

Det iboende strategiske skifte i Putins »Sputnik-chok«. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 9. marts, 2018

Jeg vil gerne opfordre vore læsere til ... at læse følgende artikel af min mand, som blev udgivet 30. marts, 1984 ... : »Draft Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R.« Jeg har altid ment, at dette særlige dokument var et af de mest fremsynede og visionære artikler af de mange, mange skønne artikler, min mand har skrevet i årtiernes løb, for dette var et år efter, at SDI blev foreslået af præsident Reagan. Som vi ved, så var modreaktionen mod dette forslag utroligt. Det kom fra kredsene omkring Bush i Reagan-administrationen, men det kom også fra Ogarkov-lejren i det sovjetiske militær. Så efter et år fremsatte min mand et meget fremsynet forslag, som var ideen om at grundlæggende set at opløse NATO- og Warszawapagt-blokkene; og bruge samarbejdet mellem NATO og Warszawapagten – men i særdeleshed USA og Sovjetunionen – til at udvikle våben baseret på nye, fysiske principper; anvende dem i civilsektoren til at forårsage en videnskabsdrevet virkning; og dernæst bruge den øgede produktivitet i begge økonomier – men især også i den sovjetiske økonomi – til at gennemføre en betydningsfuld overførsel af teknologi til udviklingslandene og overvinde disses underudvikling og ophøre med at bruge udviklingslande til stedfortræderkrige mellem supermagterne. Principperne, der blev fremlagt i denne artikel, for det politiske grundlag for en varig fred, må være alle nationers absolutte, betingelsesløse suverænitet; samarbejde mellem suveræne

nationalstater; ubegrænsede muligheder for at deltage i fordelene ved teknologisk fremskridt, til alle og enhvers gensidige fordel; og så fremdeles.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Afslutningen på geopolitik kræver et nyt menneskebegreb

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 6. marts, 2018 – Den hastige udvikling omkring den koreanske halvø er en indikation af, hvor hurtigt, den globale, strategiske situation ændrer sig i kølvandet på den russiske præsident Vladimir Putins forbløffende tale til nationen den 1. marts.

Efter at have modtaget en delegation på højt niveau fra Sydkorea, har Kim Jong-uns nordkoreanske regering indvilget i at forhandle direkte med USA; diskutere atomvåbenfrihed, så længe dens sikkerhed er garanteret; og afstå fra alle prøveaffyringer af atommissiler eller ballistiske missiler, så længe dialogen står på. I denne uge vil sydkoreanske topudsendinge rejse til Washington, D.C., for at briefe præsident Trump, og vil dernæst besøge Kina, Rusland og Japan for lignende formål.

Da nyhederne om det koreanske gennembrud først blev

offentliggjort den 6. marts, tweetede præsident Trump prompte, at der »blev gjort mulige fremskridt i forhandlinger med Nordkorea«, at »der gøres seriøse forsøg fra alle de berørte parter side«, og at USA er »parat til at satse hårdt i begge retninger«.

Hvad er den dynamik, der ligger bag disse udviklinger?

På en måde kan man sige, at både Rusland og Kina har introduceret »nye politiske principper« – dvs., overraskelsesflanker – i den globale, strategiske situation, som ikke alene har taget Det britiske Imperium og dets allierede på Wall Street og i Washington på sengen, men også har efterladt dem fortlumlede, hvor de forsøger blot at finde ud af, hvad det var, der ramte dem. De lider af en nagende frygt for, at fundamentet af deres opbyggede, geopolitiske struktur er ved at smuldre.

Deres frygt er velbegrundet.

Schiller Instituttets præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouches ugentlige webcast, der sendes 8. marts, vil diskutere spørgsmålet om »Det iboende strategiske skifte i Putins 'Sputnik-chok'«. I går understregede fr. Zepp-LaRouche i diskussioner, at, i denne ekstremt hastigt skiftende verden, er vore modstandere ved at blive desperate over det faktum, at de tydeligvis kom for sent til båden. Dette er sket pga. deres arrogance – en arrogance, der er affødt af deres dybe helligelse til radikal empirisme. De benægter selve den menneskelige eksistens' kreativitet, og således også, at noget som Putins militære annoncering, eller Kinas succesrige Bælte & Vej, overhovedet kan eksistere.

Og man kan være fuldstændig sikker på, fremhævede Zepp-LaRouche, at Ruslands videnskabelige præstationer inden for militæret, samt Putins hermed relaterede understregning af kreativitet og teknologisk fremskridt som drivkraft for den fysiske økonomi, er koordineret med Kina. Husk Kinas

Sejrsdagsparade i september 2015, med Putin og den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping, der stod sammen og betragtede det, mindede hun om. Husk, at Rusland og Kina har en omfattende strategisk alliance.

Dette er de skiftende, strategiske realiteter, udtalte Zepp-LaRouche. Vesten er langt bagud mht. den nye, militære realitet, den Nye Silkevej og ligeledes det faktum, at kolonialisme *de facto* er afsluttet med forpligtelserne omkring Afrikas storprojekt Transaqua.

Briterne er især gået i panik over udviklinger i USA, der viser, at præsident Trump viser sit potentiale til at bryde ud af den geopolitiske kasse i det hele taget – sådan, som det antydes gennem udviklingerne omkring Korea – en kasse, som briterne har lukket de fleste amerikanske præsidenter inde i gennem de seneste 50, endda 100, år.

Men hver eneste af disse situationer – fra Afrika til Rusland, til USA og endda til Kina – kræver det enestående input fra Lyndon LaRouches videnskabelige metode, for at opnå deres erklærede hensigter. Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede, at vi udgør den eneste kraft, der kan bringe folk fra totalt forskellige ender af spektret – både internt i landene og internationalt – til ét bord, baseret på højere principper.

Med dette formål for øje citerer vi endnu engang i dette forum indledningen af Lyndon LaRouches dokument fra 30. marts, 1984, »LaRouche-doktrinen: Udkast til Memorandum om Aftale mellem Amerikas Forenede Stater og USSR« (**The LaRouche Doctrine: Draft Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.**), hvis principper fortsat er lige så skarpe og uundværlige i dag, efter Putins »Sputnik-chok«, som de var for 34 år siden, da de blev skrevet. (Hele dokumentet kan, og bør, læses og er genoptrykt i *EIR*, 9. feb., 2018):

»Det politiske fundament for en varig fred må være:

a) Hver eneste nationalstats ubetingede suverænitet, og

b) Samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater med det formål at fremme ubegrænsede muligheder for at nyde godt af de teknologiske fremskridts fordele, til gensidig fordel for alle og enhver.

Det mest afgørende træk for en aktuel gennemførelse af en sådan politik for varig fred er en dybtgående ændring af de monetære, økonomiske og politiske relationer mellem de dominerende magter og så de relativt underordnede nationer, der ofte klassificeres som 'udviklingslande'. Med mindre de uligheder, der stadig eksisterer i kølvandet på moderne kolonialisme, progressivt afhjælpes, kan der ikke være nogen varig fred på denne planet. For så vidt, som USA og Sovjetunionen anerkender, at fremskridt inden for arbejdskraftens produktive evne på hele planeten er i begges vitale, strategiske interesse, er de to magter forbundet, i denne grad og på denne måde, af en fælles interesse. Dette er kernen i de praktiske, politiske og politisk-økonomiske politikker, som er afgørende for skabelsen af en varig fred mellem disse to magter.«

Foto: Både Nord- og Sydkorea har aftalt et tredje topmøde i april. Her, Sydkorea sendte en delegation til Nordkorea i to dage for at sikre et møde med den nordkoreanske leder Kim Jong-un. KOCIS (korea.net)

Det Gamle Paradigme i det transatlantiske område er døende – briterne i

panik

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 5. marts, 2018 – I løbet af den forgangne uge har præsident Trump smadret briternes og deres agenter i det miskrediterede efterretningsapparat fra Obama-tidens bestræbelser på at opfinde en retfærdiggørelse for krig med Rusland og Kina. De vestlige medier udløste en strøm af fordømmelser af Kina og præsident Xi Jinping i særdeleshed efter meddelelsen om, at begrænsninger af embedsperioder ville blive fjernet fra Kinas forfatning, og kaldte Xi en hensynsløs diktator, en ny livstidskejser og en fare for verden. Trump responderede under en privat middag med Republikanere: »Han er nu præsident for livstid. Præsident for livstid. Nej, han er storslået. Og hør engang, dette kunne han gøre. Det skulle vi måske prøve en eller anden dag?« De ynkelige mediehorer gik bersærk.

Den juridiske lejemorder Robert Muellers kupforsøg imod Trump på vegne af britisk efterretning, og som har til hensigt at standse Trumps samarbejde med præsident Putin, er ved at sygne hen. Et af Muellers mål sagde i dag, at han ville ignorere Muellers stævning, kaldte det en »heksejagt« og tilføjede: »Lad ham arrestere mig.« To Republikanske kongresmedlemmer har krævet en særlig anklager til at efterforske FBI's forbrydelser med at bruge den skandaløse rapport fra den britiske efterretningsagent Christopher Steele til at retfærdiggøre udspionering af Trumps valgkampagne. I dag tweetede Trump selv, at Obama bar skylden for denne heksejagt: »Hvorfor udløste Obama-administrationen en efterforskning af Trump-kampagnen (med nul bevis for forseelser) længe før valget i november? Uhørt. Større end Watergate.«

Samtidig demonstrerer Trump, at han bekæmper de neokonservative i det Republikanske Parti lige så intenst som dem i det Demokratiske Parti. I en tale ved et Republikansk fundraiser-møde i Florida, kaldte Trump invasionen af Irak for »den værste, enkeltstående beslutning, der nogensinde er

truffet« og som svarer til at kaste en kæmpesten ned midt i et hvepsebo. Her står vi så, som denne verdens fjolser, fordi vi havde dårlige politikere, der kørte vores land i lang tid. Det var Bush. Endnu et virkeligt geni. Det var Bush.«

Briterne er gået i panik. Denne uges *New Yorker*-magasin udgav en lang artikel for at dække over MI6-agent Steeles rolle, med overskriften, »Hvordan eks-spionen forsøgte at advare verden om Trumps forbindelser til Rusland«. Interviewet med Steele forsøger at dække over briternes rolle i den forræderiske bestræbelse på at bringe USA's regering til fald og fremprovokere en krig med Rusland.

Panikken er også fremkaldt af chokeffekten over præsident Putins annoncering den 1. marts af nye, russiske militære kapaciteter, som gør USA's og NATO's ring af missilforsvarssystemer rundt om Rusland impotente og ubrugelige, og som Helga Zepp-LaRouche har karakteriseret som en ny »Sputnik«-alarmklokke for verden. Wall Street-spekulanternes systemiske overtagelse af USA's økonomiske politik siden mordet på præsident Jack Kennedy gjorde det muligt for de narkodopede drenge i City of London og på Wall Street at svælge i deres forlorne penge, men det står nu klart, at ødelæggelsen af Vestens produktive og videnskabelige kapaciteter til fordel for 'funny money', 'Matador-penge', har sin bagside i ødelæggelsen af enhver reel rigdom. Putin fastslår den samme pointe ved at insistere på, at det russiske militære gennembrud er et resultat af et kompleks, der »omfatter videnskab, uddannelse, personel og moderne fremstillingsfaciliteter«, præcis det, som USA har opgivet til fordel for hurtige profitter gennem hasardspil. Putin tilføjer: »Det giver os stort håb, at alt det kan bruges og anvendes i civile industrier.«

Langt fra at være en trussel mod Vesten, har Putin opfordret Vesten til endelig at omstøde deres unipolære fantasier og sætte sig sammen med Rusland og andre og udarbejde midlerne til global fred og globalt samarbejde.

Trump arbejder også sammen med den sydkoreanske præsident Moon Jae-in for at skabe betingelserne for at løse den nordkoreanske krise. En sydkoreansk delegation til Nordkorea mødtes i dag med Nordkoreas leder Kim Jong-un, for at »overbringe præsident Moons hensigt om at bevare strømmen af inter-koreansk dialog og forbedre relationerne for at opnå en varig fred og en atomvåbenfri koreansk halvø ... så vel som en dialog mellem Nordkorea og USA og det internationale samfund«, som lederen af den sydkoreanske delegation sagde til pressen. I sidste weekend sagde Trump, at der afgjort vil komme forhandlinger mellem Washington og Pyongyang. Briterne og de neokonservative er rædselsslagne, eftersom Koreakrisen er deres primære (kunstige) retfærdiggørelse af deres militære ring rundt om Kina.

Det gamle paradigme er i færd med at smuldre. Italiens parlamentsvalg i søndags smed begge grene af de etablerede, politiske institutioner ud, ligesom de tyske valg for fem måneder siden efterlod de traditionelle partier i total forvirring. Efter fem måneders mundhuggeri, fik de afdankede tyske partier (SPD-CDU-CSU) endelig skruet en regering sammen i søndags, som er lige så stabil som en tobenet stol. Ligesom i USA er den eneste vej til vækst og stabilitet i Europa at erkende det gamle paradigmes død og vedtage de politikker, som Lyndon LaRouche for længe siden har formuleret – Glass-Steagall bankreform; etablering af nationale bankinstitutioner i Hamiltons tradition; skabelse af massiv statskredit til en videnskabelig, økonomisk drivkraft og infrastruktur; og fuldt samarbejde med Kina og Rusland om den Nye Silkevej. Dette er sandhedens time.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump adresserer nationen efter det tragiske skyderi på en skole i Florida. 15. februar, 2018. (Official White House Photo by Joyce N. Boghosian)

Maskerne falder: Vi må have en »Kreativitetskultur« til erstatning for »Dødsulturen« LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 2. marts., 2018

Vært Matthew Ogden: I sin afhandling, »Teatret som en moralsk institution« (original titel: Die Schaubühne als eine moralische Anstalt betrachtet), beskrev den tyske digter fra det 18. århundrede, Friedrich Schiller, noget ironisk klassisk teater og klassisk drama som det område, »hvor alle masker falder. Sminken fjernes. Sandheden er dommer«.

I klassisk drama, såsom i tragedierne i oldtidens Grækenland, eller Shakespeares tragedier, eller Schillers egne tragedier, f.eks.; eller i de største operaer af Giuseppe Verdi for at tage et andet eksempel, blev scenen, den klassiske scene, brugt som instrument for samfundets moralske og æstetiske opdragelse. Tragedie har evnen til at fremkalde i os erkendelsen af vore egne tåbeligheder, de fejl, der findes i os. Og vi ser reflekteret på scenen foran os, de ærefrygtindgydende konsekvenser af disse fejl, disse tåbeligheder, som, ifald de fik lov at bestå, udspilles på vores egen forestillingsevnes scener og tilbagekastes til os i

det frygtelige spejl i form af en rædselsvækkende og frygtindgydende forudsigelse. I disse øjeblikke transformeres vi fra at være passive tilskuere til at blive levende medlemmer af dramaet, og vi forlader teatret med ny visdom og forhåbentlig en ny vilje til at handle for, for enhver pris, at forhindre de rædsler, vi så udspilles på denne scene, i at blive til virkelighed.

Men hvis denne moralske og æstetiske opdragelse af et samfund imidlertid slår fejl, eller mislykkes, og et samfunds tåbeligheder finder sted uden at blive rettet, så ophører tragedien med at være begrænset til scenen og flyder over i det virkelige liv, hvilket undertiden fører til ødelæggende, virkelige konsekvenser.

Vi ser nu de faktiske og ligeledes de potentielle, virkelige konsekvenser af et sygt samfunds systemiske tåbeligheder, og af en forfejlet ideologi, som nu udspilles for vore øjne. I kølvandet på de forfærdelige begivenheder i Parkland, Florida, den 14. feb., ser vi nu en generel opvågning i vores befolkning, en erkendelse af, at der er noget i vores kultur, som er meget, *meget* sygt; at noget i vores samfund er råddent, og at noget har fået lov til at gå forfærdelig galt, og som har bragt os til dette punkt.

Og det er ikke slut med de forfærdelige begivenheder i Parkland. Vi har netop hørt, i dag, at der er en situation med en aktiv skytte, der fortsat er under udfoldelse på et college i Michigan. Og Parkland var på ingen måde det første skoleskyderi.

