Kontor for politisk planlægning (Office of Policy Planning) med titlen "Elementerne i den kinesiske udfordring (The Elements of the Chinese Challenge)" er det klart, at det er succesen med den kinesiske økonomiske model og hastigheden af dens teknologiske innovation, der betragtes som truslen mod amerikansk dominans i verden. Det var en forkert beregning at antage, at Kinas integration på

verdensmarkedet, ved at tilslutte sig WTO, automatisk ville føre til, at nationen ville vedtage den vestlige neoliberale demokratimodel, siger Udenrigsministeriets papir. For Kina opbyggede også sin egen "marxist-leninistiske" model af en autoritær stat, domineret af "partiets ekstreme fortolkning af kinesisk nationalisme." Derudover fortsætter det, at Kina er fast besluttet på at skabe en "national foryngelse", der skal kulmineres i transformation af den internationale orden.

Vi kan selvfølgelig ikke kommentere på alle de ekstremt fjendtlige beskyldninger i de to papirer, da Udenrigsministeriets dokument er 72 sider langt. Sammenfattende kan det siges, at stort set alle anklager, der påstås mod Kinas politik, er en projicering af deres egne politikker og intentioner. Der gøres ikke noget forsøg på at forstå Kina ud fra dets 5.000-årige historie og kultur, og der erkendes heller ikke, hvor stor en civilisationspræstation det var for Kina at løfte 850 millioner mennesker ud af ekstrem fattigdom i løbet af de seneste årtier. Fra dette perspektiv betragtes naturligvis Silkevejsinitiativet ikke som en økonomisk politik, der tillader udviklingslande at overvinde deres underudvikling for første gang nogensinde, men som bevis på Kinas intentioner om at opnå overherredømme.

I betragtning af det Nationale Sikkerhedsagenturs samlede overvågning af ikke kun dens egen befolkning, men siden 11. september 2001 hele verden og censur af endog den daværende siddende præsident for USA (Donald Trump) fra TV-netværkerne og IT-giganterne i Silicon Valley, kræver det en meget speciel form for optik for at beskylde Kina for at have spioneret på og overvåget sine borgere. Virkeligheden er, at digitalisering i Kina har muliggjort meget effektiv kontaktsporing i coronaviruspandemien, og at det sociale kreditsystem har overvældende populær støtte, fordi belønningen med positiv adfærd for samfundet også gavner hver enkelt.

Fælles for begge dokumenter er, at deres forfattere genfortolker absolut alt om kinesisk kultur, som i tusinder af

år har sat interesse for det fælles gode over individets interesse, og som strømmer fra et dybtliggende behov for en harmonisk udvikling af alle, og de gør det til den vestlige ordens fjendebillede.

Det er ikke det kinesiske kommunistparti, der søger verdensherredømme, men snarere at den unipolære verdensordens nyliberale etablissement frygter, at det vil miste sit overherredømme og har bevæget sig kilometer væk fra de universelle principper, med hvilket Amerika blev grundlagt, og som det hævder at repræsentere. Og hvad Biden-administrationen synes om respekt for andre landes suverænitet er indlysende i dens modstand mod Nord Strøm 2-gasprojektet.

I øvrigt tjener hele hurlumhejet omkring Vladimir Putins påståede forgiftning af Alexey Navalny, som er støttet af vestlige efterretningsagenturer, det samme formål, om at sætte en farverevolution i gang og derved skabe en opposition inden for Putins inderkreds, der kunne bruges til at fjerne ham fra embedet.

Alle ansvarlige og tænkende mennesker opfordres til gennem deres mobilisering at bidrage til at forhindre, at Europas regeringer trækkes videre ind i den bebudede kampagne mod Kina og Rusland. Kansler Merkel understregede korrekt i sin tale til World Economic Forums online-begivenhed, at hun afviste enhver form for blokdannelse imellem USA og Kina, hvor Europa derefter skulle vælge side, og sagde, at den multilateralismes time var kommet.

I lyset af admiral Richards farlige udsagn må de europæiske lande ikke kun udtrykkeligt distancere sig fra en sådan politik, de skal også trække sig ud af NATO og søge en sikkerhedsarkitektur, der afspejler deres befolkningers interesser. Det, der står på spil, er Europas overlevelse.

zepp-larouche@eir.de

Billede: DOD/Lisa Ferdinando

USA's forsvarsminister 'Atom-Ash' Carter rasler med sablen mod Kina

2016, 1. okt. – Under anden halvdel af sin rundrejse i hele det vestlige USA sagde forsvarsminister Ash Carter i går til marinesoldater om bord på hangarskibet *USS Carl Vinson*, at genoprettelsen af balancen af amerikanske styrker (dvs. ekstra indsættelse af militær) i Stillehavsområdet ville sikre, at USA »fortsat udgør områdets foretrukne, stærkeste militære og sikkerhedsmæssige partner«. Carter sagde, at fokus på området, som vil blive ledsaget af en stor portion militærinvestering, vil se angrebskapacitet og angrebsstøtte forstærket, så vel som »nye store investeringer« i IT, elektronisk krigsførelse og kapaciteter i rummet, rapporterede CNN. Mht. selve Stillehavsområdet sagde Carter, at det oplevede en »historisk forandring« med et »Kina, der vokser frem, hvilket er fint, men hvor de opfører sig aggressivt, hvilket ikke er«.

»Beijing synes undertiden at ville vælge og vrage mellem de principper, det ønsker at få fordel af, og dem, det foretrækker at forsøge at underminere«, skældte Carter. »For eksempel er den universelle rettighed mht. sejladsfriheden, der gør det muligt for Kinas skibe og fly at gennemrejse sikkert og fredeligt, den samme rettighed, som Beijing kritiserer andre lande for at udøve i området«, – en åbenlys henvisning til USA's provokationer af sejladsfriheden. »Men sådan er principper ikke. De gælder for alle, og ligeligt for alle nationer.«

Dernæst rejste Carter til Hawaii, hvor han mødtes med forsvarsministre fra ASEAN til et uformelt møde. Under sin pressekonference bagefter henviste han ikke udtrykkeligt til Kina, men det figurerede sandsynligvis i mødet. Han rapporterede, at han havde briefet ministrene om USA's ekstra militære indsættelse i Asien ('rebalance') og om USA's kontraterror-indsats. Om det første sagde han, at »vi har alle igen deployeret vores militær for at holde området vande åbne og sikre og være med til, at alle vore nationer ser mere, er fælles om mere og gør mere i Sydøstasiens vitale vande.«

**Det frydefulde ved at skabe
overraskelser!**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast 18. marts
2016**

Engelsk udskrift: I denne uge får vi en opdatering fra Kesha Rogers i Texas, som anfører en politik for en genoplivelse af det amerikanske NASA-rumprogram; Jason Ross fortsætter sagaen om Gottfried Leibniz; og Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches analyse af betydningen for fredsprocessen i Syrien af de seneste udviklinger, med den russiske militære tilbagetrækning.

– DELIGHT IN CREATING SURPRISES! –

International Webcast March 18, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's March 18th, 2016. My name

is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to thank you for joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, on larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and Jason Ross,

from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined via video by

Kesha Rogers, multiple-time candidate for Federal office from the

state of Texas, and leading member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

All of us had a chance to meet with Mr. LaRouche, both in person and via telephone connection (in the case of Kesha), earlier this morning. Mr. LaRouche had some very definite and specific ideas which he wished for us to convey. Mr. LaRouche was

{emphatic} when we met with him earlier today, that the global agenda right now is being set by Russia and by China, and their

allies. He said that the initiative in creating the future and shaping present global policy, lies with those two countries, strategically – in the case of Russia, as is very clear with what is occurring in Syria right now; and economically and scientifically – in the case of China.