Dette er blevet identificeret af guvernør Matt Bevin fra Kentucky, som selv har måttet håndtere et af disse skoleskyderier, på Marshall County High School i januar. Han har identificeret dette som en »dødkultur«, hvor han sagde, at selve værdien af menneskelivet er blevet degraderet.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet:

I want to just play for you a short excerpt from some remarks that Gov. Matt Bevin had after this school shooting that occurred in his own state, at Marshall County High School in Kentucky, and this was weeks before the Parkland shooting even occurred. Here's what Gov. Matt Bevin had to say.

KENTUCKY GOV. MATTHEW BEVIN: Hi this is Kentucky Gov. Matt Bevin. I want to start a dialogue with you, I want to start a conversation about something that is imperative, not only for Kentucky, but frankly for America. We have a cultural problem.

The mores of America – there will be many that will confuse that with morality, although morality is certainly part of it – but the mores that define who we are and what is or is not acceptable, what we do or don't tolerate, where we draw lines and where we put boundaries, these things have been changing, and not for the better.

You look at what's happening in popular culture; this is not a religious issue. There'll be the nay-sayers and the pooh-pooh'ers who immediately think, "oh, you're going to talk about religion." I will tell you this, I'm going to talk about morality. Because if people don't believe they have responsibility to anyone other than themselves, that there is no pecking order of authority, that there is no absolute right and wrong, that everything is morally relative, when we live in that time of morally gelatinous state, we have a problem. Because individuals, young and old alike, done assume that their actions

matter in any kind of consequential way beyond that immediate moment, and that is a problem, and this is what's happening to our culture: We are crumbling from within. And we are seeing this throughout our society. We're seeing in our classrooms, we're seeing it in our communities, and – let's be honest – it starts in our homes.

I am challenging everybody who has anything to do with what I'm about to say, to take this to heart and let's start a conversation. Look at our popular culture. Look at our movies,

– the violence, the disregard for the value of human life; we are becoming increasingly desensitized, our young people are desensitized to it. We have a culture of death in America.

We can pretend we don't. We can think that people can separate that

from fiction, from their lives, from that which they see, but if

they're immersed in it at every turn – in television, in movies,

in music, all of it! Listen to the lyrics of music today, it celebrates a culture of death! Not all of it – fair enough – but an amazing amount of it. And parents, I'm asking you to wake

up and be aware of what it is that your children are listening to.

Do you young people, be mindful of what you put in, because it becomes a part of your entire physiology, your entire mental

makeup. It becomes a part of who you are. You are a creation of

what you surround yourself by.

Parents and others, I'm asking you to look at what kind of movies you go to see. For those that produce movies, I'm asking

you, think about what you're feeding in – I know that we live

in

a day and age, where we need to shock people, more than the last

time, or they won't pay attention, in sensationalism, in the shock value, maybe gets people to pay attention to something, puts eyes on something, and you can make a buck. But at what price? It's robbing us of the very fabric of our nation, and it's killing our young people.

Watch the television shows: We glorify murder, we glorify killing. It is becoming increasingly explicit, and we are desensitizing young people to the actual tragic reality in permanency of death. It's important for us to recognize this. Look at the video games that are played. Yes, they may be marked for "Mature audiences," but I'm telling you, those of you

who make a dollar producing these movies, and those of you who buy them and bring them into your homes, you know full well, that

many young people – and old people – are playing these games and becoming desensitized. When you get extra points and are encouraged to brutally kill people, and when the blood and the mayhem and the carnage is increasingly real, it desensitizes people.

And if it's a shock to us now, that suddenly we are seeing a prevalence of, and increasing amount of this happening, not in a

video game, not on a television show, not in a movie, not in the

lyrics of a song, but in real life as young people act out that

which they are surrounded by, that which they're immersed in, this is a cultural problem in America! And I'm asking the people

who produce this media, the people who produce this entertainment; I'm asking the people who profit from it; I'm asking for those of you who are executives in the social media ranks – and I am a big believer in the Constitution of the

United States, and in our freedom of speech – but we have got to start to think about the {filth}, let's be honest, that is feeding through so many of the mediums, covered and protected by things that perhaps are not good for us; protected by a Constitution that is good for us, but creating an end-result that is not.

What are those boundaries? I don't know. Should there be any? Should there be some content that is not given to us, and to children, without any kind of filter or screen? These are conversations we need to have: It is a cultural problem. Our culture is crumbling from within, and the cost of it is high. The societal and emotional and psychological and moral cost is becoming more than our nation can bear.

I've spent time with mothers and fathers who have lost children in tragic instances. And there is no ability, there are no words to describe the grief of a parent, the grief of a sibling, the grief of a friend, the grief of classmate, of a teacher, of a community, who have lost someone that is an immediate part of their family or their community.

Something has to be done. Let's start a dialogue. How exactly it forms, I don't know. But I'm calling on other governors, I'm calling on the President of the United States, I'm calling on our U.S. Congress; I'm calling on anyone who's in a position of influence, every superintendent, every CEO of every media company that produces a video game, that is violent in its nature, the movie producers that make the movies, the record producers who produce the music that we listen to – all of you – we've got to step up. We're the adults, let's act like it! Let's step forward, let's start a conversation, and let's

figure

out how to try to repair this fabric of America, that's getting

shredded beyond recognition.

Thank you. [end video]

OGDEN: Now, Gov. Matt Bevin did something very unique there. Instead of what we've become accustomed to, in the aftermath of one of these horrific events, to point at one or another scapegoat, or one or another mechanism that failed, or one or another thing that maybe went wrong, we fail to perhaps consider that the fault lies within ourselves, that the fault lies within our own culture.

Now, it's obviously unspeakable beyond words, for an event like one of these mass shootings or school shootings to occur even once, as we were horrified to witness. But it is absolutely

inconceivable that we've allowed these shootings to occur, again,

and again, for now almost 20 years, since the first high-profile

event happened at Columbine High School, in Littleton, Colorado

in 1999, – almost 20 years ago. But the tragedy lies in the fact that it didn't just happen once, it happened over and over,

and that the society which witnesses each one of these events might be appalled and outraged, but the underlying cause remains

unaddressed.

As the father of one of the victims in the Parkland shooting said, in tears, during a listening session that President Trump

hosted at the White House, with family members of the victims, he

said, "My child is dead! I will never, ever see her again.

But

why – why do we keep letting this occur? Why does this keep happening to so many people?” And he vowed that he will not sleep until something substantive has been done to prevent this

from ever happening again.

Now President Trump has responded to this, to Parkland in a way that no previous President has, frankly. In addition to this

listening session, which he hosted at the White House, he’s held

multiple meetings with members of Congress, with governors, with

state and local elected officials to discuss actual solutions, emphasizing that something needs to be done. Action is needed,

and not just posturing and not just political talk which will make us feel as if we are doing something, he said, but we must

actually do something. So, while many of the so-called solutions

which have been put on the table are practical, and specific, such as hardening sites, and increasing police presence, and improving the early warning system to prevent persons, like this

shooter, for example, from slipping through the cracks when there

were many, many warning signs stretching over years – for the first time, in addition to these practical solutions, which are

necessary – for the first time, in addition to this, the more systemic and underlying problems of the culture have now been put

on the table, along the lines of what Gov. Matt Bevin has raised.

I’d like to share with you, first, a short clip from a roundtable that President Trump held state and local officials on

Feb. 22nd; this occurred at the White House, where President Trump himself, goes right to the core of this pervasive culture of violence, which is promulgated through popular entertainment.

Listen to what President Trump had to say:

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: We have to look at the internet, because a lot of bad things are happening to young kids and young minds, and their minds are being formed. And we have to do something about maybe what they're seeing and how they're seeing it. And also video games: I'm hearing more and more people say, the level of violence in video games is really shaping young people's thoughts. And then you go the further step, and that's the movies, you see these movies, they're so violent, and yet, a kid is able to see the movie if sex isn't involved. But killing is involved. And maybe they have to put a rating system for that. And you get into a whole, very complicated, very big deal, but the fact is that you are having movies come out that are so violent, with the killing and everything else, that maybe that's another thing we're going to have to discuss. And a lot of people are saying, you have these movies today where you can go and have a child see the movie, and yet it's so violent and so disgusting, so we may have to talk about that also.... [end video]

OGDEN: Now, this came up again at a Feb. 26th roundtable meeting which President Trump hosted with the governors from

around the country. And first what you'll see in this clip is a brief mention, by President Trump in his opening remarks, of this topic, and then you'll see Gov. Matt Bevin himself, who was present, and used that forum to repeat his point about the prevailing culture of death which undermines the morality of our population and degrades the image of man and the value of human life. And he challenges {every} person in a position of authority in this country, to use that position of authority, to address this cultural problem.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: We must strive to create a culture in our country that cherishes life and condemns violence and embraces dignity... Matt?

KENTUCKY GOV. MATTHEW BEVIN: I do think it's important for us to start at every level, with your office, with our respective offices as well, to seize the bully pulpits that we have to talk about the culture in this society. And I would challenge those in the media who would want to mock and ridicule this, and would want to say that anybody who advocates for this, to find some fault in that person as a reason why that person should not be the one advocating for a higher level of moral authority or higher mores, to think twice, because these are your children and grandchildren as well. And when we mock and ridicule the very foundational principles that this nation was built upon, where you treat people the way you'd want to be treated, where you respect human life, where you respect the dignity of women,

and
of children, and of people who we have increasingly degraded
in
our society. This culture of death is becoming pervasive.
And
if it's not addressed by all the imperfect people in this
room,
with a sense of purpose and a sense of aspiration, I think
we're
going to see a continued trajectory that's not good.
Many things have not changed. There have always been guns,
and there were fewer restrictions. There have always been
guns
in homes, and fewer rules. It isn't to say that these rules
and
these restrictions are necessarily bad, but what has changed
is
what we do or don't do as it relates to acknowledging the
value
and the dignity of every human life. And when you couple that
with the number of psychiatric drugs that are increasingly
systemic and that have very severe warnings associated with
them
related to depression and suicidal thoughts, you put all these
things in a mess and no one among us is bold enough or willing
to
step up and challenge the fact, that this is a problem, this
is
why it goes unchallenged.
And I would call on you, Sir, as I'm calling on my
fellow-governors and myself, to seize the opportunities we
have
to call America to higher action as it relates to our mores.
Thank you.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Thank you Matt.

And that's why we're here. And I think – I don't know if

it's going to be mentioned, but you have to also look at videos

– they're {vicious}, you look at some of these videos; I mean, I

don't know what this does to a young kid's mind. Somebody growing up and forming, and looking at videos where people are just being blown away left and right. The internet movies, you

look at these movies that are out today, I see just by a commercial, the level of craziness and viciousness in the movies

– I think we have to look at that, too. Maybe we have to put a

ratings system on that. They have a ratings system for other subjects, maybe we have to do a ratings system for that.

But it has to have an impact on – it doesn't take many months – if it was 1% or less, that's a lot. That's all it takes. It just takes one person to do tremendous damage. I think it's something we have to look at also. [end video]

OGDEN: So, we can see an awakening happening in this country. And it's very significant, when confronted with the real world consequences of a failure by our society, by our very

culture itself, a failure to protect our children, to protect our

young people, to protect our future; where literally, we have led

ourselves to a culture where {children kill children}, and this

is almost becoming commonplace. Finally, people are beginning to

wake up.

But the discussion, while very good, to the extent that it has progressed, it must, must go much further, and much deeper.

Let's look back 20 years, and this was at the moment that

the first such high-profile, horrific school shooting happened, which many people who were alive at that time, remember today: Columbine. Ironically, a lot of the kids that are now in school today, have lived their life under the shadow of Columbine and were not even born at the point that that shooting occurred. But Lyndon LaRouche, in the immediate aftermath of that horrific event, wrote a paper in which he addressed the reality of what actually that horrific event represented. This is in the aftermath of that, but not only should the realization of LaRouche's prescience for what we're seeing today, and what we've seen over the past 20 years be shocking to you, and think about how many children, and how many other victims have died and have suffered in the intervening period, because nothing was done, at that time, to address what the root cause of this sickness was.

But also, you should be challenged by the depth of what he addresses as the necessary cure to this cultural sickness that has led to these events.

So let me read you some excerpts from this paper that Mr. LaRouche wrote, and this was back in June 11, 1999. ["Star Wars

and Littleton," {EIR} July 2, 1999:

<http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1999/eirv26n27-19990702/index.html>]

"Unless the U.S. government, and many relevant other influentials, change their view of this problem, abandoning the useless approach they have publicized thus far, the horror

will

continue, gun laws or no gun laws. Unless relevant institutions

get down to the serious business of addressing the actual causes

for this pattern of incidents, this murderous rampage will persist...My function, in this report, is to define the methods which must be brought to bear, if the danger posed by this new form of terrorism is to be brought under control... If you are willing to be serious, at long last, you will now turn your attention to the scientific roots of the problem...

"...Merely ending the sale of satanic video games, such as Doom..., will not put this horror back in the box from whence it came. This new problem of terrorism must be attacked, by focussing on the conditions which many readers have been complicitly condoning. Face the fact, that it might be your negligent tolerance which has contributed to the popularizing of

such video games and cult films, especially the spread of these

among suggestible children and adolescents.

"...What are the methods which have, similarly, turned so many among our children and adolescents into such "zombies" as those killers?...

"To grasp the horror posed by such cases, restate the same problem as a national-security topic. For that purpose, the leading subject for discussion, as posed by the Littleton and kindred cases, is {terrorism by children}. Stating the problem in

that way, brings the sheer, satanic horror of the matter into focus.

"The following pages ... will represent a serious intellectual challenge for many readers, but, for those who really wish to bring an end to the spread of more horrors like the Littleton massacre, the extra reading-time and thought this

report requires, is more than well worth every second spent...

“How does one corrupt innocent children into becoming psychotic-like killers? The quick answer to that question, is: {dehumanize} the image of man. The details of the way this leads to the production of youthful ‘Nintendo’ terrorists, are a more complicated matter. Nonetheless, it is no oversimplification to say, that once that first step, dehumanizing the image of man, is accomplished, the axiomatic basis has been established, to make war, and killing, merely a childish game...

“Before you pull that trigger, tell me: ‘What is the difference between a human being and a beast?’...

“...[T]he focus should be on the conflict between the view of mankind as specifically human, as against the intrinsically immoral view of the human species as ‘just another animal.’ ...

“The difference between the man and the beast lies in the quality of human cognition. This is otherwise known as those cultivatable creative mental powers through which an individual

mind may contribute to all mankind the original discovery of a single, validatable, universal physical principle. This is also

the method used in those Classical humanist modes of education,

in which the student’s re-enactment of some historic discovery of

a validated universal principle, is the mode of education employed, as opposed to so-called ‘textbook’ learning. This is also to be recognized as the principle of metaphor central to all

Classical artistic composition since the time of Classical Greece.

“The fact that we are able to demonstrate the validity of these discovered universal physical principles, shows that the

universe itself is predisposed, by design, to obey man's will when such universal principles, discovered in this way, are applied to man's increasing mastery over nature. {The act of discovery of a universal physical principle, whose application directly increases mankind's power in and over the universe, is,

in first approximation, the only rational definition of truth, the only proof that human reason is in accord with the Creator's

definition of truthfulness.}...

"This faculty, of validatable cognition, is the quality of the human individual which sets all persons apart from, and above

the beasts...

"...See a child's face suffused with happiness, at the moment the child senses a validatable original rediscovery of some principle. The passion which ennobles the great performance

of any accomplished work of Classical artistic composition, whether in poetry, the performance of great tragedy, great Classical painting, or music, is the same joy with which the child is illuminated by experience of a cognitive act of discovery of some principle—whether or not the child knew that many people had made that same discovery earlier...

"...The non-deductive process of discovery, which leads to proof of principle through experimental validation of that discovery as a universal principle, is the proper strict definition of the term {Reason}. ...It is that capacity for {Reason}, so defined, which defines the unique quality of the mentally healthy human specimen, as representing a distinct species, apart from and above all beasts.

"This quality of the person, this divine spark of Reason innate to the human individual, is the kernel of the proof of Moses' formulation, that man and woman are each made (equally) in

the image of the Creator of the universe...

"An idea, is any validatable discovery of universal

principle, which is generated within the mind of the knower, by no different means than cognition, as I have defined cognition above. The tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and the dialogues of Plato, or the tragedies of Shakespeare and Schiller, are models of artistic compositions, by means of which the artist prompts the regeneration of his idea respecting principles of social relations, within the mind of the audience...
“...[T]he underlying social relations among persons must be, axiomatically, the relations among their cognitive processes. The underlying issue of social relations, is how individuals interact in terms of the ordering of, or, the inertness of their respective cognitive processes...
“The progress of civilization has been shaped by a process of humanizing the image of man, as distinct from, and higher than the animals. Christ and his Apostles embedded this principle within European civilization. The process of Nietzsche’s and others’ de-civilization, is to attempt to reverse that process, to dehumanize the image of man, to bring man’s status back ... to the status of just another lower form of life...
“...The only moral purpose of education, is to develop an entire population up to the level of scientific and moral knowledge necessary, not only to perpetuate society at no less than its present level of power in the universe, but to carry the process of development of the whole population a step upward.
“The purpose of education is to develop the cognitive potentials of each and every person up to that standard of quality as a citizen, to develop an individual whose life qualifies as a permanent part of the simultaneity of eternity.

{The proper purpose of education, is to affirm the universality of humanity, and to accomplish this through embodying the history of the discovery of universal ideas within the cultivated personality of the matriculated student.}

“See, from this standpoint, how things went so terribly wrong. Think of the successive downward steps in our educational systems and popular culture, which brought us up to the point of decadence that phenomena like the Littleton horror are now a typical feature of our culture in this time...

“...When we allow the natural, human nature of children and adolescents to be crushed ..., when we seek to suppress the role of the cognitive function, when we substitute the act of merely learning for the act of actually knowing, we produce, as was done, increasingly, during the first post-World War II decades, the kind of future adult who will come to haunt us, and menace our world, when we have become old.

“What happens, when we allow those changes in national policy, which create an economy in which the adult members of the family household must work two or three jobs, or even more, among them, ‘simply to make ends meet’? ... What happens when we have done to education what has been done during most of the recent three decades? Did you ever think about that, or do you avoid pangs of guilty pain by refusing to think about that?

“What happens, when your toleration of the past decades’ changes in U.S. economic policies, creates a situation, today, when the family is no longer able (between many jobs to work each week, and much commuting between besides), to provide nurture to

the children and adolescents of the family household? If your economic situation compels you treat your children so, as if they

were stray dogs to be let into the house at feeding and sleeping

times, how are you educating them?...

"...Think! What kind of a social identity are such unfortunate children and adolescents expressing?

"Perhaps you were building the road to the Littleton massacre? Not everyone who expresses such a poor sense of personal self-identity in those ways, is necessarily going to go

all the way to becoming a Littleton-style terrorist; but, such low self-esteem is a step down in the direction which might lead

to such a horrible result in the succeeding generation of youth.

You may not have intended that outcome, but, year by year, the parents and grandparents built the road which made reaching that

destination possible.

"That explains, in part, how the road to the Littleton massacres was built....

"To understand the kind of mentality which fosters the proliferation of horrors such as the Littleton massacre, look at

the way in which so many in the U.S.A. responded to the way in which the British monarchy's Blair government used its U.S. puppets.... British financial oligarchy, and its debased monarchy, have openly stated their intent to revoke the doctrine

of international law established by the 1648 Peace of Westphalia,

this time in the case of Bloody Blair's Balkan War....

"The moral nation-state, the modern sovereign nation-state which our U.S. republic was intended to be, never conducts wars

for pleasure, as the Littleton killers and Blair have done, or wars for revenge...

“When we examine the role of sections of the U.S. military, in shaping the policies and techniques carried into action by the

Littleton killers, we must take into account the fact that there

is a connection between the recently increasing tendency for moral degeneration in our military and related institutions, and

the causes for the Littleton horror and related cases... If such

thinking within our military, is among the well-springs of phenomena such as Littleton, how shall we be rid of the latter,

without purging ourselves of the former?...

“The American way, is [to use] the power of victory to establish an order which is justly beneficial, to the victor and

formerly vanquished, to rebuild, as Lincoln’s last public address

proposed to rebuild the nation as if the Civil War had never occurred.

“Similarly: only by bringing that spirit back into our nation now, can we wean the damaged souls among our adolescents,

of that wont for Nintendo warfare so horridly displayed at Littleton....

“If we take into account, together, the present physical state, and direction of the world, and also the deteriorating mental and moral condition of populations throughout most of the

planet, as in the U.S.A. itself, we have already reached the threshold of the worst disaster known to the recorded history of

the human species. Unless we reverse the policy-trends of the recent several decades, especially those cultural trends

inside

the U.S.A., there is little possibility of the survival of civilization in the Americas, western Europe, or Africa much beyond the beginning of the coming century.

“For most among you, that means that you must change, must free yourself from, especially, those habits of thinking you have

built up during the recent quarter-century or longer. In a sense,

you must be prepared to go back to the way we used to think when

John F. Kennedy was President. Admittedly, there were lots of bad

habits loose back then; but, that is still a good point of reference at which to begin the process of cleaning away the mass

of cultural rubble which, unless cleared away, will ensure that

our nation does not survive.

“Look at the Littleton horror as an omen, as the hands of the clock of history, pointing to the time in which we are living

at this moment.

“You must change this nation, and perhaps yourself, too, before this nation, soon otherwise dies. Take Littleton as that

kind of warning. It is past time that you acted to change the set

of definitions, axioms, and postulates which have been controlling your opinions and other behavior during recent decades.”

OGDEN: So, that was Lyndon LaRouche on June 11, 1999, almost 20 years ago. And it is shocking how prescient Mr. LaRouche’s warning were, at that time, in the aftermath of the {first} of what has proven to be countless numbers of {horrible}

spectacles that we saw at that Littleton massacre. Now's the time for us to let that sink in, and not be satisfied with just halfway, practical measures and partial solutions, but to realize in a moment of truly self-conscious reflection, in true Classical tragedy form, that the horror we're witnessing today, really is the sign of the disintegration of our society, a potential Dark Age, as Mr. LaRouche said in that report. And a stirring within ourselves of the realization that the only solution, is a clean break from those follies which have led us down that path, and decisive action to create a Renaissance in our understanding of what it means to be human, our view of man, a re-humanizing of the human individual, not to just try to negate evil, but to try to replace this reigning culture of violence and this culture of death, with rather, a culture of creativity, which recognizes and celebrates that unique nature of the human species. And cultivates that divine spark creativity within every human individual, {every} child. Now, as Mr. LaRouche pointed out in that report, one cannot separate this sort of sickness in our culture, from the policies which have been expressed by our governing leadership for the last 50 years; especially the policy of endless war, killing, endless warfare, which has dominated our nation, really, since the Korean conflict, but in ever-increasing rates since the death of John F. Kennedy. And this was very usefully pointed out, just last week in an interview podcast by Coleen Rowley, who was a former FBI agent, and a whistleblower, actually, in the months leading up into 9/11. And you can see there, on the screen, that

her podcast with "WhoWhatWhy" is titled, "FBI Whistleblower: American Culture of Violence Starts with Perpetual Wars." In this interview, Coleen Rowley addresses the issue that this kind of "domestic terror," as she calls it, as we're seeing with these mass shootings, in schools and otherwise, really does have very much to do with this culture of violence which we now have in the United States. And she pointed to the media's role in fostering this kind of widespread culture of violence. She stated that while the tendency in law enforcement is to try to treat every single one of these as the specific set of circumstances, which led down the path to every single one of these crimes, she said, the reality of what we are dealing with is really something much larger. She said: "Our culture is doing this, it's promoting this violent culture. And of course this is over and above the availability and easy access to weapons." You put all of this together and just those added up on their own "does explain the question. Columbine, why is this happening? Why are we experiencing an epidemic of mass violence? Again, our news never mentions that because ... we want to compartmentalize this and make it seem as if it's easily, it's not us as a culture." And then she pointed to some specifics. She said, it really is the influence of this perpetual war mentality on our society. She indicated that there are several studies that have come out, that veterans of these perpetual, endless wars are twice as likely to become mass shooters; and she also pointed out that

the
CIA and the Pentagon have had a sort of devil's bargain with
the
mass media and the entertainment media, movies and video
games.

And she said that "The CIA and the Pentagon have been backing,
helping make about 1,800 movies," including among them are the
famous "American Sniper" movie from 2014, "Zero Dark 30" from
2012, and numerous others. She said in those movies, the hero
will always be someone who is wronged, and then in the end,
they

shoot everyone: "A mentally impaired or emotionally troubled
person is seeing themselves as that hero in those movies."

That's a very useful affirmation of exactly that point, that
you cannot compartmentalize, you cannot separate out all of
these

different, sick, sick phenomena. And our tendency is to try
to

scapegoat one thing, as opposed to realizing that the fault,
perhaps, lies within ourselves as a culture.

But it goes even further than that, and I think as Mr.

LaRouche made clear, we have to not be satisfied with partial
remarks, and partial considerations. In the last number of
years, more than just perpetual war and bloodshed, in an age
of

thermonuclear weapons, the ultimate conclusion of a culture of
death, and this culture of perpetual war and violence, in
which

human life has lost its value and weapons of greater and
greater

destructive capability have become the central pillar of
international policy and relations of states with other
states,

in this age of thermonuclear weapons, the ultimate conclusion
of

this mentality is the extinction of the human race.

We've now reached a point of decision. With the

announcement just yesterday by the Russian President, of a new generation of weapons which have been developed by Russia which

have the power to evade all known ballistic missile defense shields, flying at hypersonic speeds, some reaching Mach 20 – unbelievable speeds – under the power of nuclear propulsion, which allows them to fly almost endlessly, and can deliver, as he

said, a doomsday payload literally anywhere on the surface of the

planet at any time, truthfully, the era of belief in survivable

limited nuclear war, or preventive nuclear first strike, or this

global strike policy, which believed that you could knock out one

nation's defenses and then launch a nuclear or conventional attack against them, that age is now definitely over.

And this announcement has really caught the world by surprise.

As Helga Zepp-LaRouche characterized this: If everything which President Putin announced is in fact real, and there's no

reason not to believe that to be the case, this is a complete "Sputnik-type" shock. It's also being compared to the Soviet development of the hydrogen bomb in the 1950s, which completely

shifted the so-called "strategic balance of power," and took the

entire idea, at that time, of a preemptive nuclear strike against

the Soviet Union off the table.

What Helga Zepp-LaRouche's assessment is, is that this announcement of an entirely new weapons system, based on "completely new physical principles," an obvious echo of course,

of the language that was originally used in discussing the

Strategic Defense Initiative, the SDI, that this is a qualitative leap of extreme significance, which shifts the entire international strategic framework. And the follies of our belief in statecraft based on Mutually Assured Destruction, of dominance and so-called "deterrence" of geopolitics, all of these follies have now been exposed. The mask has fallen away. And humanity itself now sits before the judgment seat. Will we continue collectively, to pursue an ideology of nihilism, which necessarily, in the end, must lead to the destruction of civilization and the extinction of the human species in its ultimate consequence, if allowed to proceed to that point? {Or}, will we finally recognize the horror, {which we ourselves have wrought}, and awaken to the awful reality of the ultimate, real-life tragedy in the making, which is now unfolding around us

President Xi Jinping of China talks about creating a "community of common destiny." Now obviously, he discusses that in a beautiful sense, a win-win relationship among nations, where all nations are working toward the mutual benefit of others and are working towards the "common destiny of all mankind." Well, ironically, that common destiny already exists, but, in a negative sense, with this thermonuclear Sword of Damocles hanging over our heads, the potential for a "common destiny of humanity" for a global annihilation, is a very, very real thing. As Lyndon

LaRouche made the point with regards to the warning that he delivered in that report that I read excerpts from – which he wrote, now, almost 20 years ago – when he foresaw the horrors which the events in Littleton presaged. Survival under these conditions will not come from within the theories, the axioms, the postulates, of the prevailing system, but survival can only

be delivered through the overturning of those failed ideologies

which form its foundations, and the construction of an entirely

new outlook, based on truth, truthful principles; based on a recognition of what it really means to be man.

The ultimate principle which must come before, and precede everything else, not only in philosophy and education, and social

relations, but in international strategic policy, and economic policy, is the recognition of the true nature of man, a species

which is unique from all other species in its capacity for creativity, and the necessary ordering and subordination of everything else, to the cultivation and promotion of that.

So how does that principle play out on the world stage?

It's through rejecting the kind of anti-human, anti-development,

anti-progress ideology, which has prevailed in the form of competitive strategic geopolitics, zero-sum economic

policymaking; and instead, to consciously and scientifically decide, that the common destiny which man must pursue is not thermonuclear extinction and Mutually Assured Destruction

warfare, but rather, mutually beneficial development and shared

creative progress: Space exploration, the Strategic Defense of Earth from asteroids and other cosmic threats in our cosmic environment; the development of limitless power through the development of fusion energy – all of these, the list goes on and on and on.

{But this New Paradigm is already there. It's already in existence.} Just look at what China is doing, with the Silk Road, with the One Belt, One Road initiative. Look beyond all of the propaganda that you're being fed, about "Chinese hegemony" and so forth and so on. This is where the future lies: Mutually beneficial progress, development, the giving of the opportunity for the full cultivation of creative reason to every man, woman and child on this planet. The most beautiful example of this, just in the recent months, has been what China has already accomplished in the otherwise hopelessly destitute areas of Africa. And a beautiful report has just come out of Nigeria, where the idea of the Transaqua program to refill Lake Chad through massive water development and water-transfer projects, this idea which has been on the books for 20 years or more, is now becoming a reality. These are the kinds of projects, these are the kinds of visions, these are the kinds of goals which bind us together as a common humanity, and will affirm, for our children and for ourselves, the beauty of mankind, and the true creative nature of this species. This is the antidote for a culture of death and a culture of despair which has plagued our nation and this is the vision which will inspire us, as we work to build this shared destiny, this common future. It's not only through negating what is evil, but it's through cultivating what is good, that man can be redeemed, and that we can cure this sickness which has infected our culture at its very root.

So let us allow those masks to fall away, and let us allow the truth to sit in judgment, recognizing that that the fault lies within ourselves, within our very cultural values and beliefs which has led us down the road of tragedy. As the nation

has mourned alongside the victims and the family members of those

horrible events in Parkland, Florida, but has also been inspired

by the courage of those family members and those survivors who have said, "Enough is enough: Let's bring an end to the so-called status quo. This must be allowed {never} to happen again! Let us commit ourselves to action now, before we reach the point of no return, to cure this culture, and to cure this world, of the sickness which threatens our very survival. And to

resolve, that out of evil {must} come greater good."

For those who were victims in Florida, for those who are victims every day, of the diseases of depression and despair, addiction, overdose, opioids and heroin, and for all of us who now live under this thermonuclear Sword of Damocles which threatens to exterminate mankind in the blink of an eye, let all

of us resolve: That we will no longer accept this culture of death, which prevails not only in our media, and in our entertainment, but underlies the very economic and strategic fabric of society. If there was {ever} a moment in which it is

clear that the necessity of a New Paradigm for civilization is literally life or death, that moment is now.

So, let me conclude by returning to that essay by the poet Friedrich Schiller that I cited at the outset of this show, and

read to you the closing section of this essay, which he titles "The Theater Considered as a Moral Institution." What Friedrich

Schiller had to say, was:

“When grief gnaws at our heart, when melancholy poisons our solitary hours; when we are revolted by the world and its affairs; when a thousand troubles weigh upon our souls, and our sensibilities are about to be snuffed out underneath our professional burdens – then the theater takes us in, and within its imaginary world we dream the real one away; we are given back to ourselves; our sensibilities are reawakened; salutary emotions agitate our slumbering nature, and set our hearts pulsating with greater vigor.

“And then, when man at last, in all districts and regions and classes, with all his chains of fad and fashion cast away, and every bond of destiny rent asunder – when man becomes his brother’s brother with a single all-embracing sympathy, resolved once again into a single species, forgetting himself and the world, and reapproaching his own heavenly origin, each takes joy in others’ delights, which then, magnified in beauty and strength, are reflected back to him from a hundred eyes, and now his bosom has room for a single sentiment, and this is: to be truly human.”