You can see very clearly that the outdated and archaic methods of the trans-Atlantic system are proving to be impotent,

both in the case of resolving the current grave crises which are

facing mankind as a planetary species right now, but also impotent in setting the agenda and fulfilling and laying out the

vision for the future of mankind. The mission which has been undertaken by China, in terms of their objective to explore the

far side of the Moon – something which is going to be unfolding

over the coming two years – exemplifies the necessary identity which mankind must have in order to affirm and to fulfill our true nature as a creative species.

Mr. LaRouche stated that something that we should develop, in dialogue with him and with each other, is to think about the

open questions, the unanswered questions about how is mankind, a

species, reflective of a much larger, and as yet not fully understood, creative characteristic of the galactic system as a

whole. This is a relationship which Johannes Kepler drew out in

very unique detail in terms of his discoveries about our {Solar}

System, but we have many, many large and unanswered questions of

what is the role of the human species in our relationship to the

galactic system as a whole, and then the complex of galactic systems as a much, much larger whole.

Mr. LaRouche said that this mission to explore the "dark side" of the Moon, so-called, is a pathway in order to begin to

understand even the opening of the questions along these lines.

The dark side of the Moon, his hypothesis was, is where you can

find some of the shadows of this much larger system, have insight

into it, and also to begin to understand mankind's role as reflective of these broader creative processes which are involved

in these great astronomical systems.

This is the spirit of the United States at our best. Our republic was founded on these kinds of unique ideas, as we've discussed here in previous weeks. The role of the great

philosopher and scientist Gottfried Leibniz is a major contributor, a "founding father", or "founding grand-father" of our republic. This is something which I know Jason Ross has presented multiple times and is in the process of having a series of developing classes on that subject; and I'm sure we'll be part of his discussion later today.

But also, this is what you can see in a great statesman, such as Abraham Lincoln – very, very much so. Franklin Roosevelt; and John F. Kennedy. Tragically, that spirit in the United States has deteriorated drastically. We see now that the leadership does indeed lie with China and with Russia; and this is something which Kesha Rogers, who is joining us here today, wrote about in an editorial which is appearing in this week's edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine. Kesha's editorial is titled, "To Save the United States Economy, Revive the Space Program."

Kesha and I had a brief conversation earlier this afternoon. I know she has some broader ideas to develop on this subject, so, without further ado, I would like to hand over the podium to Kesha Rogers.

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matt. I think I'd like to start, first of all, by continuing to develop what has and must be the focal point by which we come to understand the necessity for the revival and the defense of, not just the American and U.S. space program, which I have continued to be a leader in championing

the development and the necessity of our space program and what it truly represents for the progress of all mankind. But just on the editorial that I wrote, I think, to understand it, it's not just from the standpoint of looking at the economic conditions of the United States and some practical applications to economics that the space program will provide; but we also have to look at it from the standpoint of is, the space program as a true conception of real economic value. This is what's actually missing from our thinking and what has been attacked by the current Wall Street/British imperial system, is that economic value is based, from {that} standpoint, on monetary value and not on the creative powers and progress of the human mind. The real question at hand right now, is to bring about – as we're seeing and will be developed further in these discussions today – a new conception of what is the identity and what is the purpose of mankind. I have continued to use the example and the works of the great pioneer of space flight, space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke; and looking at his conception of mankind as a space-faring creature, as the understanding of mankind's "extra-terrestrial imperative," as that which must be identified and understood.

If you look at the conditions of the space program and why it's so important, you take the example, for instance, of what

China is doing now, as completely rejecting this monetarist policy; that the space program is not how much money you're going to put into pet projects and specific projects. It is creating something that's never been created before, to actually create a new conception and identity of mankind, from the standpoint of the idea of acting on the future. That's what this idea and what is being developed, for instance with China in their investigation of the far side of the Moon. People may look at this, "Well what is this going to benefit us? How is this going to improve the economic conditions, in terms of monetary value, or any of this?" But that is the wrong way to look at it; because the problem right now is that what you have seen is two different opposing conceptions of the view of mankind. One coming from the trans-Atlantic system, coming from a collapsing imperial system that has been based on money and monetary value that is dying; and the other is represented by what Russia and China are doing. And as Matt emphasized and what I developed in my recent writing, was that this was the mindset of the great leaders of our nation, represented by the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, of Franklin Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, [and] John F. Kennedy. It wasn't just on the creating of new projects per se, but on a whole new different conception of the identity of mankind. And so, you take for instance, the example of what we accomplished in the United States, of landing a man on the Moon – the idea that Kennedy put forward, that by the end of decade we would land a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth. What was the vision and intention behind that? Was it just the

idea that we would go and plant our flag on the Moon? This would be some short-term gratification and so forth? Or, was it a forward-thinking outlook, in terms of the direction of mankind in recognizing what Krafft Ericke, the great pioneer of space flight, recognized, that mankind was not just a creature of the planet Earth. We were not just a part of, as he called it, a "closed system," and so it was our responsibility to go out and to do what no other animal had the capability of doing; of actually conquering and developing, coming to understand what is the purpose of mankind and what is the development of mankind in the universe as a creature of our solar system and of the galaxy as a whole.

One thing that I thought was very insightful, is that Krafft Ericke wrote about the understanding of the Renaissance, the Classical Renaissance, as an achievement of human progress. And also the Classical Renaissance is something that contributed to the development of what became our space program and what was the intention that guided the direction of space travel and the space program.

I'll just read a quick quote from what he expressed on this idea. He says, "The development of the idea of space travel was always the most logical and most noble consequence of the Renaissance ideal, which again places man in an organic and active relationship with his surrounding universe and which, perceived in the synthesis of knowledge and capabilities, its

highest ideals."

So you look at this from the standpoint of Krafft Ericke understanding that the Renaissance that was guided by the scientific breakthroughs which I'm sure you'll hear a lot more from my colleague Jason there, of Brunelleschi, or the breakthroughs that came about from the works of Kepler. That the

idea of mankind, is to create something fundamentally new, something that had never been created before, and increasing the

relationship of mankind to the Universe.

Now that's economic value! That is not what is being discussed when you look at these debates going back and forth from the standpoint of these Congress Members to the space community, and what budgets are being cut and should not be cut.

But the reality is, as I stated before, we have to have, in the

defense of the space program, a new conception of the direction

of mankind. That means we're removing all limitations to progress, all limitations that are put on mankind's ability to continue to understand how to make new discoveries in the principles scientifically of what's out there. Why should we actually investigate the Solar System? What is our mission in doing so? And it's not about a money-making short-term gratification. And so, I think this emphasis that Krafft Ehricke

put on the renaissance as an ideal of looking at why we have, as

a human species, an extraterrestrial imperative, is really a continued expression of what you're seeing coming from China; not

just in their space program, but in the development of the win-win strategy of cooperation for all mankind, for every nation

to come to join together. And to further the progress of

addressing the necessary challenges to the economic condition of the planet by actually recognizing that the solutions do not lie right here on planet Earth. So, I think that's the conceptions I wanted to get across; and what I hope to have further discussion on as we continue this fight to identify what is the real mission of the space program, and how we come to rid the world immediately of this current dead system that's keeping us from advancing in the way that we should be.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Kesha; and I can recommend that people read what you've written in the current edition of {Executive Intelligence Review}. I also know that you're planning on making a video statement – which will be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and available for people – developing some of these ideas a little bit more in detail. So, if people have been watching this website, you know that Jason Ross has also been working very closely with Kesha to develop some of these ideas with their implications from the standpoint of a scientist, whom I hope you are becoming more familiar with by now – Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. As we discussed last week on this webcast, I think if you begin to consider this question which Kesha just laid on the table for us, about how do you create a future for mankind. How do you initiate the creation of something which is completely new, as we move into the future? Now, this can never be done through the replication of the past; there's no precedent for a discovery.