So let us resolve to make mankind truly human, to be our brothers’ brother, and to usher in a culture of creativity to replace this culture of death.

Thank you very much. And please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

De første responser på Putins annoncering af nye våben omfatter forbløffelse og ros og fra andre hysteri

2. marts, 2018 – De første responser på præsident Vladimir Putins tale til nationen den 1. marts, hvor han annoncerer de nye, russiske atomvåbensystemer, omfatter udtryk for forbløffelse og ros, og fra andre, hysterisk latterliggørelse.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der kaldte Putins fremlæggelse for »utrolig«, understregede, at man »ikke bør undervurdere den chokværdi«, dette har. Hun refererede til dagens *Bild Zeitung*, der sammenlignede Putins rapport med, hvordan en mus brokker sig over for en løve. Artiklen sagde, at Putin kom med »umulige« påstande. USA's budget er, trods alt, lød det i artiklen, på \$700 mia., sammenlignet med det russiske budget på \$60 mia.

I USA latterliggjorde Tv-værten Rachel Maddow fra MSNBC Putin for at bluffe.

Disse eksempler viser, at Vesten er så »arrogant og selvsikker«, sagde Zepp-LaRouche, at de ikke ved, hvad virkeligheden er. Man kan sammenligne russernes præstation med atomvåben med »Sputnik-chokket« i USSR's bemandede rumfartssucces, der ramte USA og Vesten. Eller med Sovjetunionens sprængning af H-bomben, som slog Bertrand Russells sindssyge planer om verdensdominans af pinden.

Skribenten Paul Craig Roberts begyndte i går sin dækning med, »Putin har holdt en bemærkelsesværdig tale for den føderale forsamling, det russiske folk og verdens folkeslag«. Roberts (»Putins State of the Union, March 1) fortsatte, »I sin tale har Putin afsløret eksistensen af nye, russiske atomvåben, som

gør det ubestrideligt klart, at Rusland besidder en enorm atomoverlegenhed i forhold til USA og dets patetiske NATO-vasalstater. Ud fra de russiske kapaciteter står det ikke klart, at USA stadig kvalificerer til at være en supermagt ...« Roberts rapporterer, at »Efter at have gjort det klart, at Vestens politik for overherredømme og intimidering er dødfødt, rakte Putin atter en olivengren frem: lad os arbejde sammen for at løse verdens problemer ...«

Websiden The Saker (<http://thesaker.is>) har stor ros til Putins tale. Artiklen fra 1. marts, » Putin's Stunning Revelations About New Russian Weapons Systems«, rapporterer om fire kategorier af nye systemer og siger, at de har »forbløffende, virkelig tektoniske implikationer«. Efter at nævne en gæsteanalyse fra en krigsekspert i flåden, konkluderer, »Det er virkelig 'set, game og match over' for Imperiet: der er ikke længere nogen militær option over for Rusland«.

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der kaldte Putins fremlæggelse for »utrolig«, understregede, at man »ikke bør undervurdere den chokværdi«, dette har.

Første officielle responser fra USA på Putins bemærkninger om nye atomvåben er afvisende

2. marts, 2018 – Pentagons offentlige respons på den russiske præsident Vladimir Putins annonceringer af nye atomvåbensystemer kunne karakteriseres som en kombination af

ringeagt og afvisning. »Vi er ikke overrasket over erklæringen [fra Putin], og det amerikanske folk bør være forsikret om, at vi er fuldt ud parat« til at forsvare os mod angreb, sagde Dana White, Pentagons cheftalsperson, under en briefing i går. »Vi er parat til at forsvare denne nation uanset, hvad Putin måtte føje til sit arsenal af atomvåben«, tilføjede hun.

Pentagons afvisninger blev ledsaget af gentagne benægtelser af, at USA's globale deployeringer af missilforsvar skulle have noget som helst at gøre med Rusland. »De ved udmærket, at det ikke handler om dem. Vort missilforsvar har aldrig handlet om dem«, hævdede White med reference til USA's politik for atomafskrækkelse. »Vi må sikre, at vi har en troværdig atomafskrækkelse, og vi er fortrøstningsfulde mht., at vi er parat til at gøre – vi er parat til at forsvare denne nation, uanset hvad.«

I Det Hvide Hus hævdede talsperson Sarah Sanders den 1. marts, at »Præsident Putin har bekræftet, hvad USA's regering hele tiden har vidst, og som Rusland har benægtet. Rusland har været i gang med at udvikle destabiliserende våbensystemer i over et årti, i direkte overtrædelse af dets traktatforpligtelser«. Dernæst pralede hun, »USA's forsvarskapacitet er og vil fortsat være uovertruffen, og nu, pga. vores nye forsvarsbudget på \$700 mia., vil vores forsvar være stærkere end nogensinde«, sagde Sanders. »Som præsidentens gennemgang af holdningen til atomvåben gjorde klart, så går Amerika frem med at modernisere vores atomvåbenarsenal og sikre, at vore kapaciteter er uden sidestykke.«

I Udenrigsministeriet kaldte talsperson Heather Nauert den 1. marts videoen, som Putin viste om atomkrydsermissiler, der rammer Florida, for »plat«. Hun hævdede ligeledes, at Putins tale viste, at Rusland havde overtrådt sine forpligtelser under traktaten om mellemdistance-atomstyrker, en påstand, der kraftigt benægtes af den russiske side.

Den russiske ambassadør til USA, Anatoly Antonov, sagde, »Vladimir Putins tale fokuserede på strategiske våben, som ligger uden for rammen af INF-traktaten«. Han tilføjede, at Ruslands udvikling af dets atomkapacitet er i fuld overensstemmelse med alle traktater om våbenkontrol og Ruslands internationale forpligtelser. »Den antirusiske propagandakampagne med henvisning til INF-traktaten indikerer i stigende grad, at Washington har kurs mod en tilbagetrækning fra denne aftale, ligesom USA for nogen tid siden forlod traktaten om antiballistiske missiler«, sagde Antonov. »Vi har gentagne gange opfordret til en professionel diskussion om dette spørgsmål med vore amerikanske kolleger. Vi har gentagne gange advaret om, og advarer nu igen om, at et sammenbrud af INF-traktaten ville være et forfærdeligt slag imod bestemmelserne om våbenkontrol og om ikkespredning«, tilføjede han.

Foto: Pentagon-talsperson Dana White: »Vi er parat til at forsvare denne nation, uanset hvad.«

Kina sender topregeringsfolk til Washington for at 'rette og stabilisere' relationer

28. feb., 2018 – En redaktionel kommentar den 27. feb. i Kinas *Global Times* (»Højtplacerede regeringsfolks besøg i USA har til formål af undgå yderligere handelskonflikter«) påpeger, at to af Kinas højst placerede og betroede regeringsfolks nylige besøg i Washington – statsråd Yang Jiechi (Kinas højst

placerede regeringsperson inden for udenrigspolitik) for to uger siden, og i denne uge, økonomisk seniorrådgiver til præsident Xi Jinping, Liu He – er yderst usædvanligt.

Det reflekterer imidlertid det faktum, at de bilaterale relationer med USA befinder sig ved et afgørende punkt, og at Kina »håber at rette og stabilisere retningen af de kinesisk-amerikanske relationer så snart som muligt«, iflg. Diao Daming, associeret professor ved Kinas Renmin Universitet. Yang Jiechi behandlede internationale og regionale hovedspørgsmål, såsom Korea, alt imens, iflg. Udenrigsministeriet, Liu mere vil behandle bilaterale relationer, især handel og økonomi.

I betragtning af amerikanske »offensiver« mod Kina om handelsspørgsmål, kunne Lius mission »blive vanskelig«, iflg. An Gang fra Pangoal Institution i Beijing. Det bliver hans job at lade Washington vide, at Beijing kan handle proaktivt og »imødegå amerikanske handlinger i handelskonflikter«. Men han kan også briefe USA om Kinas »nye, overordnede plan for økonomisk reform«, som blev fremlagt efter Kinas Kommunistiske Partis 19. nationalkongres. Da Liu talte på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum i år, indikerede han, at Kina planlægger en række nye forholdsregler for reform og åbenhed, minder *Global Times* om og bemærker, at Donald Trump også arbejder for økonomiske reformer. Nøglen til kinesisk-amerikansk koordinering, konkluderer avisen, er således »at realisere gensidig promovering, alt imens begge sider arbejder for reformer«. Med andre ord, understreger An, »så må de finde et nyt grundlag for win-win-samarbejde«.

Hvad der er vigtigt, så tilføjer han, at en afbalancering af de kinesisk-amerikanske, økonomiske bånd »ikke blot kan bero på stigende import fra USA og formindsket eksport til USA, og begge sider bør søge en løsning ud fra deres strukturelle reformer«.

Foto: Økonomisk seniorrådgiver til præsident Xi Jinping, Liu

He, besøger USA fra 27. feb. til 3. marts., 2018.

Tiden er inde til at fjerne fattigdom og give vore børn en fremtid

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 28. feb., 2018 – I dag anfører *New York Times* den flok hyæner i det vestlige pressekorps, som misbilliger den kinesiske beslutning om at fjerne tidsbegrænsning for deres præsidenter og vicepræsidenter. »Xi sætter Kina på kollisionskurs med historien«, hyler *Times'* overskrift og citerer ingen anden en taberen Hillary Clinton, der udtalte, at Kina er på »en taberkurs og forsøger at opretholde et regeringssystem, der ikke kan overleve i den moderne verden«.

Kesha Rogers, den uafhængige kandidat til Kongressen for Texas (9. Kongresdistrikt), og som støttes af LaRouche Politiske Aktionskomite, responderede til dette hysteri imod Kina ved at minde vore borgere om Martin Luther Kings ord (som, ulig Hillary, var *kvalificeret* til at være præsident), der sagde: »Tiden er inde for os at blive civiliserede ved totalt, direkte og omgående at afskaffe fattigdom.« Det er selvfølgelig det, Kina er ved at opnå, både for sine egne borgere (frem til år 2020) og for verden, gennem sit historiske Bælte & Vej Initiativ. Hvilken nation eksemplificerer den »civiliserede verden« i dag?

Global Times, det Kinesiske Kommunistpartis avis, skriver i dag, at »de vestlige medier begyndte at tale dårligt om Kina på deres sædvanlige og forskellige måder« efter meddelelsen om, at Kina ville afslutte begrænsede embedsperioder. »Den

vigtigste grund til alt dette«, fortsætter lederartiklen, »er, at Kinas fremvækst har nået et afgørende punkt, hvor nogle vesterlændinge rent psykologisk ikke kan holde det ud længere. De ønsker at se en ulykke ramme landet. Selvfølgelig, hvis det skulle skade deres egne interesser, så er de villige til først at se Kina smuldre«. De skriver fortsat, »I årenes løb er både Kinas Kommunistiske Partis Centralkomites myndighed og vort kinesiske samfunds fremgang vokset. Centralkomiteens myndighed er den mest fremragende del af Kinas konkurrencedygtighed. Den er kilden til landets effektivitet og evne til at mobilisere folk og foretage tilpasninger. Det er den ting, som den omgivende verden mest misunder Kina, og det er målet for vestlig, antikinesisk retorik.«

Mange i Vesten responderer, at, på trods af det store fremskridt i Kina, er det kinesiske folk ikke frit, har ikke basale menneskerettigheder, som om retten til et anstændigt levebrød, frihed fra fattigdom og frihed til at bidrage til nationens og menneskehedens fremtid, ikke skulle være den mest fundamentale af menneskerettighederne.

Men vi må også stille spørgsmålet, hvad er tilstanden for menneskerettighederne i USA? Hvad gør man mod vore børn, af hvilke millioner er blevet nægtet ethvert håb om en produktiv fremtid, og som i stedet tilbydes »friheden« til at tage narkotiske stoffer, til at blive »underholdt« af film og videospil og popmusik, der lærer dem at umenneskeliggøre deres medmennesker gennem vold og pornografi, og som nægtes enhver uddannelse med hensyn til den klassiske, vestlige kulturs skønhed, for slet ikke at tale om den klassiske kinesiske kulturs skønhed, eller skønheden i nogen af de andre, store kulturer i menneskets historie? Der bør ikke herske tvivl om, hvorfor hundredevis af vore børn bliver forvandlet til mordere. Der bør heller ikke herske nogen tvivl om, at hele økonomien og hele kulturen må transformeres for at denne rædsel skal stoppe, og for at verden kan gå ind i et nyt paradigme, baseret på menneskeligt fremskridt og menneskelig

værdighed.

Præsident Trump vækkede et håb i det amerikanske folk, hvor han lovede at genopbygge nationens industrielle grundlag og den kollapsende infrastruktur, at afslutte narkosvøben, mindede folk om Alexander Hamiltons »Amerikanske System« og lovede at afslutte den nytteløse og farlige konfrontation med Rusland og Kina. Det er de spørgsmål, som Lyndon LaRouche har kæmpet for i et halvt århundrede, alt imens det politiske lederskab har været i færd med at transformere nationen til en postindustriell skrotbunke og en permanent krigsmaskine på vegne af Det britiske Imperium.

Håbet om at genoprette Amerikas storhed må nu fuldbyrdes på den eneste, mulige måde – ikke stykkevist, ikke med små skridt, men gennem den fulde og hele genindførelse af det Amerikanske System gennem LaRouches program, og ved fuldt og helt at vedtage den Nye Silkevejsånd, som Kinas Bælte & Vej har lanceret. Det er, hvad et civiliseret samfund må gøre.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump og præsident Xi Jinping møder børn, der vifter med kinesiske og amerikanske flag under velkomstceremonier uden for Folkets Store Hal, 9. nov., 2017, i Beijing, Folkerepublikken Kina. (WH Photo Shealah Craighead)

**For at overvinde
døds-kulturen,
må der komme en**

renæssancebevægelse; USA må tilslutte sig Bælte & Vej

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 28. feb., 2018 – I dag adresserede Helga Zepp-LaRouche den globale, strategiske situation og den nationale debat, som det nylige skoleskyderi i Florida har udløst i USA, med følgende udtalelse:

»Der er to udviklinger, som oligarkiet er utilfreds med. Den ene er, at den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping vil forblive efter år 2020 for at sikre, at Bælte & Vej-transformationen af verden og Kinas udviklingsmål frem til 2020, 2035 og 2050 går fremad på bedst mulig måde. Og den anden er, at Donald Trump har meddelt, at han genopstiller til præsidentvalg i 2020. Og jeg er fuldstændig sikker på, at begge disse begivenheder vil gøre visse mennesker ekstremt utilfredse – hvilket er en god ting.«

Zepp-LaRouche identificerede de to baner, verden står overfor.

»Den ene er en meget optimistisk bane med hensyn til Bælte & Vej Initiativets potentiale for at transformere verden. Den anden bane er, at dele af Vesten stadig lider under det, guvernøren fra Kentucky har kaldt en 'dødskultur'. Som VIPS-whistleblower Coleen Rowley for nylig udtalte, så er dette, i det mindste for en stor del, resultatet af en politik for evindelig krig. Man kan i realiteten sige, at både de voldelige videospil og masseskoleskyderierne indirekte eller direkte har været et resultat af disse evindelige krige – hvilket gør det absolut klart, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme.

På den optimistiske side går Bælte & Vej hurtigt fremad, og det er opmuntrende for alle, der kender til det. Det er også vigtigt, at der finder et meget signifikant præsident-til-præsident-diplomati sted. Den seneste udvikling er, at det

kinesiske politbureauemedlem Liu He kommer til USA i fem dage til intensive diskussioner med Trump-administrationen om spørgsmål om økonomi og handel. Dette kommer kun to uger efter, at statsråd Yang Jiechi var i USA. Så denne personlige dialog mellem Trump og Xi er ekstremt vigtig.»

Zepp-LaRouche mindede om den pointe, som en kinesisk kommentator er fremkommet med, nemlig, at Bælte & Vej er en irreversibel tendens, og de lande, der ikke ønsker at komme med om bord, vil ende med at stå og kigge på kabyssens baglygter, når den forlader stationen. »Dette er en meget opmuntrende dynamik; og jeg mener, at den kendsgerning, at både Trump og Xi vil blive om bord, er ekstremt gode nyheder.«

Dernæst adresserede Zepp-LaRouche efterspillet af skoleskyderiet i Florida i USA. »Der er afgørende tegn på en omstilling. Som Kentuckys guvernør Matt Bevin udtalte, så har dette intet med skydevåben at gøre; det har til gengæld alt at gøre med den absolut morbide dødkultur, man ser i nutidens sangtekster, film osv., og det er, hvad vi må ændre. Selvfølgelig talte guvernør Bevin ikke om løsningen, nemlig at få en opløftende, klassisk kultur, som ville vaccinere børn mod dette. Men det er i det mindste en begyndelse, og han opfordrede til en national debat om problemet.«

Fr. Zepp-LaRouche opfordrede til, at LaRouche-bevægelsen spiller en central rolle i denne diskussion.

»Stigningen i selvmord, nedgangen i den forventede levealder, alt dette er resultatet af en manglende vision og det rædselsfulde paradigmeskift, der har fundet sted i USA, især i de seneste 50 år efter JFK's død.

Som VIPS-whistleblower Rowley sagde, så er henved 1.800 film blevet produceret med hjælp fra Pentagon og CIA, og hvor man har sindsforstyrrede veteraner fra krige i udlandet, der har PTSD (posttraumatisk stress-syndrom), og så går amok i skydeorgier. Dette er, hvad Lyndon LaRouche adresserede i sin

udtalelse efter Littleton-skyderiet. Efter dette har der været 31 skoleskyderier med dødelig udgang i USA. Og nu, efter Florida-skyderiet, har der været 50 rapporterede tilfælde [af trusler] om dagen«,

sagde hun med henvisning til rapporten fra 22. feb. fra Educators School Safety Network.

Dette fremkalder chokvirkninger i befolkningen, rapporterede hun, hvilket kræver, at en løsning på denne krise må fremlægges. Men denne diskussion og denne løsning, formandede hun,

»kan ikke være begrænset til kun ét enkelt spørgsmål. Hvorfor finder dette kup mod Trump sted? Hvorfor står Det britiske Imperium bag? Hvorfor går efterforskningerne i Kongressen nu efter dette? Og hvorfor er det, at Trump spiller en potentielt ekstremt vigtig, strategisk rolle? Dette er alt sammen en del af det samme billede, og det må tackles som en helhed.

Vi må sige til folk, at den eneste måde, hvorpå denne dødkultur kan overvindes, er at løfte befolkningen op, atter skabe forbindelse til USA's bedste traditioner og bevæge sig ind i et Nyt Paradigme for et win-win-samarbejde med kinesernes tilbud om at gå med i Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Dette betyder naturligvis at gennemføre Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love, og det betyder, at folk intensivt må studere den økonomiske metode, som LaRouche har udviklet.

Vi må optrappe i denne retning og virkelig forstå, at dette er et historisk øjeblik, hvor en stor del af det, der finder sted, og en endnu større del af vores organisations aktivitet og succes, er afhængigt af den subjektive faktor.

Det er en stor ting, men det kan gøres!«,

konkluderede Zepp-LaRouche.

Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche kort før sin optræden på et

engelsksproget TV-dialogshow under sit besøg på Bælte & Vej Forum i Kina, maj, 2017.

Medlem af Kinas politbureau Liu He besøger USA

27. feb. 2018 – Medlem af det kinesiske politbureau Liu He, der anses for at være den mest indflydelsesrige rådgiver til præsident Xi Jinping, og som for nylig repræsenterede Kina på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum, ankom til Washington, D.C. i dag til et fem dages besøg med intensive diskussioner med Trump-administrationen om spørgsmål om økonomi og handel. Den officielle meddelelse fra Udenrigsministeriet var kortfattet og erklærede blot, at Liu var på besøg »efter indbydelse fra USA's regering«, og at »de to sider vil udveksle synspunkter om de kinesisk-amerikanske relationer og bilateralt samarbejde inden for områderne handel og økonomi«.

China Daily havde lidt mere at sige den 27. feb., i en artikel med overskriften, »Lius USA-rejse tænkt at skulle mindske spændinger«. Artiklen bemærker, at »Lius rejse til USA kommer rundt regnet to uger efter, at statsråd Yang Jiechi besøgte Washington, hvor hans besøg fremviste succesfulde udvekslinger på højt niveau mellem de to nationer, sagde eksperter«. De uddybede denne pointe ved at citere Wu Xinbo, direktør for Center for Amerikanske Studier ved Fudan Universitet i Shanghai, og som sagde, at »Beijing og Washington har fundet en måde til at styrke tillid – hovedsageligt ved at lade betydningsfulde regeringsfolk mødes oftere«. Med andre ord, så bevarer præsidenterne Xi og Trump deres direkte kommunikationskanal for fortsat at udbygge deres »fremragende« personlige relation, der blev etableret i april, 2017, på Mar-

a-Lago, Florida, og dernæst under Trumps besøg til Kina i november, 2017.

Der er i øjeblikket ingen tilgængelige oplysninger om, hvem, Liu skal mødes med i Washington – men der kan udrettes meget på fem dage.

Foto: Medlem af Kinas politbureau Liu He repræsenterede Xi Jinping på Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum i Schweiz, 23.-26. jan, 2018.

Hvad er geopolitik? Første del: Historie.

LaRouche PAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, Lektion 2, 17. feb. 2018

Der var de fortsatte provokationer i Mellemøsten, provokationer i Asien, Koreakrigen, Vietnamkrigen – dette var geopolitik med det formål at bevare Det britiske Imperium. Og desværre, med mordet på Kennedy, blev USA en partner i det, man kunne kalde et »anglo-amerikansk geopolitisk imperium«.

Og hvad gik politikerne ud på? Frihandel, neoliberal økonomi, nedskæringspolitik. Svækkelse af regeringer, svækkelse af ideen om national suverænitæt og etablering af institutioner som den Europæiske Union, der ønsker ikkevalgte bureaukrater til at bestemme politikker for det, der plejede at være

nationalstater.

Det så ud, som om alt dette kunne ændre sig i 1989, med den kommunistiske verdens fald, med det østtyske regimes kollaps og Berlinmurens fald. På dette tidspunkt interвенerede LaRouche-organisationen meget direkte, for et alternativ til geopolitik. Lyndon LaRouche var blevet fængslet af George Bush, med assistance fra den daværende vicestatsanklager i Boston, Robert Mueller. Men Helga Zepp-LaRouche anførte kampen for det, vi dengang kaldte den Produktive Trekant Paris-Berlin-Wien, og dernæst, så tidligt som i slutningen af 1990, det, der blev kaldt den »Nye Silkevej« eller den Eurasiske Landbro, som et middel til at bringe nationer sammen og overvinde disse kunstige opdelinger, skabt af Det britiske Imperium.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**EIR: Man det britiske kup i
jorden: Muellers
anklageskrifter**

mod russiske sociale medietrolde platter det amerikanske folk

Som vi gentagne gange har vist, så er den strategiske sammenhæng for kuppet mod Trump en fuldt optrappet bestræbelse på at bevare den anglo-amerikanske orden imod det, der opfattes som Kinas fremvoksende magt, som nu er allieret med Rusland. Kina har kontinuerligt og konsekvent inviteret USA til at gå med i dets Bælte & Vej Initiativ, det største infrastrukturprojekt, man nogen sinde har påtaget sig i historien. Præsident Trumps fornuftige fremgangsmåde over for både Rusland og Kina ses som en eksistentiel trussel mod det fortsatte anglo-amerikanske partnerskab, der har domineret verden, siden Franklin D. Roosevelts død.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Mueller-dossieret revideret:
Hvordan briterne og Obama
plattede USA
LaRouche PAC Internationale
Webcast, 23. feb., 2018**

Vært Matthew Ogden: I takt med, at Muellers anklageskrift mod 13 såkaldte russiske 'trolde' fortsat dominerer overskrifterne hen over weekenden, er amerikanerne i stigende grad begyndt at fatte det iboende hykleri i hele denne Russiagate-narrativ. Fra tidligere CIA-direktør James Woolsey, der af Laura Ingraham på Fox News bliver spurgt, om USA nogen sinde har blandet sig i et andet lands valg – til hvilken han måtte rømme sig og hoste og sige, »Jamen, det har vi sandsynligvis, og vil sandsynligvis fortsætte med«; og til en række blogindlæg i denne uge på tidligere forsvarsefterretningsofficer Pat Langs webside, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. Man ser her [Fig. 1] titlen på et af de seneste indlæg: »Robert Muellers Amerika – En farce pakket ind i hykleri«. Dette blev postet den 20. feb., og her er et kort uddrag af hans blogindlæg, hvor han siger:

Under overskriften »Robert Muellers Amerika – En Farce pakket ind i hykleri«, fremfører Tacitus, at anklageskriftet er »intet mindre end en køreplan for despotiske regeringer, der ville ønske at behandle enhver, der vover at udlægge afvigende materiale på internettet, som en kriminel.« I virkeligheden »er det ikke andet end en gang harsk butterdej. Det prætenderer at have et bjerg af beviser på russernes misgerninger. Men, hvis man begynder simpelt hen at stille kritiske spørgsmål om det underliggende bevis for disse misgerninger, opdager man hurtigt, at dette dokument er et stykke politisk teater snarere end en faktisk opremsning af kriminelle gerninger.«

»Der er ikke et eneste stykke solidt bevis i hele dokumentet, der underbygger« påstanden om Internet Research Agency (IRA), det russiske selskab, der angiveligt skulle have haft tilsyn med den beskidte propagandakrig mod intetanende amerikanske vælgere. »Det er blot en konstatering af en overbevisning. Det er ikke sådan, man skriver et anklageskrift, der beskylder en for kriminelle handlinger.«

»Denne sag er således meget langt fra at være en 'slam dunk'

for Mueller-teamet. Skulle det nogen sinde komme for retten, er der signifikante huller og sårbarheder i anklageskriftet, som en kompetent forsvarsadvokat kunne splitte ad. Niks. Det her handler ikke om at straffe folk, der overtræder loven. Dette er et politisk teater, der er designet til at nære memet for at promovere antirussisk hysteri.« Tacitus understreger, at enhver objektiv efterforskning af angivelig »indblanding« fra IRA kun ville kunne konkludere, at »IRA's aktiviteter er på grænsen til irrelevante og uden indvirkning«. Ingen stor afsløring her: Rusland har gennemført efterretningsoperationer i USA i 80 år. Men USA har gennemført lignende operationer »i og imod Rusland / USSR og har været involveret i hemmelige indblandinger i valg i hele verden. Dét er det hykleriske. Vi har et hysterisk anfald over latterlige internet-narrestreger, udført af en lille gruppe russere, der var dårligt finansieret og genererede liden aktivitet samtidig med, at vi ignorerer vores egen historie, hvor vi rent faktisk har væltet andre lovligt valgte regeringer. Der har vi det. Farce og hykleri.«

Hør så dette næste indlæg, publiceret i dag, den 23. feb., med titlen »Amerika blander sig i Ukraine« [Fig. 2]. Han siger:

»Historikere vil bemærke den enorme ironi, der ligger i USA's engagement i undergravende virksomhed og indblanding i valget i Ukraine, som overgår alt, Rusland har forsøgt.

De ideologiske spaltninger, der vokser i USA, begynder at ligne de krigsførende lejre, der karakteriserer den politiske verden i Ukraine. Splittelsen i Ukraine sætter grupper, der beskrives som »højrefløj«, og mange er ideologiske efterkommere af ægte nazister og nazi-sympatisører, op imod grupper med et stærkt tilhørsforhold til Rusland.

Hvem støtter USA's regering og medierne? *Nazisterne*. Du tror, jeg laver grin!«

Han fortsætter dernæst med at fremlægge OUN's historie [Organisationen af Ukrainske Nationalister] og Stephan

banderas støtte til Hitler og fortsættelsen af denne arv med Sektor Højre i dag. Dernæst fortsætter han:

»Regn mig med blandt de mennesker, der er oprørt over det hykleri og den stupiditet, der nu kommer frem i USA.

Der foregår helt tydeligt indblanding i det det amerikanske politiske landskab. Men det er altså ikke den russiske regering. Nej. Der er fremmede og hjemlige kræfter i alliance, som er ivrige efter at portrættere Rusland som en trussel mod verdensordenen, og som må modgås med højere forsvarsudgifter og hårdere sanktioner. Det er den propaganda, der dominerer medierne i USA i disse dage. Og det er i sandhed farligt for vores nations sikkerhed og frihed.«

Det står klart, som Pat Lang pointerer her i dette blogindlæg, og ligeledes, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche pointerede i sin internationale webcast i går, at hele denne Russiagate-historie, og desuden hele Kina-hysteriet, der i stigende grad nu oppiskes; at dette forkyndes med det formål at portrættere disse lande som en dødbringende trussel mod den herskende verdensorden, og som må tilintetgøres. Som Helga LaRouche sagde i dette klip, vi nu skal se, så man se dette som intet mindre end førkrigs-propaganda. Her er, hvad Helga havde at sige:

(her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.)

(Hele Helga Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra 22. feb. kan læses på dansk, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23890>)

Henvisninger i den engelske tekst:

Nyt Paradigme undervisningsserie, Indtegning, program:
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23703>

Helga Zepp-LaRouches introduktion 10. feb. (dansk):
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23855>

Harley Schlanger, lektion 2 17. feb., video, (engelsk):

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xy87_gzTTTU

“The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British and Obama Diddled the United States”, <https://larouchepac.com/20180220/mueller-dossier-revisited-how-british-and-obama-diddled-united-states>

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: This is a case which will never go to trial, because these are people living in Russia. It's an old case, it was already discussed in 2014, and since there is no extradition treaty between the United States and Russia, the trial will never take place; and therefore Mueller does not have to provide any evidence for any of his accusations. So it's a very convenient way to keep beating the drums in an anti-Russian hysteria and it's a big, big “nothing-burger” as people have been pointing out. But it is actually a fraud against the population, because if you keep building this kind of enemy image, such as against Russia and China – and people should understand, this has nothing to do with Russian hacking, or Russian collusion; as a matter of fact, there were several people, but one of them was a leading member of the Russian Duma who said that there are 102 very well documented cases for the United States meddling in the internal affairs of other countries, and it's fairly well known how many coups and regime-change operations. So obviously, at minimum, you could say is that both sides are doing it, but

the

United States has a very long record of having tried to intervene

in the internal affairs of other countries in multiple ways.

So, this should be understood as pre-war propaganda, and people easily fall for things which are in the mainstream media,

and rather, they should think twice. What Russia is doing and what China is doing, is they are building a completely different

model of international relationships, explicitly modeled on noninterference, and respect for the social system of the other

country. And therefore, this propaganda is just a terribly dangerous scenario of lies which actually is serving as a preparation for war, and that is what people really must get straight.

OGDEN: So the stakes are very high, and in the same broadcast yesterday, Helga LaRouche made the point that there are

ongoing investigations coming out of the House Intelligence Committee under Devin Nunes, and also the Senate Intelligence Committee under Chuck Grassley, into the role of Christopher Steele as a central figure in this entire Russiagate narrative.

As she said, this leads directly to the role of British intelligence. So, here's a second clip from yesterday's broadcast.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Yes, it is directly British intelligence. It's not "former" MI6 agent, but it is an MI6 operation, and it involves the Foreign Office of Great Britain itself, as we saw in a case which was launched by one of the Russians who were accused of hacking, who took the Steele case

to

court, and then the Foreign Office intervened directly to block

any revelations coming from the Steele operative of theirs.

Now, that it is an incredible story: It means the British have intervened, not only in the coup against the Yanukovych government, but also in the case of the coup against President Trump. That whole Russiagate as some people funnily say is a big

“regurgitated nothing-burger” – there is absolutely no substance

to it. And we should just note the fact that the continuous investigations coming from the two Houses of Congress, under the

leadership of Nunes and Grassley, they are still pointing absolutely to the coup-plotters who were involved with the British in this coup.

In the recent developments, [House Intelligence Chair] Congressman Nunes has sent out 10 or 11 other letters to officials of the existing or former government, where they have

to answer very pointed question – when did you know first about

the Steele dossier? Did you discuss it with anybody else? Did Obama know it? When did he know it? And these individuals have

to answers these questions by March 2nd, so it’s not a long-term

investigation, but it’s something extremely hot. And it’s not yet decided how this coup will go: If the Congress has the courage to go after those Obama intelligence officials who colluded with Great Britain, but if they do, a lot of people could not only lose their position, but actually end up in jail,

as some judges are now already demanding.