A discovery is something which is always new, and is created {de novo} and is introduced, which changes the course of human history. Obviously, there is a lineage that goes back to Gottfried Leibniz, and many Leibnizians who have lived since him:

Karl Gauss; Bernhard Riemann; Albert Einstein; and I would even

include Mr. Lyndon LaRouche in that lineage.

So, without further ado, I'm going to ask Jason to elaborate a little bit more; picking up on what Kesha just left off on.

JASON ROSS: Thanks, Matt. Well, I think if you consider how to conceptualize the value of the kinds of programs that Kesha was discussing that we're promoting today, you reach a contradiction if you try to approach them from a monetarist standpoint. That is, the kind of economics that's generally taught today, the kind of economics practiced as a religion – well, I was going to say as a religion on Wall Street; the primary religion on Wall Street is stealing – but, in general, the basis of thinking is that economy is about money; we can measure things in terms of money. How much is somebody willing to

pay for something? That's how valuable it is. That isn't. Money

doesn't measure different qualities; money doesn't measure the future potential that something is able to create. And if you base money on how much somebody's willing to pay for something,

you don't distinguish between things that are good and useful versus bad and vices. People are willing to pay for heroin; people are willing to pay for other opioids if they're addicted

to it. Does that mean that those drugs, as used by those people,

are valuable, or worth something because they're willing to pay

for them? Quite the contrary. So, we need a different way of thinking about how we can measure economic value if we're going

to be human economists, instead of Wall Street magicians or Satanists.

So, the reason we have economy is that we aren't animals; animals don't have economies. Animals don't change what they do

from generation to generation; they don't improve, they don't develop. We do. We create a new kind of time for ourselves. In a

very real way, humanity is a totally new and totally distinct force of nature from anything else. Over geological time, geologists describe to us how the Earth has changed, or how a planet has formed; this is over hundreds of millions of years. Over evolutionary time, perhaps tens of millions of years, we're

able to see transformations in the kinds of life that exists on

the planet. Over biological time, we have short-term periods of

the life of an organism, of its respiration, very much tied to the daily cycle of the Earth, for example. And with humans, we have a different kind of time. We create time. The flow of history isn't always the same speed.

During the Dark Ages, when not much happened, you might say that human time slowed down. And with the Renaissance, and with

the ability to discover more about nature by having a more powerful way of thinking about it, and a more powerful conception

of us as human beings interacting with it; you could say that time sped up. We create a certain time in that we create new eras

of humanity; not in the way that geology or evolution does, but

willfully by developing new principles that if we were

animals,
you would say this is a whole new type of life all together.
Life
moving from the oceans onto land; that's a totally different
quality of life. Life having developed photosynthesis and
using
the Sun as a power source; that's a totally different kind of
life. But we're still human beings after the discovery of the
combustion engine, for example; the use of heat-powered
machinery. We create in ourselves the change that's comparable
only to large-scale evolutionary changes when we look at life
in
general. So, we're distinct.
Now, how do we understand this? Both how do we understand
that world around us that we act on and interact with; and how
do
we understand our thoughts about it and our ability to
progress
and use the practice of science itself? What sort of terrain
is
it? What sort of world is it? The physical world and the
mental
world.
Well, here's where I'd like to take up some concepts that
Mr. LaRouche has been bringing up recently about Bernhard
Riemann
and about Gottfried Leibniz, and a bit about Einstein, too,
who
got the verification of his hypothesis of gravity waves
announced
very near his birthday this year – which was on Monday. So,
let's think about it. Is the terrain that we're operating on,
one
which is steady and indifferent to our actions? Or, is it one
where what we do and what we discover and how we interact with
it, changes that world around us in a way that the world is
not

fixed; either in ourselves or in our understanding of it? And, that is the case; we transform the world in changing our mental understanding of it. The math that we use in understanding how we conceptualize that world; that changes our interaction with it, and we're a force of nature. We change the operation of the forces of nature by improving our understanding of the world around us and of ourselves and our ability to discover such things. How can we possibly think about that quality of change?

As a couple of other examples, think about the difference between what you might say is a fixed object – let's say iron oxide. Iron oxide is basically rust; it's a mineral that's rust.

It's reddish brown, it's not terribly useful; but with the development of metallurgy, instead of being a deposit of some compound, it's now a resource. It's an ore from which we can create iron and steel. The substance itself, did it change chemically? It did in terms of the potential of what we could do with it. And remember, we're a force of nature; we changed what it was. It has to be thought of that way.

Or, what's the value of a technology? How does it change over time? In the 1400s, windmills were a great invention; they were somewhat new on the scene. They allowed pumping water, they allowed grinding grain. That's excellent; that's a breakthrough.

Are windmills valuable today for making electricity? I don't think so. Consider helium; helium is an interesting element. It was first discovered in the Sun, not on Earth. It was discovered

in the Sun by the kind of light that came from the Sun when that light was broken up into a rainbow with a prism, and certain bands of the absence or presence of color were the clue that there was a new element out there named helium, after Helios, the Sun. That element, what's it used for? You might think of it's being used to fill up balloons for children; you might think of it being used as a gas for cooling for physical purposes or for experiments. It's also, as Helium-3, an ideal fuel for fusion. So, this substance transforms its meaning based on our developing understanding. How can we think about this? Well, let's take the example of Bernhard Riemann. In 1854, Bernhard Riemann delivered a presentation and a paper on the subject of the hypotheses that underlie geometry. That might sound like a dry title; it might sound like it has nothing to do with physical economy or anything that we'd want to be doing right now. But this paper is very important in the view of Lyndon LaRouche for his own development and as a way of understanding economics. So, let's say why. Very briefly, Riemann points out that our conception of space itself and of the way things operate in space is taken for granted. The ideas that we use to understand it, they don't really come from experiments per se, or from physical theories; they come from our thoughts about space. For example, the idea that space has no particular characteristics of its own; that was the view of Isaac Newton. Newton said space is uniform, it's out there; things occur within space. Space is there first, it's just space; it has no

characteristics in particular. Newton said the same thing about

time; that time flows on uniformly. That's what time is; it's really not much of a definition, or an understanding.

Geometric ideas that people had, for example, are the idea that if you add up the angles in a triangle, you get 180 degrees.

Now, if you're drawing triangles on flat paper, yes that's true;

if you draw them on a curved surface like a sphere, it's not true. Triangles on a sphere have more than 180 degrees in them.

If you then ask, "What if I draw a triangle in space?"; that's a

tough question. When we connect points in space, is the space between them flat, is it curved? How could we discover that, and

what would be the basis of it having a curvature if it wasn't flat?

What Riemann does, is he discusses through all the possible ways that this could come about. He discusses in general, curvature – both of surfaces and of space; how a space could be

curved. He works out in general how you could do that; but he can't answer the question. He says, to answer the question, "What's the nature of the space, and which processes unfold?"; you have to leave the department of mathematics and you have to

go to the physics department. You can't answer questions like that just be pure reasoning; you got to have a hypothesis – "What physically makes space?" And in this way, he's coming back

to the view of Gottfried Leibniz, who, just to say very briefly,

Leibniz and Newton totally disagreed on a number of subjects. People may have heard of the dispute over their invention of the

calculus; did Leibniz steal it from Newton, or vice versa? But there's a lot more there.