OGDEN: So, as Helga said, this investigation continues and

it continues to escalate. This is the question of the role of the British and their fellow-travellers in the American intelligence community in actually meddling in the US electoral

process. Chairman Devin Nunes is scheduled to appear at the CPAC

[Conservative Political Action Conference] conference today; he's

scheduled to be the closing speaker. We'll see what he has to say there, but as Helga mentioned, Nunes has continued to march

forward with Phase Two of his investigation into this entire Christopher Steele matter. He issued a series of questions; this

is letter that was just published yesterday which was sent to the

FBI and officials within the State Department. The letter is asking for questions regarding information contained in the Steele dossier, which was funded by the DNC [Democratic National

Committee] and the Clinton campaign, and used in a FISA [Foreign

Intelligence Surveillance Act] application targetting Carter Page. He notified them, as Helga mentioned, that if their responses are not received by March 2nd, which is a week from today, then subpoenas will be issued. He said, "If you do not provide timely answers on a voluntary basis, the Committee will

initiate compulsory process."

So, included in these questions is one which directly asks what did Obama know and when did he know it? So, here are a few

of the questions that are asked by Chairman Nunes [Fig. 3]:

"1. When and how did you first become aware of any of the information contained in the Steele dossier?

"2. In what form(s) was the information in the Steele

dossier presented to you? By whom? ...

"3. Who did you share this information with? When? ...

"6. When did you first learn or come to believe that the Steele dossier was funded by a Democrat-aligned entity?

"9. Was President Obama briefed on any information contained in the dossier prior to January 5, 2017?

"10. Did you discuss the information contained in the Steele dossier with any reporters or other representatives of the media?

If so, who and when?"

So clearly it is very significant that this investigation is going all the way to the top, with Obama himself being implicated. Now recall that Chairman Grassley of the Senate Intelligence Committee, has also been asking questions about what

Obama knew and when did he know it. Take the example of the very

bizarre email that was sent by Susan Rice to herself on Inauguration Day at 12:15pm on the day that President Trump was

inaugurated; literally right before she walked out of the doors

of the White House for the last time to attend this inauguration.

The email describes a January 5, 2017 Oval Office meeting between

President Obama, former FBI James Comey, former Deputy Attorney

General Sally Yates, as well as Vice President Joe Biden and Rice

herself. The email that Susan Rice sent to herself obviously has

been publicized by Chairman Grassley, and in this letter [Fig. 4]

that you're looking at, he published the relevant excerpt from this email. Again, this is Susan Rice, addressed to Susan

Rice;

12:15pm, January 20, 2017. This is what she says:

“On January 5, following a briefing by IC leadership on Russian hacking during the 2016 Presidential election, President

Obama had a brief follow-on conversation with FBI Director Jim Comey and Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates in the Oval Office.

[She mentions that Biden and herself were also present.]

“President Obama began the conversation by stressing his continued commitment to ensuring that every aspect of this issue

is handled by the Intelligence and law enforcement communities ‘by the book’. The President stressed that he is not asking about, initiating or instructing anything from a law enforcement

perspective. He reiterated that our law enforcement team needs

to proceed as it normally would by the book.

“From a national security perspective, however, President Obama said he wants to be sure that, as we engage with the incoming team, we are mindful to ascertain if there is any reason

that we cannot share information fully as it relates to Russia”.

“The President asked Comey to inform him if anything changes in the next few weeks that should affect how we share classified

information with the incoming team. Comey said he would.”

Now, what Senator Grassley asks in his open letter to Susan Rice is the following:

“It strikes us as odd that, among your activities in the final moments on the final day of the Obama administration, you

would feel the need to send yourself such an unusual email purporting to document a conversation involving President Obama

and his interactions with the FBI regarding the Trump/Russia investigation. In addition, despite your claim that President Obama repeatedly told Mr. Comey to proceed 'by the book,' substantial questions have arisen about whether officials at the FBI, as well as at the Justice Department and the State Department, actually did proceed 'by the book.'...

"4. Did anyone instruct, request, suggest, or imply that you should send yourself the aforementioned Inauguration Day email memorializing President Obama's meeting with Mr. Comey about the Trump/Russia investigation? If so, who and why?"

"12. Did President Obama have any other meetings with Mr. Comey, Ms. Yates, or other government officials about the FBI's investigation of allegations of collusion between Trump associates and Russia? If so, when did these occur, who participated, and what was discussed?"

So, these questions and these investigations are beginning to hit very close to home. Remember, Susan Rice was also caught and has admitted to requesting the unmasking of several individuals associated with the Trump campaign; Americans whose communications were collected under NSA wiretaps and surveillance. Susan Rice and other officials have now been caught on repeated occasions requesting the unmasking of these American officials; raising many questions as to what the motives were.

Now Chairman Nunes has been appearing on several talk shows and media interviews over the last several weeks. Obviously, since the publication of his memo. But he appeared last weekend on "The Full Measure" show with host Sharyl Atkinson. In that

interview, he continued to keep a laser focus. Let me just read

you a few excerpts of what Chairman Nunes had to say in that interview.

“We have a Russian Investigation going on whether or not there was collusion between any campaign and the Russians. That’s

coming to a close. We’ve never had any evidence of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians. There’s nothing there”.

“[I]n that investigation, we’ve unearthed things that are very concerning. We know that there are un-maskings that occurred

and probably were leaked to the media”. [W]hat we found was happening is, in the last administration, they were unmasking hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of American’s names. They were unmasking people for what I would say, for lack of a better

definition, were for political purposes”. [N]ames were unmasked.

And those names ended up in the newspaper.

“[I]t’s like political dirt to create a narrative and a spin with the mainstream media”. [T]here were unmaskings that we unearthed, then there are the FISA abuse that we’ve discovered.

[T]his is where the FBI and the Justice Department – because they’re involved in this FISA Abuse, because they’re the ones who

“ go before the secret court to get the warrants, they’re all involved, they’re all implicated in this”.

“It really boils down to this. You had a campaign. The Hillary Campaign and the Democratic Party went out and paid for

dirt”. Then they used that dirt and funneled it into the FBI. The FBI then used that dirt to get a warrant on a US citizen who

was part of the other campaign”. [T]o do that, it’s wrong.

"|... As it relates to Department of Justice and the FBI, if they need to be put on trial, we will put them on trial. The reason that Congress exists is to oversee these agencies that we

created. DOJ and FBI are not above the law. Congress created them, we oversee them, and we fund them. And if they're committing abuse for a secret court, getting warrants on American

citizens, you're darn right that we're going to put them on trial.

"I think people are just starting to learn now what really happened. Because as we peel more and more of this back, I think

more and more Americans get educated. And I think that they're gonna demand that changes are made."

Remember that this entire line of investigation is exactly what was suggested in the original LaRouche PAC special report.

Obviously, this special report on Mueller was published now over

six months ago. But this continues to be very timely and very relevant. An update to that report will be forthcoming, but we

have a preview now available on the website of what will be contained in that updated dossier. That preview is available under the title "The Mueller Dossier Revisited: How the British

and Obama Diddled the United States". There you can see a screen

shot [Fig. 5] from that updated preview. This is obviously available in full on the LaRouche PAC website, and we would encourage you to read it in its fullest extent. It's a fairly long update. But what I'd like to do is just read you from the

beginning of how this report is set up, a little bit of a retrospective on the effect that this Mueller dossier has had over its six-month circulation; but also the context in which

you

have to understand always the big strategic picture behind the events that are now unfolding on a day-to-day basis. So, this is

what this updated report has to say:

“On September 29, 2017, LaRouchePAC published the original version of the dossier ‘Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will do His Job If You Let Him’. To date, that dossier, now being circulated nation-wide by LaRouchePAC, represents the most thorough and the most accurate assessment as

to the character of Robert Mueller, as well as the utterly fraudulent nature of the ongoing treasonous effort to bring down

the Trump Presidency.

“This present report is an update to that dossier, with the emphasis on the dramatic significance of two documents which were

released in the first days of February. The first is the House Intelligence document known as the ‘Nunes Memo’, and the second

is the – by far more substantive – un-redacted document authored by Senators Grassley and Graham.

“We shall examine the importance of these two documents in depth, as well as significant other developments which flow from

the impact of their release. Before doing so, however, it is of

critical importance that a matter of primary overriding concern

be re-stated here, at the beginning of this update.

“The British Origin of the Coup

“Nothing of any truth about the current assault on President Trump can be understood, unless one addresses the question of *why* all of this is occurring, along with the subsumed question

of “cui bono?” This requires transcending the world of partisan politics and inside-the-beltway gossip, and the necessity for examining the *strategic* setting and implications surrounding the coup plot.

“Everything that is now transpiring must be viewed within that truthful strategic context. During the eight years of the Obama Presidency, and the prior Administration of George W. Bush,

a profound shift in U.S. strategic policy took place. Obama, working closely with – and often under the direction of – the British, committed the United States to enforcing a global policy

of Anglo-American hegemonism, what is sometimes referred to as a

‘uni-polar world’. This took the form of escalating provocations

against Russia, and more recently the targeting of China.

Currently, this imperial Anglo-American faction is determined to

thwart China’s gigantic Belt and Road Initiative infrastructure

development of Eurasia, Africa, Southwest Asia (the Middle East),

and nations in Central and South America. This largest infrastructure development project in human history now involves

more than 68 countries.

“For the British, such geo-political designs are nothing new. British strategic policy since before World War I has been

based on geopolitics. Under the theories of Lord Halford Mackinder, completely embraced by today’s Anglo-American foreign

policy establishment, control of Eurasia dictates strategic mastery of the world. China is now establishing vast transportation and other infrastructure throughout Eurasia, a

region which Anglo-American policy up until now had reserved as a primitive looting ground.

“Unable to break from imperial axioms and join China’s offer of win-win cooperation, let alone offer a viable alternative model which promotes the general welfare, Barack Obama and the British adopted a strategy of geopolitical containment and provocation, a New Cold War policy. It began with the Anglo-American coup in Ukraine in 2014, pushing NATO right up to

Russia’s borders, and involves hostile encirclement strategies against both Russia and China, employing color revolutions, economic sanctions, overt economic, cyber, and information warfare, provocative military maneuvers, development of new nuclear and other warfare capacities, and military support of insurgents and terrorists in states friendly and/or trading with

Russia or China, such as Iran and Syria. All of this, of course,

threatens the extinction of the human race.”

Now, the final aspect of that memo which is now available goes through the fact that with Trump’s election, this entire agenda was derailed. As it says:

“In November 2016, it was the intention of Obama and the British that Hillary Clinton would continue this dangerous geo-political gambit. Donald Trump’s victory in that election stopped this mad drive to war just as it was turning very hot.

“As we detailed in our original Mueller dossier, ‘Russiagate,’ – which has roiled our nation since Summer 2016, has driven most members of Congress into a McCarthyite insanity

so severe that you can literally picture them braying at the Moon

at night, and has critically undermined Donald Trump’s Presidency

– has absolutely nothing to do with any hostile action by Russia

against the United States. Its origins are to be found in the desperation of the British and American establishments, among individuals and interests who are frantic to re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama Administration.”

I would strongly encourage you to read the entirety of this report, which is available on the LaRouche PAC website now.

It's

crucial, but let me just pick up on that picture, which was just

laid out in that prefatory section. As is very apparent from developments in the recent week and a half, these frantic attempts to impose the re-impose the strategic outlook of the Obama administration, which the Hillary Clinton administration clearly would have continued full-bore; this attempt to re-impose

that track is now in full swing. One only has to look at the escalations that have occurred in Ukraine, the escalations which

have occurred in Syria, the calls for a response to that, and absolutely the very heated rhetoric and hysterical speeches which

were delivered at the so-called Munich Security Conference which

just occurred this week. We saw just a raft of anti-Russia, anti-China speeches, one after another after another, attacking

the One Belt, One Road policy as an imperialistic scheme; trying

to identify a full spectrum intelligence operation that's being

allegedly run by the Chinese against every nation in the West, and so forth and so on.

In contrast to that, the spokesperson from China at the Munich Security Conference, very calmly and very undefensively laid out the picture of what the New Paradigm of win-win relations that China is offering to the world really entails.

That was originally elaborated by Xi Jinping at his speech at

the

United Nations General Assembly several years ago, but it involves non-confrontation, non-meddling in foreign countries' affairs, an understanding of differences in approach and differences in political and cultural systems. But overall, not

an attempt to impose one nation or one system's view of the world

on other nations in a sort of unipolar or hegemonic way; but a way to say, "Let's take our differences and use them to our collective advantage. Let's put together a system of shared, mutual benefit under a vision of common destiny for mankind."

Which is the way the Chinese have put it. But this is characterized as a win-win approach, as opposed to the Cold War

mentality of winner take all, zero-sum game type of geopolitics.

So, Helga LaRouche in her broadcast yesterday strongly encouraged people to actually read the text of the speeches from

the Munich Security Conference, both the anti-China, anti-Russia

war-mongering speeches so you can see for yourself just how rabid

and hysterical this prewar propaganda actually is. But also, go

and read that speech from the representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, and you can see how the Chinese are responding.

This is the time where we desperately need a New Paradigm of international relations; and it comes under the form of that win-win relationship. The way that you can see that playing out

on the ground, not from 300,000 feet with rhetoric; but really look at the reality on the ground, in places such as Africa, Central and South America, countries in Eurasia. These countries

are already benefitting from the infrastructure, the modern technology and the infrastructure which is being brought to those countries by China and the One Belt, One Road initiative. It's high time that the United States and other countries in Western Europe come to the table and say what China is doing is very good. This is for the benefit of these countries, and instead of trying to shut this down and beat the drums of war, we should finally reciprocate what China is doing. We should come to the table with intentions of good will, and we should join together and as a community of nations, build this future which will be for the common benefit of all.

So, the LaRouche PAC class series, which we've been promoting now for several weeks, and is already ongoing, could not be more timely and more urgent. This is titled, "The End of Geopolitics; What Is the New Paradigm?" You can register, if you haven't already, at discover.larouchepac.com or at the link that you see here on the screen – <http://lpac.co/np2018>. Again, there are public classes which have been available on YouTube; two so far. The first inaugural speech by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and then the second follow-up by Harley Schlanger last Saturday; which was "What Is Geopolitics? Part I, the History". That was very informative and very in-depth. But there are also aspects of this class series that you cannot access unless you are a registered participant; such as the discussion period which

will

occur tomorrow, which will only be open to those who are registered for this class series. So, we strongly encourage you,

if you haven't yet, to register. Also, to encourage other people

that you know to register for this class series at that link that's on the screen and to become active participants in this entire series.

The time has come. We must take very seriously what's at stake here in this current unfolding battle over the soul of the

United States and the soul of the US Presidency. The ugly nature

of this operation and this apparatus continues to come to light,

but we have to continue – as the LaRouche PAC dossier does very

well – to put it into its proper strategic context and to understand *cui bono?* and what is the strategic context for this

unprecedented assault on the US democratic system and the US Presidency that we now see ongoing.

So, thank you very much for joining me here today. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do.

Forsvarerne af det 'Gamle Paradigme' angriber Kina på München Sikkerhedskonference. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 22. feb., 2018

Så man skal forstå dette som førkrigs-propaganda, og folk falder let for ting, som er i de gængse medier, hvor de hellere skulle tænke sig om to gange. Det, som Rusland og Kina gør, er, at de er i færd med at opbygge en helt anden model for internationale relationer, der er specifikt modelleret efter ikkeindblanding og respekt for det andets lands anderledes samfundssystem. Derfor er denne propaganda simpelt hen et forfærdelig farligt scenarie med løgne, der faktisk tjener som en forberedelse til krig, og det er, hvad folk virkelig må forstå.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Seneste fupnummer fra Mueller, trængt op i en krog: Opgylpet Nothingburger

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 17. feb., 2018 – Sidste fredag så vi det seneste udslag af spil for galleriet fra den særlige anklager Robert Muellers side, med dennes annoncering af, at der var indgivet anklageskrifter mod 13 russiske borgere og tre enheder, inklusive Internet Research Agency, for angivelig »indblanding« i de amerikanske valg i 2016.

Men hele denne episode, der har domineret overskrifterne i de fleste vestlige medier, er en eneste, stor, genopgyldt Nothingburger, som man siger i folkeligt sprogbrug.

For det første, så blev hele denne angivelige sag bredt dækket i medierne for år tilbage. Der er intet nyt i anklagerne, som i sig selv er skrevet og formuleret som en pressemeddelelse snarere end et juridisk dokument. Vi anbefaler vore læsere at læse artiklen i det kommende *EIR*-nummer, »Robert Mueller II Indicates Some Russian Social Media Trolls: Indictment Scams the American People«, af Barbara Boyd, forfatter af LaRouche PAC's nu berømte **Mueller-dossier**.

For det andet, så befinder de anklagede personer sig i Rusland, der ikke har nogen udvisningsaftale med USA, og de vil derfor aldrig blive retsforfulgt i USA. Dette er meget belejligt for hr. Mueller, eftersom han ikke behøver fremlægge nogen kendsgerning for at styrke sin sag – eftersom det er mere end sandsynligt, at han ikke har nogen sag.

For det tredje, og det vigtigste, så er hele dette cirkus beregnet på at skulle fjerne opmærksomheden fra den kendsgerning, at det er Mueller, hans FBI- og DOJ-

medsammensvorne, samt Obamas Hvide Hus (i.e., Obamaregeringens folk) der alle agerer under marchorder og overvågning fra britisk efterretning, der er blevet taget på fersk gerning i et statskupforsøg imod USA's valgte præsident, Donald Trump, på vegne af en fremmed magt. Deres kriminelle team, såsom »pit bull« Andy Weissmann, bliver yderligere afsløret med hver dag, der går. Og den amerikanske befolkning er i stigende grad oprørte over det faktum, at FBI har haft for travlt med at iscenesætte et kup til at følge op på ledetråde, som de var i besiddelse af, for at stoppe skolemassakrer såsom den, der netop fandt sted i Florida.

Den russiske regering er klar over, hvordan landet ligger i Washington, D.C. Udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov sagde til Euronews den 16. feb., at »Demokraterne kan ikke forlige sig med nederlaget [i 2016], som fuldstændigt tog dem på sengen, og nu går de af deres vej for at forpeste tilværelsen for præsident Trump ... eftersom han er en leder, der kommer fra uden for systemet ... og som mere end en gang har bekræftet sin oprigtige hensigt« om at have respektfulde og produktive relationer med Rusland. Lavrov afviste selvfølgelig Muellers seneste anklageskifter imod de 13 russere og bemærkede, at de, der arbejder på hele Russiagate-operationen, »har trængt sig selv op i en krog gennem erklæringer om præcise data om russisk indblanding«, der ikke eksisterer.

Mueller og briterne er virkelig trængt op i en krog, men de er endnu ikke helt besejret, og som et resultat udgør strategiske provokationer – såsom forsøget på at dele Syrien og direkte militære trusler imod Rusland og Kina – fortsat en meget reel fare.

Denne fortsatte fare understreger den strategiske betydning af den åbning, der er skabt i USA af den nationale debat over præsident Trumps infrastrukturplan, hvor **Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Love«** for økonomisk og videnskabelig udvikling kan placeres i centrum for en diskussion om politikken i hele den bankerotte, transatlantiske sektor.

Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen Webcast, 16. feb., 2018

Gæst Paul Gallagher.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen«. Jeg har inviteret Paul Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for Executive Intelligence Review, på showet i dag, og vi er glade for at du tager dig tid til at komme, Paul. Vi har nu mulighed for at få en meget seriøs og nøgtern diskussion om LaRouches økonomiske program: De »Fire Love«, og lige nu er dørene vidt åbne.

Med udgivelsen af den såkaldte »Udkast til Lovgivning for Genopbygning af Amerikas Infrastruktur« – Dette er programmet fra Trumps Hvide Hus, som blev sendt over til Kongressen. Det blev udgivet mandag. Alt imens indholdet af denne rapport er, for at sige det mildt, uheldigt – det har Wall Streets fingeraftryk over det hele, alene det, at dette forslag er kommet frem; men det er rent ud sagt en total taber, der har galvaniseret diskussionen nationalt, og det er virkelig begyndt at katalysere kongresmedlemmer på begge sider midtergangen til at begynde at tænke over spørgsmålet på en meget mere seriøs måde: Hvordan finansierer man infrastruktur? Hvis vi taler om \$1,5 billion, hvor skal de komme fra?

(Her følger engelsk udskrift):

And this includes, frankly, Trump himself. As President Trump said in the Letter of Transmission, that was sent over as the opening to this legislative proposal, he said: "Our nation's infrastructure is in an unacceptable state of disrepair, which damages our country's competitiveness and our citizens' quality of life. For too long, lawmakers have invested in infrastructure inefficiently, ignored critical needs, and allowed it to deteriorate. As a result, the United States has fallen further and further behind other countries. It is time to give Americans the working, modern infrastructure they deserve... My administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact a law that will enable America's builders to construct the new, modern, and efficient infrastructure throughout our beautiful land."

Now, on Tuesday, President Trump held an open, televised roundtable with different Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, and this was ostensibly to discuss the aluminum, steel industries and trade policy around that, but during that roundtable, which was televised, the discussion of the infrastructure program came up. And I'd like to just play a short clip from that roundtable; this is an exchange between President Trump and Sen. Sherrod Brown [D] from Ohio, and then Senator Blumenthal [D-CT] also gets in on this. And what you hear is that President Trump says, look, I want to have a bipartisan plan. Come back to me with a counterproposal.

What

we put out was an opening bid, but I really want a bipartisan plan. I'm ready, willing and able.

So, here's a clip from that roundtable:

[start video]

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I actually think that we can go bipartisan on infrastructure, maybe even more so, than we can on DACA. ... On infrastructure which is the purpose of what we're doing tonight, come back with a proposal. We put in our bid – come back with a proposal. We have a lot of people that are great Republicans that want something to happen. We have to rebuild our country. I said yesterday, we've spent {\$7 trillion} – when

I say "spent," and I mean wasted – not to mention all of the lives, most importantly and everything else – but we've spent \$7

trillion as of about two months ago, in the Middle East – \$7 trillion. And if you want to borrow two dollars to build a road

someplace, including your state, the great state of Ohio, if you

want to build a road, if you want to build a tunnel, or a bridge,

or fix a bridge because so many of them are in bad shape, you can't do it. And yet, we spent \$7 trillion in the Middle East.

Explain that one. [crosstalk]

SEN. SHERROD BROWN: I've love a bipartisan – we have a bipartisan proposal. We can [crosstalk] dollars on it in infrastructure. We're glad to work together on a real infrastructure bill with real dollars, plus what you can leverage

in the communities and private sector.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Do a combination.

SENATOR BROWN: It needs real dollars.

President Trump: I would love to have you get back to us quickly, 'cause we can do this quickly and we have to rebuild our country. We have to rebuild our roads and our bridges and our tunnels, so the faster you get back, the faster we can move. Focus on document this week, if you don't mind, right? But the faster you get back, the faster we move.

SEN. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: I come back to Senator Brown's point, I think there's a opportunity for real bipartisanship here, in these two areas.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I agree, and I'd like you to come back with a suggestion on infrastructure in the plan, and I think that's a bipartisan plan. I really would like to see you come back with a counterproposal on the infrastructure. I think we're going to get that done. I really believe that's – we're going to get a lot of Democrats, we're going to get a lot of Republicans. We're going to get it done. It's something we should do. We have to fix our country: We have to fix our roads and our tunnels and bridges and everything, so, if you can work together on that, and I am ready, willing and able, on infrastructure – that is such a natural for us to get done. And I think we could probably do it. Thank you all very much. [End video]

OGDEN: So as you can see, asking them to come back with a counterproposal, he said, this is our opening bid, but the point is clear: Now is the time for us to mobilize like never

before,

to put the LaRouche plan on the table. {This} is the counterproposal.

Let me put on the screen here: first we've got our Campaign To Win the Future. This is obviously the national statement of

intent for the elections in 2018. LaRouche PAC is mobilizing a

national movement and galvanizing discussion around this program.

And then the content of that campaign can be seen on the next slide, this is "The Four Laws To Save the United States: The Economics Principles Necessary for a Recovery – Why the United States Must Join the New Silk Road" and this contains full elaboration of Lyndon LaRouche's four economic laws.

So, I know that Paul is very short on time, and I would just like to ask you: Please address what the situation is now in Washington. What's coming out of this release of this so-called

legislative proposal? And what actually has to be done?

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thanks, Matt. My first reaction, when the White House plan was released – I call it the "White House plan," not the Trump plan, but the White House plan – when it was released, was that closed a certain door of people in elected

offices around the country and in Washington, constantly saying

"what is the White House going to come up with? what is the White House going to come up with? what are they going to give

us in the way of what they can get started towards infrastructure

investments? because we desperately need it?" And when it finally came out, and it was very, very, very lacking – as you said, a Wall Street plan – that closed a certain door, and immediately, thus, opened another one.

OK, now they have come out with that. Now, we have to come out with something. It's up to the rest of us, particularly those in elected office, but all of us who are active in fighting

for this: It's up to us now to shape the alternative, because this one just isn't going to work. And it's good to see that that definitely includes the President – that view. He, on another occasion, immediately after the plan was rolled out on Monday, he said that compared to the tax legislation and the military spending increases and so forth, that this infrastructure plan that the White House has put out, was really

quite unimportant. A rather surprising thing for him to say. But it indicated, when it was followed the very next day by the

comment you just saw, "give me an alternative," and then the very

day after that, in another meeting with members of Congress, when, as soon as he was prompted in any way by any of them, he came out very strongly for increasing the Federal gasoline tax by

25 cents a gallon, and applying that through the Highway Trust Fund, to infrastructure investment – not at all something which

is part of the White House plan, so-called; and not part of the

Republican leadership's plan at all.

But when he was asked, he went with that. He hasn't said this publicly, but a number of senators and representatives who

were at that second meeting, have reported it publicly in the same way. It's clear that he did say that he was for that increase in the gas tax, and as he said, he would take the political heat for backing it as President, if they would go forward with it.

So you've had, in rapid succession, a number of indications that this plan, as poor as it was that came out from the White

House, is not in fact the President's plan, and it simply closes

the door on all this waiting, and now says, where are the alternatives?

And that is very definitely what is in the LaRouche Four Laws, is the one alternative to this that will work.

Let me get into this in another way, unless you want to break it up, Matt. And if you have questions, please, interrupt.

But I wanted to read a piece that was written just two days ago by a Chinese scholar John Gong; he's a very prominent professor University of International Business and Economics in

Beijing; and he's a former executive editor of the {Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies}.

OGDEN: We actually have a slide with the title of that article which was written for China Global Television Network (CGTN), "Make America Great Again – With Chinese Money." And I

can read some of the quotes that people can see on the screen, and then maybe you can address what the content is.

This is what he had to say: "Trump is absolutely right that Americas crippled bridges, potholed highways, and crooked railways cannot wait any longer. America needs to be great again.

The only question is, where is the money coming from?" And then

later in the article he said, "I have a great idea. Bank of China

and other major banks from China are now flush with dollar cash

and other dollar-denominated liquid assets, totaling over \$3 trillion, mostly in the form of holdings in U.S. Treasury bills

and bonds. This money can be readily used for Chinese investors

to participate in America's infrastructure boom. By that I mean

Chinese investors can participate in those infrastructure projects as active equity investors, and maybe contractors or suppliers at the same time.

"Call it the Belt and Road. Call it

America-belt-America-road. I don't care, as long as China's current

account trade surplus can be somehow transformed into a capital

account stock, in the form of money invested in America as permanent equity shareholders, and more importantly permanent

stakeholders of a stable and prosperous Sino-U.S. economic relationship. This could be a win-win mode for both countries."

[https://news.cgtn.com/news/79596a4d33677a6333566d54/share_p.html]

So that's Dr. John Gong.

GALLAGHER: Now, that's very important, in the way it is formulated, in the precision of it. He's talking about Treasury

holdings, – he's not the first Chinese official to do this. In

fact, a year ago, in late January of 2017, Ding Xuedong, the then-chairman of the Chinese Investment Corp., which is one of their two big sovereign wealth funds, made essentially the same

proposal. He said, we have such and such a volume of long-term

U.S. Treasury holdings, they're not earners, their interest rates

are very low, their return is very low; we would like to trade them for a long-term investment in a U.S. infrastructure bill, as

he put it. And he, at the time, estimated that really, the need

for investment in the United States for new infrastructure, was
{\$8 trillion}, a figure which may seem impossibly large to many,
but actually isn't.

[http://www.larouche.com/pr/2017/170116_chinese_invest.html
]

Nonetheless, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has written in articles which have been published in the Chinese press, she's frequently interviewed and quoted there, – she has written exactly this proposal in articles which have been published there. I have presented exactly this idea to Chinese officials in Washington.

This is part of LaRouche's Four Laws.

But to start with, the first action implied by his four actions that have to be taken legislatively and from an executive standpoint, is the restoration of the Glass-Steagall Act and the breakup of the Wall Street banks and the hiving off of all of the casino speculative investment vehicles, special purpose vehicles and all of that, in order to protect and use the commercial banking system for investments.

You cannot get to real, major infrastructure renewal without doing that, and you could see this in the meeting that you played the clip from. There was at least one representative from Missouri, who brought up the issue, when the discussion was about trade, and specifically whether there might be tariffs against aluminum imports from China, he brought up the fact that there is a grave lack of capacity to produce sufficient aluminum for industry in the United States, and where is that lack coming

from? The lack of power supplies. So that, this is an infrastructure question, although if you ask the simple question,

“Is there an apparent sufficient amount of kilowatt-hours per year per capita in the United States?” Yes, there is. But is there sufficient, reliable electrical power supply – constantly

online, reliable, electrical power supply – for an expansion of

industry? The answer would in many cases be, “no.” And that was

what he was bringing up, in particular with respect to more aluminum plants in the United States. You have a grave inability

to produce enough power, particularly since the fiasco of electricity deregulation out on the West Coast 15 years ago: That

deprived the aluminum industry and shut down a very significant amount of it.

Now, if there’s going to be that kind of investment in infrastructure across the country, it’s not going to be one, or

two, or three, or four, very famous big projects, like the renovation of the whole Northeast rail corridor of Amtrak, and the bridges and the tunnels in New York and so forth. It’s not

going to be simply those things. It’s going to be, at many, many

levels around the country, the production of enough clean water

supplies, the production of enough electrical power supplies; the

replacement and renovation – mostly replacement – of the river navigation systems, locks and dams, and many of these things.

And for those, the commercial banks have to be ready to lend, because it takes a lot of employment, a lot of contracting, a

lot

of local borrowing: The banks have to be ready to lend and if you allow them to stay the big commercial banks, and the mid-size

regional banks – if you allow them to stay in the Wall Street casino, that's where they'll stay. If you say, "no, your business as a commercial bank is lending," then you have a credit

channel through the banking system through which national credit

can flow, and cooperate in this kind of thing.

So it starts with restoring bank separation under

Glass-Steagall. We're going to have a group of elected officials

from Italy in a couple of months come over and help us organize

in Washington on this, because they're fighting for it in Italy

at the national and also the local level.

Then, the specific second law of LaRouche, a national credit institution, which is able to produce large volumes of productive

credit for productive employment of the people, and for increased

productivity. And that is where not only the White House plan,

but many other plans that have been put forward, are really completely inadequate, where we do have to talk about several trillions of dollars at least of investment, and the way to do

that, is exactly the way that was reflected in that comment by Dr. Gong: That is, there is a lot of long-term Treasury debt held

out there; three major holders of this long-term Treasury debt,

which totals \$7.5-\$8 trillion, are the commercial banks of the United States, again, which hold it in their reserves and all

their excess reserves which are very large right now; second, Japan, which holds more than \$1 trillion in primarily long-term

U.S. Treasury debt; thirdly, China, which actually holds now somewhat more than Japan; about \$1.2 trillion of the same kind of

debt. Those are potential shareholders, equity holders, subscribers of that Treasury debt into a new bank created by Congress for the purpose of generating this kind of credit. That is exactly how we have proposed and circulated and organized that this is the way to form – without a tremendous amount of new borrowing – to form a sufficiently large national

bank for infrastructure; essentially by swapping existing long-term Treasury debt holdings for equity in such a new national bank created by Congress with a guarantee from the Treasury for the payment of the dividends on that equity. And with taxes – this is not free; it's never free, – but with taxes assigned to make sure that those dividends can be paid. That's where the increase in the Federal gasoline tax and potentially the use of other what you would call infrastructure

excise taxes, like the port excise tax and the navigation tax on

the locks and dams, that's where these would come in. Because if

you simply go and raise the gas tax by 25 cents and spend the money for infrastructure projects, it will not produce nearly, nearly enough. But if you use it in this way as leverage to guarantee the equity in a new national bank in exactly the way that we're seeing reflected in that proposal, that article from

Dr. Gong, then it'll work. As I said, he's not the only person,

not only among leading Chinese thinkers about this, but also from

Japan, there's the same kind of positive view of this idea.