One of the major disputes they had was about space. Newton's view was that space and time were absolute; and Leibniz's view that space was a way of understanding co-occurrences. The relationship of things that are here at the same time – that's space; and for Leibniz, time was the evolution of things, how things change. But time didn't have its own existence. Now, that's precisely what Einstein took up in his theories of relativity; he did what Riemann said had to be done. He didn't finish the job; but he did what Riemann said had to be done. Einstein overthrew, in a very specific way, the outlook of Newton; Einstein showed that space was not flat, that it was bent

in special relativity, that it was curved in general relativity.

And very importantly, the basis of its shape, the basis of how things interact over distances – that sense of space – was based not on what a mathematician might imagine, but on what a physicist hypothesizes. Einstein hypothesized an equivalence between different observers that the laws of nature shouldn't depend on whether you're moving; something that Leibniz also said

very explicitly. Einstein considered that light moved at the same

speed to any observer; something he had been pondering since he

was a pretty young man. And he hypothesized that gravitation would transform the shape of space; that straight lines wouldn't

be straight to the extent that gravity is affecting them. This is

what was seen with the experiments about the position of stars around the eclipse of the Sun, performed earlier during Einstein's life; and it's seen in the recent verification of gravity waves.

So, most people acknowledge that Einstein, OK, this is

physically important; this is a scientist, he discovered things.

What does it have to do with this other point, though, about understanding humanity, and our role in economy, and our creation

in economy? Well, what Riemann did was, he made it possible to say that human discovery is a force of nature; it reshapes nature, it transforms our understanding about the objects around

us. And the basis of that world outside of us, can't be considered independently of our increasing knowledge about it. What we know about the world around us changes it, in that it changes our ability to interact with it.

So, if we're looking for a real idea of what economics is, throw away any sense of monetarism that says money made in a warehouse is just as valuable as money made in a steel plant; and instead say, "How do we foster scientific discovery? How do

we foster its social implementation through technologies that physically improve our power over nature and our ability to provide improving standards of living and promote the general welfare of human beings?" If this is our basis of economics, fostering that kind of outlook, then I think we can say that Gottfried Leibniz was the first physical economist in that sense.

I'll just reference to the show on Leibniz from earlier this week, and one of the documents I cited there; Leibniz's paper on

the creation of a society for science and economy in Germany. And

I think if you read that paper, you'll be astonished at how Leibniz pulls together both promotion of discovery, how that works, what kind of thoughts are needed, how people should work

together, and how to implement those thoughts to improve people's

lives to the betterment of mankind. And that really has to be

the

basis of our economics.

One simple rough measure, proposed by LaRouche to measure this, is the potential population density. How many people can be

supported in a given area? That's a measure that is fixed for animals. For a certain kind of environment, the number of deer that can live there; deer don't change that. Human beings do. And

as a rough measure of economic progress, we could take that value. What's the potential population that we're able to support? The ability to use these thoughts is one that is not being expressed in the trans-Atlantic at present. In our discussion today, Mr. LaRouche talked about the positive impact

that Riemann had had on Italian science. Riemann had tuberculosis, and spent a good deal of time later in life – he didn't live that long – but later in his short life in Italy; where thoughts from Riemann influenced the development of hydrodynamics, stretching all the way into the time of airplanes

and the consideration of getting out into space.

Today, this overall outlook is best represented by Russia, and especially at present, by China. So, this doesn't have to be

a purely Chinese development; this is clearly something that we

can take up as a mission for ourselves to contribute to here in

the United States and in the nations around the globe. And we've

got very special and precious people in the past that we can look

to for insights in how to make the next breakthroughs in developing our understanding of what it is to be human, the basis

of human culture, and how best to advance human economy.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. Now, as Jason just mentioned, and as I said in the beginning, really right now you do see the initiative – the economic and the scientific initiative – being taken by China to lead mankind into the future; especially with the space program. You also see the initiative being taken by Russia; and this is very clearly illustrated this week with the actions that have been taken by Russia in Syria. The strategic initiative lies in Putin's actions there. As Mr. LaRouche emphasized, Putin is setting the agenda; he is constantly on the flank. You can see this going back to the chemical weapons, where Putin took the initiative to say fine, we will help Assad dismantle these chemical weapons. It can be seen with the decision to intervene, a few months back, by Putin into the situation in Syria; and then with the pull-out that happened earlier this week. What's clear is that every step along the way, Putin's actions have caught Washington and Obama by surprise; constantly breaking profile. And this is what's called "taking the flank" in a military sense. There's clear precedence, as Mr. LaRouche always uses the example, of Douglas MacArthur's actions in Inchon. You always, always act on the surprise. Now, this was illustrated I think just anecdotally very well in an article that was published March 15th – Tuesday of this week – in the {New York Times}, with a very apropos headline which read "Putin's Syria Tactics Keep Him at the Fore, and Leave Everyone Else Guessing". I just want to read the first

paragraph

of that article, actually, because I think it just describes very

vividly what we mean by this:

"President Vladimir Putin's order to withdraw the bulk of Russian forces from Syria seemingly caught Washington, Damascus,

and everyone in between off guard; just the way the Russian leader likes it. By all accounts, Mr. Putin delights in creating surprises."

So, this is the subject of our institutional question for this week; which Mr. LaRouche had some very specific words to say

in response to, which I'm going to let Jeff elaborate on for us.

But let me just read the text of this question to start off.

"Mr. LaRouche, as you know, earlier this week, at the start of the Geneva Peace Talks, Russian President Vladimir Putin announced that he ordered the withdrawal of some of the Russian

military forces in Syria. The withdrawal of Russian fighter planes began the next day and has continued. A residual force will remain at the naval base at Tartus and at the air base in Latakia. How do you view Putin's decision? How might it impact the Russian, American, and United Nations efforts to bring the Syrian war to an end, now underway in Geneva?"

STEINBERG: Of course, we've taking up the bulk of this week's report with a discussion about man's extraterrestrial imperative; the need for man to get off of the planet Earth, because man was never an Earthbound creature. So, we're at a point right now where Mr. LaRouche was delighted in our discussion earlier today at the prospect of over the next two years, China going through the preparations for the launching of

an orbiter that will be hopefully landing on the back side of

the
Moon. And will for the first time, give mankind a window into
the
Solar System and the Galaxy beyond. And this is something of
enormous importance and enormous excitement, because it puts
this
nature of man as an extraterrestrial creature capable through
creative discovery, of not remaining Earthbound, but of
exploring
the near Solar System and beyond. And it reminds me that
virtually every astronaut and cosmonaut who has travelled in
space, has remarked at one point or other, that having the
vantage point of looking down on Earth, you become at one
point
overwhelmed with the fact that so much of what goes on, on the
planet of Earth, is trivial relative to the challenges that
are
very obvious when you look at man from the standpoint of man's
ability to explore the Universe and make these kinds of
discoveries. And it was that approach that actually informed
our
discussion about the Syria situation per se. Because as Matt
said, Russian President Putin has demonstrated once again that
he
has a certain understanding that at the core of grand strategy
is
always the idea of continuously moving; continuously flanking;
continuously confusing your adversaries by constantly being on
this kind of offensive.

So, we do have the developments of the past days, where at
the very moment that the Geneva second round of peace talks
were
beginning, President Putin announced a draw-down of the
Russian
military forces inside Syria. And in fact, the very next
morning
– Tuesday morning of this week – the first Russian bombers and

other air force equipment and personnel began leaving. Now, the Russians are there still; make no mistake about it. Russia has established a fundamental change in the situation on the ground, which is both a military shift and a shift at the diplomatic table taking place right now in Geneva. Russia has a permanent naval base fully established and more secured than at any time previously at the port of Tartus; and it has now a major air force facility in the Latakia province. And more recently this week, yesterday President Putin issued a statement where he said, if the circumstances change, if the peace process does not go forward, then Russian forces can be reinforced in Syria, not in a matter of days, but in a matter of hours. And quite clearly, the infrastructure is in place for that to happen. But Mr. LaRouche wanted to make a larger and much more fundamental point about what is going on here. What he emphasized is that you can't lose sight of the fact that the war is still going on. We don't know how things are going to play out; what we do know, is that there has been a change of conditions. In fact, there was a major change of conditions beginning on September 30th of last year, when the major Russian military presence began. And when the situation systematically shifted from that point on, and yet at the same time, certain leading political figures around the world – the spokesman for the Jordanian government; Steffan de Mistura, the UN representative for Syria – they all said, "We're not surprised by President Putin's announcement this past Monday." In the case of the Jordanians, the chief of staff of the Jordanian military, the chief of staff

of the Syrian military, were both in Moscow last October; and they met with Russian Defense Minister Shoigu, they met with President Putin. And they were told quite clearly that the Russian mission was not a permanent mission; but was a limited mission in both size and in time duration. And that when the circumstances reached the point where it was feasible to reach a diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis, that the Russian forces would begin to be withdrawn.

As Matt pointed out with the {New York Times} coverage, people in the West were scratching their heads, because they refused to take note of the fact that Putin is a strategic thinker. And very often, what he says – in most cases, in fact – is exactly what he intends to do; but he's not going to do it in a predictable fashion. He's going to do it in a way that will

catch you by surprise. And the biggest surprise is that most political thinkers in the West, most officials in government in

the West, are ignorant and prejudiced. So, their own prejudices

prevent them from understanding how Putin thinks about these things. Their own prejudices prevent them from understanding because they're incapable of thinking in this kind of a strategic

fashion. Now the problem is, that we're still in a state of warfare; and that state of warfare will continue until certain things occur that go way beyond the borders of Syria.

Until the British Empire ceases to exist, there will be a condition of warfare on this planet. We see it, not necessarily

in the form of warfare that most people think about – soldiers shooting, artillery pieces firing, bombers dropping bombs. Look

what's happening right now in Brazil. The British Empire is

waging a war against the new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered global system. They're trying to destabilize Brazil, which is a founding member of the BRICS. There's a similar effort underway to destabilize the Zuma government in South Africa; because South Africa is the latest country to join in the BRICS initiative.

So, there are all kinds of problems going on; you can't look for a simply linear expectation or projection of what's going to happen by the situation now ongoing on the ground in Syria or in Geneva. Another example: President Obama is taking a series of measures that will lead unavoidably – unless they're reversed –

to a major confrontation between the United States and China. We

had a report earlier this week from David Ignatius in the {Washington Post}, who is very often a kind of reliable leak sheet for what's going on inside the administration. And the Obama administration is preparing for confrontation with China over the South China Sea; they're waiting for a ruling from the

World Court in the Hague on a complaint filed by the Philippines.

So the United States is preparing contingencies for poking China

in the eye, for carrying out new provocations against China. The

sanctions that President Obama announced this week, ostensibly against North Korea, are in fact sanctions against China; they go

way beyond what was agreed upon by China and the United States at the United Nations.

So, if you take all of these factors into account, and if

you think of them as a process, not simply as a series of discrete events, then you get a very clear idea of what Mr. LaRouche means when he says that the planet, in general terms, is in a state of war. Now, ultimately what this state of warfare comes down to, is the fact that you have a new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered future. It's defined by the economic initiatives of China, by the One Belt-One Road policy, and most emphatically by China's systematic plan for collaborating with other nations on the kind of space exploration that once was a hallmark of American policy; but has not been abandoned. President Obama has spent the last seven years systematically taking down and dismantling America's space capability; and Kesha is leading the fight to reverse that process. Over the last 15 years, if you look at the Bush/Cheney administration followed by the Obama administration, the United States has been under British occupation. Both Bush/Cheney and Obama were each, in their own way, governments that were at the beck and call of the British Empire, of the policies of the British financial oligarchy operating through Wall Street. And as the result, the United States, really the entire trans-Atlantic region, is dead. Germany was once a great prospering economy; the result of the "economic miracle" that Franklin Roosevelt envisioned for the post-World War II period; no replay of Versailles, but a completely different approach. Germany has now been destroyed by the policies largely coming from the British Empire. All of continental Europe is hopelessly and irreversibly bankrupt; and Mario Draghi's announcement of an expansion of

quantitative easing and a zero interest rate policy is a reflection that certain people are desperate over the fact that

Europe is doomed, that the United States under present circumstances. We've talked in recent months on this broadcast about the death rate increase in the United States; the true rate

of unemployment; the epidemic of heroin addiction and heroin overdose deaths; the declining life expectancy in the United States. These are all measures of the fact that the trans-Atlantic region is dead; and will only begin to reverse that death if there is a revolutionary, fundamental change in policy. That alternative policy is being carried out in the Eurasian and Asia-Pacific region; led by China, led by Russia, reflected in the way that Russian President Putin has navigated

the strategic situation.

So, the great threat is coming from the fact that a dying British Empire – which is irreversibly doomed – is lashing out and is trying to preserve something that can no longer be preserved. There was a time when the British Empire could impose

petty tyrannies on countries around the world and achieve a certain limited degree of stability. That's over with. All of the

efforts within the framework of the mindset of the British Empire, the mindset of the Obama administration, the mindset of

virtually all European leaders – the French probably the worst of the bunch on the continent – is doomed; it doesn't work. Yet,

there is an opportunity; and opportunity for all of mankind in what's going on in the Asia-Pacific region, led by China, by Russia. India is clearly stepping in to play a significant role

in this new emerging combination, cooperation among nations for

purposes that go beyond national interests, but address the interests of all of mankind. Egypt is fully established as orienting towards that new Asia-Pacific combination.

So, this is the larger picture; this is the framework for judging the initiative taken by President Putin this week. And it

must be judged from the standpoint of the global consequences; and not just simply the consequences for the immediate negotiations around Syria. Although his actions this week have certainly greatly improved the possibility of bringing that five-year tragedy to an end.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. I would just add, the initiative being taken by these countries also very much has to

do with the decades-long work Mr. Lyndon LaRouche and Mrs. Helga

LaRouche have undertaken. The One Belt-One Road policy that China

has adopted, is the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy which the LaRouche movement uniquely championed in the beginning of the 1990s. Now, you have an evolution of that to the World

Land-Bridge; and this is what is documented so thoroughly in the

350-page Special Report that was issued by {Executive Intelligence Review} called "The New Silk Road Becomes the World

Land-Bridge". One very exciting announcement, because you mentioned Egypt, just this week there was a very high-level event

which was sponsored by the Transportation Ministry in Cairo; featuring a LaRouche collaborator, Hussein Askary, to announce the formal publication of the Arabic language of this full, 350-page World Land-Bridge Special Report from {Executive Intelligence Review}.

So, you can see that at the very highest levels of government around the world, this is what is shaping the

discussion; the initiatives that the LaRouche movement have taken for decades. And one final note along those same lines, as we announced last Friday, Mrs. Helga LaRouche just got back from a very important trip to India; at which she was one of the featured speakers in a very prominent, very high-level dialogue – the Raisina Dialogue. And if people have not seen it yet, a wonderful half-hour interview that Jason Ross conducted with Mrs. LaRouche was posted on the LaRouche PAC website earlier this week. So, if you haven't watched that yet, I would really encourage you to watch it; and to just think about everything that has been said here today. Think about these initiatives that are being taken by some of the world's leading countries to create the future; and think about the role that the LaRouche movement has played over years and decades in shaping the possibility of these initiative being taken today. So, thank you all very much for joining us here today. I'd like to thank Kesha Rogers for joining us over video; and I would like to thank Jeff and Jason here in the studio. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

**Truende konfrontation med
Kina fremføres i Washington**

Post

16. marts 2016 – I dag udgav *Washington Post* en artikel af David Ignatius, der var bygget op omkring et interview med Kurt Campbell, og som advarede om muligheden for et »Augusts kanoner«-øjeblik i uoverensstemmelsen mellem USA og Kina over det Sydkinesiske Hav. Ignatius rapporterede, at »det Hvide Hus har en intens planlægningsproces i gang mellem diverse afdelinger, som forberedelse til den truende konfrontation«. Det, som Ignatius refererer til, er den sag, der verserer ved den Internationale Domstol i Haag om Kinas krav om suverænitet over øerne i det Sydkinesiske Hav, der refereres til som Kinas »ni streger linje« (demarkationslinje). Ifølge tidligere viceudenrigsminister for det asiatiske Stillehavsområde, Campbell, vil domstolen sandsynligvis afgøre til fordel for Filippinernes protest over Kinas krav på rækken af øer, og dette kunne udløse en kinesisk reaktion og muligvis en ADIZ-erklæring (luftforsvars-identifikationszone) over det Sydkinesiske Hav. Ignatius bemærkede, at USA kunne respondere ved at foretage overflyvninger med B-52-fly ind over ADIZ, eller ved at arbejde sammen med Filippinerne, Vietnam og andre nationer omkring det Sydkinesiske Hav om at opbygge deres egne ø-forstærkninger eller indgå i fælles overflyvninger. »Det her er ikke Pearl Harbor, men hvis ikke folk på alle sider er forsigtige, så kunne det blive til 'Augusts kanoner'«. Regeringen, advarede Campbell, er ved at nærme sig »endnu et rød-streg-øjeblik, hvor den skal finde ud af, hvordan den vil forholde sig til tidligere advarsler«. Med andre ord, så sidder Obama med skægget i den postkasse, han selv har skabt, og er vadet direkte ind i midten af noget, som kineserne vedholdende har hævdet er en uoverensstemmelse mellem suveræne stater, der bør forhandles på bilateralt grundlag uden indblanding udefra, fra hverken USA eller den Internationale Domstol.

Amerikansk hangar-krigsskib ankommer til Sydkorea

13. marts 2016 – Det atomkraftdrevne hangarskib USS John C. Stennis ankom til Busan i dag, som en del af Obamas massive magtopvisning over for Nordkorea og Kina. Stennis har kapacitet til 90 kampfly, med et mandskab på 6.500. Angrebsgruppen J.C. Stennis omfatter fire ledsagekrigsskibe – tre destroyere med guidede missiler og en krydser med guidede missiler.

Korea Times bemærker, at JCS-angrebsgruppen er hovedomdrejningspunktet i den »Store Grønne Flåde«, et initiativ, der har stået på i et års tid, og som har sat fokus på den amerikanske flådes indsats for at transformere sit energiforbrug til at forøge sine operationelle evner. Man ville kunne spare en hel masse energi ved at afslutte Obamas krigsprovokationer.

RT's dækning af Obamas interview i *Atlantic* i denne måned fokuserede på Obamas krigsplaner mod Kina. Under en titel, der siger, at Obama »siger, at en konflikt med Kina er en mulighed«, citerer de chef-dræberen: »Hvis det [Kina] kun anskuer verden som regionale indflydelsessfærer, så ikke alene ser vi potentialet for en konflikt med Kina, men vi finder også, at vi har flere vanskeligheder med at håndtere disse andre udfordringer, der vil komme.«

Foto: USS John C. Stennis

Den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi fremlægger en udvej i stedet for krig for USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry

24. februar, 2016 – Den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi, der talte ved en timelang pressekonference med den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry i forlængelse af deres møde i Washington tirsdag, fremsatte flere afgørende forslag, der, såfremt de accepteres, kunne få USA væk fra den selvmorderiske kurs, som præsident Obama har sat, for krig med Kina.

Med hensyn til Koreakrisen sagde Wang Yi, at han og Kerry var enedes om en formulering af en FN-resolution, der fordømmer den nordkoreanske prøvesprængning af atomvåben og test af missilaffyring. Resolutionen skal frigives efter begge regerings godkendelse. Men, tilføjede Yi, en sådan resolution "kan ikke tilvejebringe en grundlæggende løsning på spørgsmålet om koreanske atomvåben. For virkeligt at gøre dette, er vi nødt til at vende tilbage til sporet med dialog og forhandling."

Han sagde, at Kerry var enig i dette, men tilføjede, at den kinesiske side havde "fremsat et primært forslag: dvs., at vi ønsker at forfølge atomafrustningen af den koreanske halvø sideløbende med udskiftningen af den koreanske våbenhvile med en fredsaftale. Vi ved, at visse parter har et andet syn på dette forslag."

Dette markerer en betydningsfuld intervention. Nordkorea vil kun diskutere fredsaftalen, og Obama vil kun diskutere

atomprogrammet. Pyongyang hverken kan eller vil opgive sit atomvåbenprogram under trussel om krig fra Obamas side, vel vidende, hvad USA gjorde imod Irak og Libyen, da disse stoppede deres atomprogrammer. Hvis der kunne findes en fredsaftale, der garanterede deres sikkerhed, så kunne de overveje alternativer til atomprogrammet.

Kerry holdt sig til Obamas linje – opgiv atomprogrammet, og vi vil overveje en fredsplan – men Kina har derimod lagt en gennemførlig plan på bordet.

Wang Yi berørte også krisens aktualitet og sagde, at han og Kerry var enedes om, at “vi er nødt til at overvåge situationen på halvøen tæt i de kommende to måneder. Forskellige ustabile faktorer kunne overlappende hinanden og have en virkning, så under de omstændigheder er det meget vigtigt, at de forskellige parter fører mere dialog for at forhindre, at spændingen øges eller situationen optrappes. Vi må især forhindre situationen på halvøen i at spinde ud af kontrol.”

Om det Sydkinesiske Hav sagde Wang Yi, at regionen, til trods for Vestens hylene op, er fredeligere end andre dele af verden, og at intet handelsfartøj er stødt på nogen trussel mod den fri sejlads. Forsikringspræmier er ikke steget en øre, sagde han (det frie marked siger, at der ikke er noget problem!).

På den anden side, sagde han, “håber jeg, at venner inden for medierne ikke kun vil se radaren (Kinas radaranlæg på en af øerne), men måske snarere, og nok så vigtigt, at der for hver dag dukker avancerede våbensystemer og udstyr op i det Sydkinesiske Hav, inklusive de strategiske bombefly, krigsskibe med missilforsvarssystemer – hvorfor har folk har valgt at se bort fra dem eller ignorere dem?”

Briterne genkoloniserer Filippinerne gennem deres håndlanger Obama, som forberedelse til krig mod Kina

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 13. januar 2016 – Formanden for LaRouche-bevægelsen i Filippinerne, Butch Valdes, fordømte tirsdag den filippinske Højesterets beslutning, som erklærede præsident Aquinos forræderiske aftale med præsident Obama, der overdrager de filippinske militærbaser til amerikansk militærbesættelse, for at være en »aftale på den udøvende (eksekutive) magts niveau« snarere, end den er en traktat, og at den derfor er juridisk lovlige og forfatningsmæssig, og ikke skal underkastes en afstemning i Senatet.

Denne afgørelse skaber en forfatningsmæssig krise, eftersom det filippinske Senat i december vedtog, at aftalen helt klart var en traktat, som det defineres af Forfatningen, og således skal godkendes af Senatet – hvilket næsten med sikkerhed ikke ville ske.

Lyndon LaRouche udtalte i dag, at denne aftale, hvis den ikke bliver stoppet, udgør en britisk genkolonisering af Filippinerne gennem deres agent Barack Obama. Hele processen blev kørt af Obama – aftalen blev underskrevet under hans besøg i Manila i april 2014 og skulle efter planen godkendes af Retten under hans besøg i november 2015, men den enorme opposition fra befolkningen og Senatet forhindrede afgørelsen. Aftalen, med navnet Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement,

(EDCA) (Aftale om Forstærket Forsvarssamarbejde), vil give USA mulighed for at deployere sine mest avancerede styrker til vands, til lands og i luften, samt sine mest avancerede våben, ind i filippinske militærbaser, på trods af en klar, forfatningsmæssig begrænsning for alle udenlandske baser på filippinsk jord.

LaRouche tilføjede, at dette er en klar indikation på, at Obama agter at indlede Tredje Verdenskrig.

Erklæringen fra Butch Valdes lyder:

DET ENDELIGE FORRÆDERI

Af Butch Valdes

Det filippinske folk er endnu engang blevet forrådt ... ikke alene af en afsindig præsident, og heller ikke af købte parlamentsmedlemmer, men af selve den institution, hvem det først og fremmest er pålagt at opretholde Den suveræne republik Filippinernes Forfatning.

Lig tåber og Judas'er skjuler de sig bag fejlagtige, tekniske spørgsmål i aftalen EDCA, og forvrænger definitioner og støtter sig til overfladiske fortolkninger for at frembringe deres åbenlyst forræderiske afgørelse. Idet de med overlæg gør sig blinde for den sande natur af USA's militære installationer på filippinske militærbaser – som meget vel kan være siloer med atombevæbnede mellem- og langdistanceraketter, rettet mod Kina – begår disse højesteretsdommere højforræderi imod det filippinske folk. Efter min mening har de aflagt troskabsed over for en fremmed besættelsesmagt, hvilket gør dem til moralske kujoner, der ikke har fortjent en tøddel respekt fra borgerne. Nu afdøde højesteretsdommer, Jose Abad Santos, en sand helt og patriot, vender sig i sin grav over, at disse foragtelige personer betræder de samme, respektindgydende Retfærdighedens Sale.

At sætte 100 millioner filippinske liv på spil med fuldt overlæg, i en atomkonflikt mellem to stormagter, gør dem fortjent til de værste steder i Helvede ... og måtte de leve længe nok til at opleve resultatet i form af smerte og ødelæggelse, som de har forårsaget.

Den nævnte tidligere højesteretsdommer Jose Abad Santos var højesteretsdommer i Filippinerne i 1941-42, og også stedfortrædende præsident på vegne af præsident Quezon, da denne gik i eksil i USA efter den japanske invasion efter råd fra general Douglas MacArthur. Højesteretsdommer Santos blev i landet, men nægtede at kapitulere til de japanske besættelsesstyrkers kommando. Japanerne myrdede ham i 1942.

Sammenligningen mellem den amerikanske militære besættelse af Filippinerne med den japanske besættelse er absolut korrekt, idet japanernes mål ikke var selve Filippinerne, men Kina og Asien generelt – som det også er tilfældet med Obama.

Det filippinske folk vil respondere dybt til denne nøjagtige sammenligning. Vil den amerikanske befolkning gennembyrde sin degenererede tilstand og se, hvad det er, Obama foretager sig i deres navn, og fjerne ham nu, før det er for sent?

**Opdatering over situationen i
Asien:
USA rasler med atomsablen
over for Nordkorea, o.a.**

USA rasler med atomsablen over for Nordkorea

10. januar 2016 – Et amerikansk B-52 bombefly fløj i søndags ved middagstid over Sydkorea, eskorteret af to sydkoreanske F-15 og et par amerikanske F-16. Skønt den vestlige presse rapporterer, at flyene "kan medbringe" atomvåben, siges det i dækningen fra *Korea Herald*, at flyet rent faktisk var armeret med atommissiler og "bunker buster" bomber, der er i stand til at bombe Nordkoreas undergrundsfaciliteter.

Under alle omstændigheder erklærede USA, at togtet var en "demonstration af beslutsomhed." Mens der ikke er rapporteret om respons fra Pyongyangs side, vil de alligevel med sikkerhed tage til efterretning, at B-52 er i stand til at medbringe atomvåben og læse det som en trussel. Enhver antydning af amerikansk atommagt vækker raseri i Pyongyang, der forbinder sin egen stræben efter atomvåben med det, som det opfatter som tidligere amerikanske manøvrer, støttet af atomvåben, for at vælte landets regering, med jævnlige henvisninger til amerikanske bombeflys masseødelæggelse af landet under Koreakrigen.

Den sydkoreanske forsvarsminister Han Min-koo har i mellemtiden instrueret militærets missilkommando om "hurtigt og præcist" at gøre gengæld, hvis Nordkorea foretager nogen som helst provokationer i kølvandet på den seneste atombombeprøvesprængning, sagde Ministeriet for Nationalt Forsvar søndag.

Selv betegnede Kim Jong-un atombombeprøvesprængningen som en "defensiv" foranstaltning. "Det er en suveræn stats legitime ret, som ingen kan gendrive", sagde han. "Vores brintbombeprøvesprængning, som vi foretog ved årets begyndelse, hvor Koreas Arbejderpartis 7. kongres afholdes, er en forholdsregel til selvforsvar, der udelukkende skal forsvare landets uafhængighed og folkets ret til at overleve truslen om en

atomkrig med USA og imperialister, og sikre fred på den Koreanske Halvø, samt sikre regional sikkerhed.”

En unavngiven topembedsmand i det nordkoreanske kommunistparti advarede om, at Sydkoreas genoptagelse af propaganda-udsendelser (der, ud over propaganda mod Nordkorea, også inkluderer en dosis af såkaldt K-popmusik), tillige med forhandlinger mellem Washington og Seoul om muligheden for at udstationere atombevæbnede bombefly i Sydkorea, har drevet den Koreanske Halvø til randen af krig. Skønt den slags udtalelser fra Nordkorea tilsyneladende ikke er usædvanlige, gør den øjeblikkelige globale situation dem mere realistiske end normalt.

Korea Times afspejler Obamas forsøg på at starte en fuldt optrappet krig over Nordkorea

10. januar 2016 – Den engelsksprogede avis *Korea Times* rapporterer i dag, idet den hævder at citere kilder i regeringen i Seoul, at ”Sydkorea og USA søger at afskære pengestrømmen til den nordkoreanske leder Kim Jong-un, og som bruges til at afstive hans regime”. Avisen rapporterer, at ”Seoul overvejer at tilslutte sig Washingtons indsats for at indefryse Kims udenlandske finansielle aktiver og opgradere de økonomiske sanktioner imod Pyongyang ... De allierede lægger også pres på Kina for at forbyde landets olieeksport til Nordkorea, der er stærkt afhængig af brændstof fra Kina ..., for derved effektivt at forvolde Nordkorea smerte.

Avisen bemærker, at Obama også overvejer at pålægge en sekundær boykot, som USA en gang før har gjort, ved at sanktionere enhver bank, der gør forretninger med Pyongyang.

En velinformeret kilde i Sydkorea sagde til *EIR*, at mange i Sydkorea bemærker, at Nordkorea ikke lytter til Rusland eller

Kina, men, at dømme efter Washingtons respons, er det sandsynligt, at anglo-amerikanerne i hemmelighed opmuntrer Nordkorea til at fortsætte med atom- og missilprøvesprængningerne, således, at Sydkorea vil blive tvunget til at droppe sin modstand mod, at der deployeres THAAD-missiler og andre amerikanske strategiske styrker i Sydkorea. Den sydkoreanske regering har kraftigt modsat sig disse deployeringer som værende rettet mod Kina, og ikke mod Nordkorea, og det ønsker ikke at have noget med Obamas krigsplaner mod Kina at gøre.

Den japanske højrefløj er ligeså forrykt som de amerikanske neokonservative

10. januar 2016 – Kinas politik for 'Ét bælte, én vej' kan synes at være rettet mod menneskehedens fælles interesser, men, rapporterer den ekstremt konservative *Yomiuri Shimbun* i en lederartikel i lørdags, i realiteten tilsigter den økonomisk og militær dominans over Eurasien, og må stoppes. Initiativet med 'Bæltet og vejen', skriver avisen, "tilsigter at udvide Beijings økonomiske indflydelse i forbindelse med den kinesisk ledede Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank" (AIIB), med planer om at opbygge en "enorm økonomisk blok". Hvad der er mere ildevarslende, så er det "et andet aspekt af en militærstrategi, der tilsigter at bygge et netværk, som perler på snor, af forsvarsværker for den kinesiske flåde, når denne opererer på de åbne have".

Lederartiklens overskrift er "Kinas iøjnefaldende opbygning af atomvåbenenheder udgør en udfordring for USA", selv om der ikke står noget i artiklen om Kinas atomvåbenkapacitet. Dundertalen blev genoptrykt i *New Haven Register* (Connecticut).

I øvrigt gentager artiklen det vestlige hysteri om Kinas konstruktion af kunstige øer i det Sydkinesiske Hav og

beskylder Kina for "at forsøge at gøre sin kontrol over det Sydkinesiske Hav til et *fait accompli*, alt imens det dækker over sin sande plan for at gøre de kunstige øer til militære forsvarsværker", en "trodsig holdning, der ikke kan tolereres". Artiklen opfordrer USA til at indgå i et partnerskab med Japan, Indien, Australien og sydøstasiatiske nationer, for at "håndtere situationen" med "regeringen Xis forsøg på at gøre Kina til en sømagt".

Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede, at det moderne Japan altid har haft en gruppering, som briterne bejlede til, og som ønsker at holde alle ude af "deres territorium", inklusive især kineserne, i modsætning til den gruppering, der skriver sig tilbage til Meiji-restaurationen og det Amerikanske Systems daværende indflydelse, der er fortalere for opbygning af nationer, hjemme og i udlandet.

USA's styrker i Sydkorea i alarmeredskab; Kongressen angriber Kina

11. januar 2016 – Curtis Scaparrotti, kommandør for de kombinerede sydkoreanske/amerikanske styrker i Sydkorea, beordrede USA's styrker i »højeste alarmeredskab« under det fælles inspektionsbesøg på Osan Flyvebasen nær Seoul, der opereres i fællesskab af USA og Sydkorea, sammen med general Lee Sun-Jun, formand for Sydkoreas generalstabschefer.

Ifølge det Koreanske Forsvarsministerium diskuterer man at sende flere amerikanske, strategiske styrker ind i Sydkorea, inklusive B-2 bombefly, atombevæbnede ubåde og F-22 stealth kampfly. I går fløj USA et B-52 bombefly over Sydkorea, eskorteret af amerikanske og sydkoreanske kampfly.

Sydkorea taler også gennem højtalere ind i Nordkorea og begrænser adgangen til Kaesong-industrikomplekset i landets nordlige del, hvor sydkoreanske selskaber producerer med billig, nordkoreansk arbejdskraft.

I Washington har Repræsentanternes Hus trukket et lovforslag om flere sanktioner frem, der blev vedtaget i Komite for et år siden, men aldrig bragt til afstemning i salen, og Huset forventes at vedtage forslaget i aften, den 11. jan. Loven til Gennemførelse af Sanktioner mod Nordkorea er i realiteten rettet imod Kina og foreslår at nægte Nordkorea adgang til hård valuta ved at indføre tvungen »blokerende sanktioner« imod ethvert land, forretningsforetagende eller enhver person, der gør forretninger med Nordkorea, »bidrager materielt til Nordkoreas udvikling af atommissiler og ballistiske missiler, eksporterer luksusvarer ind i Nordkorea eller er involveret med Pyongyang i pengehvidvaskning, fremstilling af smuglervarer eller narkotikahandel«, ifølge lovforslaget. Kina er selvfølgelig den primære eksportør til Nordkorea, og Obama og ligesindede kongresmedlemmer kan identificere næsten enhver eksport som hørende ind under denne kategori.

Kina er meget stærkt imod Nordkoreas atomvåbenprogram, men afviser også kraftigt ideen om, at sanktioner skulle hjælpe, og kræver, at USA ophører med sine trusler mod og sin dæmonisering af Nordkorea. Kina anbefaler USA at acceptere Pyongyangs tilbud om forhandlinger uden forhåndsbetingelser, og som tilsigter en fredsaftale sammen med en afslutning af atomvåbenprogrammet.

Foto: Der er i øjeblikket henved 28.500 amerikanske tropper i den sydlige halvdel af den Koreanske Halvø. I mandags blev hele styrken sat i absolut højeste alarmberedskab.

Sydøstasien: Kinesisk ekspert advarer om amerikansk fremstød for krig mod Kina

29. december, 2015 – "Det centrale formål med den amerikanske strategi er, med præsident Obamas egne ord, 'at undlade at gøre dumme ting.' Men de forløbne 10 år har været fyldt med dumme beslutninger, foretaget af USA."

Sådan siger Zhao Minghao, stipendiat ved Chongyang Instituttet for Finansielle Studier ved Kinas Renmin Universitet i en artikel i *Global Times* i dag. (Chongyang Instituttet var sammen med *EIR* medsponsor af den kinesiske version af *EIR's* rapport, Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen.)

Zhao ser tilbage på den ødelæggelse, der blev fremkaldt af Bush' og Obamas politik i Irak, Libyen og Syrien, og som igen har skabt ISIS-svøben. Dernæst skriver han: "Men hvad der er mere bekymrende, er, at Washington, på katastrofal vis, sandsynligvis agter at gøre det Sydkinesiske Hav til orkanens øje i det asiatiske Stillehavsområde. USA's hyppige såkaldte 'fri sejlads'-operationer nær kinesiske øer og rev, såvel som den nylige 'utilsigtede' overflyvning af to B-52 bombefly, betragtes af Beijing som alvorlige militære provokationer. Til trods for, at de ikke er parthavere i tvisten om det Sydkinesiske Hav, prøver USA's allierede, som f.eks. Australien og Japan, også at deltage i det farlige magtspil.

"Mange mennesker er bekymrede for, at det sandsynligvis vil komme til en militær konflikt mellem Kina og USA, idet USA intensiverer sine militære aktioner mod Kina i det Sydkinesiske Hav...Pentagon synes for indeværende at mene, at

Beijing fortsat vil beherske sig, uanset, hvor provokerende USA optræder”.

“USA overvurderer sin chance for at vinde en mulig væbnet konflikt med Kina. Kina har meget præcise, langtrækkende anti-skibs missiler. Desuden har Kina fordelene af at kæmpe ud for sin egen dør, mens USA’s flåde skal sejle over lang afstand.”