Potentially, there you have it – an infrastructure bank. Then you have to go on and what are you going to use that credit for? It can't be used simply to repair roads and repair bridges. There are entirely new areas of technological and scientific breakthroughs which will raise productivity in the economy to a far greater extent. One of them that we identify is that a crash program is necessary to develop not only thermonuclear fusion electric energy, but the plasma technologies of infrastructure, which will probably come from such a crash program even before commercial nuclear fusion electricity arrives. We will have plasma technologies being spun off from that crash program, which will address themselves exactly to the production of the kinds of capacities that have died out in deindustrialization in the United States. But they'll do it at a higher level of technology. Those kinds of investments, are one of the Four Laws that LaRouche has called for. Also, a big increase in NASA's capabilities, going back to the Apollo Project level of effort by NASA to really go back to the Moon; industrialize, develop the Moon, develop the raw materials there, including for fusion energy production. And from there, go deeper into the Solar System and ultimately into the galaxy. This is the kind of science driver which leads up-shifts in productivity in industry. And infrastructure is really the way that these up-shifts get introduced to the economy. For example, in a high-speed rail system of cars using magnetic levitation and similar technologies, this is the way it gets introduced.

So, that opening from the President is very important. Yesterday you had comments which I think are very significant from the two leaders of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee – the Republican chairman William Shuster of Pennsylvania, the Democratic ranking member Peter DeFazio – they are normally quite a bit at odds. But in interviews yesterday which were reported today, they were reporting that they are already jointly working on a legislative alternative to exactly what you saw the President asking for there. A legislative alternative again, with real Federal dollars; the language which Senator Brown used – actually it was Senator Wyden was the other Senator – real Federal dollars. An alternative to present which the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is where legislation along these lines will have to start. So, you're seeing that; you're seeing the gas tax being discussed very widely, including by those same two leaders of that committee. You're already seeing an infrastructure bank act in the House – HR547 – of Representative Rosa DeLauro, Democrat from Connecticut, which has the backing of fully half of the Democratic Caucus in the House and is not a national infrastructure bank which would operate in the way that we've described and therefore would not be as large or as capable. But nonetheless, it's legislation which in my view is quite similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which operated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration and did so much to recover the country and then to lead the

mobilization for the war and through the war in the 1940s. So that is also something definitely within the purview of LaRouche's Four Laws.

OGDEN: The idea of national banking is, I think, really the critical idea; and it takes us obviously directly back to Alexander Hamilton. If you look at Hamilton's view on infrastructure, the idea of public infrastructure is very much an American idea, and is a major pillar of the American System. Hamilton's emphasis on the necessity for the rapid upgrading of the national infrastructure, the ports and dredging the harbors and things like this, what was called "internal improvements." But this idea of public infrastructure has an American idea to it. In fact, it was written directly into the Constitution in the form of the General Welfare. There were huge fights, including Hamilton's defense of the Constitutionality of a national bank against Thomas Jefferson around this idea of the General Welfare. I know you have to go, so maybe one more aspect that you can address before you leave, and then I can conclude the remaining portions of the show on my own. But just on this subject of the idea of the public good, the United States used to be the world's gold standard, in great modern infrastructure, public infrastructure. You can see that obviously by what Franklin Roosevelt did during the New Deal. Nations around the world were banging on our door to try to imitate what we accomplished with the Tennessee Valley Authority and so forth and so on. But now, the gold standard is swiftly being set by China and what China has done in an unparalleled way. Create this

amazing public infrastructure in a very rapid and swift manner.

Two things I think maybe could be addressed in what we need to now learn from China or relearn in terms of what we used to be committed to, is: 1) the policy approach that has made this possible in China; but also, 2) the philosophy that China is clearly committed to when it comes to this idea of the public good, the common good, or what we call in American Constitutional

language, the General Welfare. Maybe you can address that just

briefly before you leave, Paul.

GALLAGHER: There was, in the 19th Century, the American Whig and then Republican leaders were all very conscious Hamiltonians. They realized that they were attempting to develop

the country, and they were doing it – at least a lot of the time

– extraordinarily successfully with a commitment to the “internal improvements” what we call infrastructure, but the internal improvements, the national credit provision, the protection of industry; which came from Alexander Hamilton. But his overriding premise was actually none of those particular policies, but rather his stating against the tide of

opinion in the 1790s when he was Treasury Secretary and the decade before and after. He definitely took on the tide of opinion that the United States was going to be an agricultural country, a country of yeoman farmers with all of their well-known

virtues and so on and so forth. He said that the wealth of a country is found in the inventive qualities of its people, and in

the freedom and opportunity that they have to turn their inventive qualities into enterprise. And he really was responsible for the emergence of the first banks of the United

States; not only the First Bank of the United States, the first national bank, but also the first private banks of the United States, of which there were very few at that time. He saw the creation of a national bank as essentially the necessary link or liaison between the actions of the government to assist the economy and the actions of the private banks; that this was the necessary way, in which they should be related. But his principle was that the mind of the individual and the freedom of the individual and opportunity to make that into enterprise, that that was what defined the ability to produce the wealth of a country and that the wealth of a country was produced within it; it was not gained by trading with other countries – fairly, freely or otherwise. It was gained primarily by producing the wealth which the inventiveness of the people and the resources of the country made possible. And that was the function of protection when it was used, but of course, Hamilton favored more what we would call industrial subsidies than he did what we call tariffs. So that, right through Abraham Lincoln, was the creed of the great leaders of the United States in the 19th Century and considerably thereafter. We became the greatest industrial nation on Earth that way. Franklin Roosevelt revived that general outlook, although he did so without the creation of a national bank, really because of what he was working with in Congress. Otherwise, he might have preferred to do that. But he did it through such institutions

as
the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the TVA, which
became
wonders of the world. We have not really improved on that
much
in the 70-80 years since. But that idea, Hamilton's ideas
spread
very rapidly through Friedrich List, who spent a lot of time
in
the United States and was a leading Hamiltonian in the 1820s
and
1830s, and then was in the middle of the unification of
Germany
for the first time in the Customs Union of Germany in the
middle
of the 19th Century. This spread through Bismarck's policies,
who knew that he was a Hamiltonian, later in the 19th Century.
They spread through the Japanese adopting and learning a lot
of
the works of Hamilton; late in the 19th Century inviting
Hamiltonian economists from the United States to come over and
advise them. This kept being repeated in Korea again. China
has
taken this far beyond, because as you said, they're not only
applying those policies, but they're also as they always say
doing them with Chinese characteristics. Particularly now
with
Xi Jinping as the President of China, he has really defined
and
enshrined in their Constitution the principle of what a
country's
leadership is judged for is its ability to strive for the
common
welfare, the common aims of the population; what we call in
the
Constitution, the General Welfare. That has really had a very
distinctive effect on Chinese policy in the country and also

on

the policy of the Belt and Road Initiative which Xi Jinping launched, but was really already underway before he made the formal speech three and a half years ago. Already the investments by big Chinese commercial banks outside China, in these projects of energy, mining, but also a lot of infrastructure projects. These big investments were already underway in 2011, 2012; then he made the announcement in 2013, which was so very close to the policy of the World Land-Bridge which had been promoted by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche since the later 1980s. And since that time, that has really been recognized in China; they call Helga the Silk Road Lady. This policy of the common welfare is clearly one reflected in the way

that they've eliminated almost entirely down to the last few tens

of millions of people, they've almost entirely eradicated extreme

poverty in China. I just heard the World Bank chairman the day

before yesterday praising that to the skies and saying it's the

one model for the world. He said the World Bank has been trying

to do this for so many decades, to eradicate poverty, without making too much progress. China has done it, and now they are seeking to help do it in Africa and other places. They want to

invest in the Middle East in reconstruction. But this is really

the test that you are acting for the general good, for the common

welfare, which is what our Constitution commits us to.

So, in that sense, they've gone beyond, and in the process, really developed a lot of technological breakthroughs in infrastructure; and that's where you find them. That's where Roosevelt found them. The projects of the 1930s, which many

people think of as just creating a lot of work for people, and building a lot of airports and roads and bridges and things like

that; those projects – especially the hydro-electric projects and especially the Tennessee Valley Authority – were technological breakthroughs at the time. They built dams, navigation systems, hydropower systems technologically in ways which not only hadn't been done, but had been denied that they could be done even right up to that time. John F Kennedy spoke

about this later, that experts were saying that you couldn't build dams that were simultaneously for water management, for navigation, and for hydropower. The TVA did 57 such dams.

So,

they completely transformed an area of the country. These breakthroughs were made in all of this infrastructure building in

such a way, that the productivity of the U.S. economy leaped up in

the 1930s at the fastest rate of the last 150 years. A close second was the 1940s, including the war mobilization.

So that's what China is experiencing now, as they make these kinds of investments; and they're doing it with a very common welfare orientation.

OGDEN: Wonderful! So, thank you very much, Paul. I'm going to let you go before we finish the remainder of our show.

But I think you've made it very clear that we are uniquely positioned to inform and ultimately shape this counterproposal and what must ultimately become the infrastructure and general economic policy of this Presidency. So, I know we have a lot of

work to do. Thank you for joining us, Paul.

GALLAGHER: Thank you. I'm sure you'll talk about the necessity to bring this up from the bottom as well; from the

local elected officials, from the state legislatures in particular and apply it to the election campaign. I think it's probably true what Chairman Shuster said, which is that work on this legislation will be going on until the summer. I think that's definitely true. It will become a part of the election campaign, no question. If we can get candidates out there and local elected officials out there who are for the Four Laws, we're going to shape this. So, thanks for the opportunity and having me on, and have a good time.

OGDEN: Thank you, and we'll talk to you again soon. What Paul said is absolutely correct. This is the ultimate principle or thought behind the campaign to win the future. This is the LaRouche PAC election mobilization in 2018. We've already had a number of state legislators endorse this campaign. We're really on the ground in various places, including in West Virginia; doing some very significant meetings with people who are involved in the China-West Virginia deals. We've also mobilized in a very big way in the Midwest, which was key to the Trump election victory. We know that these former industrial states really are the most significant in swinging these elections and creating the constituency blocs around this idea of the LaRouche Four Economic Laws and everything that you just heard Paul go through. This is the urgent necessity as we mobilize around this kind of program. I think everything that you just heard from Paul, makes it

very

clear that we are uniquely well-positioned to shape this entire

discussion. I think the opportunity is even greater now than it

was previously.

Now, let me just go over a few things that I think will make it very clear to you that there is an opportunity for a moment of

awakening, you could say, among people who have recognized that

everything that we've been committed to for the last several decades up to this point has completely failed. There were two

very informative or entertaining articles over the last week and

a half, which point to exactly this; indicate exactly this opportunity for people to perhaps open their minds and begin a more sober and serious discussion around the true principles of

economics. One of these is an article which appeared in Bloomberg, this was {Bloomberg Business Week} I believe. The title of this article was "What if China Is Exempt from the Laws

of Economics?" This is by a fellow named Michael Schuman, but the subtitle is "Beijing's policymakers seem to be doing a lot of

things right – and that may upend much of basic economic thinking, especially our faith in the power of free markets."

So, here are a couple of excerpts from that article. He says:

"Over my two decades of writing about economics, I've devised a list of simple maxims that I've found generally hold true....

"But recently, my faith in this corpus of collected wisdom has been badly shaken. By China.

"The more I apply my rules of economics to China, the more

they seem to go awry. China should be mired in meager growth, even gripped by financial crisis, according to my maxims. But obviously it's not. In fact, much of what's going on right now in

that country runs counter to what we know – or think we know – about economics. Simply, if Beijing's policymakers are right, then a lot of basic economic thinking is wrong – especially our

certainty in the power of free markets, our ingrained bias against state intervention, and our ideas about fostering innovation and entrepreneurship.

“On the surface, that probably sounds ridiculous. How could one country possibly defy the laws that have governed economies

everywhere else?...

“Yet as China marches forward, we can no longer dismiss the possibility that it's rewriting the rulebook. Beijing's policymakers are just plain ignoring what most economists would

recommend at this point in its development. And, so far, they're

getting away with it....

“... Perhaps China really is refashioning capitalism.

“Perhaps. I, for one, am still clinging to my maxims....

“... Maybe my rules of economics will hold firm after all.

But thanks to China, I'm prepared to edit them.”

Now, it's not that China is rewriting the rule book. I think that what you just heard from Paul is that it's the West,

it's the United States under the influence of British free market

ideology; this free-market school economics. It's the United States and the West which have been playing by the wrong rulebook

for decades, if not generations. We've neglected the rulebook that we originally wrote. It was Alexander Hamilton, it was our

first Treasury Secretary; that's why it's called the American System of economics. Other countries have applied these principles of Hamiltonian economics and experienced the same phenomenal growth that we experienced under the influence of Hamiltonian policy. That is exactly what China is experiencing right now. It's leaving these economists scratching their heads, but perhaps they merely have to open a few history books. I think as you can tell from that Bloomberg article, it's beginning to dawn on people. "Gee! Maybe we've been wrong. Maybe we've been duped by this British free trade, free market ideology. Perhaps that's why our economies are in shambles right now."

Here's another article. This is in the {New York Times Magazine}. It came out earlier this week. This one is very interesting and goes through a lot of the history you just heard

Paul elaborate on. This is called "The Rise of China and the Fall of the 'Free Trade' Myth." The subhead is "China's economic success lays bare an uncomfortable historical truth. No one who preaches free trade really practices it." So, here's an excerpt

from the article:

"[T]o grasp China's economic achievement, and its ramifications, it is imperative to ask: Why has a market economy directed by a Communist state become the world's second-largest?

Or, to rephrase the question: Why shouldn't it have? Why shouldn't China's rise have happened the way it did, with state-led economic planning, industrial subsidies and little or no regard for the rules of 'free trade'?...

“Indeed, economic history reveals that great economic powers have always become great because of activist states. Regardless of the mystical properties claimed for it, the invisible hand of self-interest depends on the visible and often heavy hand of government. To take only one instance, British gunboats helped impose free trade on 19th-century China – a lesson not lost on the Chinese... The philosophical father of economic protectionism is, in fact, Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the American financial system, whose pupils included the Germans, the Japanese and, indirectly, the Chinese.”

After some history, he lays out the case of Germany, and this one is interesting to focus on. He says:

“... Unified in 1871, Germany was scrambling to catch up with industrialized Britain. To do so, it borrowed from recipes of national development proposed by Hamilton soon after the Americans broke free of their British overlords. In his ‘Report on the Subject of Manufactures’, submitted to Congress in 1791, Hamilton used the potent term ‘infant’ industries to argue for economic protectionism.

“... In his view, infant nations needed room to maneuver before they could compete with established industrial powers. The United States embraced many of Hamilton’s recommendations; the beneficiaries were, first, the textile and iron industries and then steel.

“It was Hamilton’s formula, rather than free trade, that made the United States the world’s fastest-growing economy in the 19th century and into the 1920s. And that formula was embraced by

other nations coming late to international economic competition.

Hamilton's most influential student was a German economist named

Friedrich List, who lived in the United States from 1825 until the 1830s and wrote a book titled {Outlines of American Political

Economy}. On his return to Germany, List attacked the free-market

gospel preached by Britain as sheer opportunism... Applying List's lessons, Germany moved with spectacular speed from an agrarian to an industrial economy.

"... Closely following Germany's example, Japan heavily subsidized its first factories ...

"... South Korea, too, found solutions for its problems in Friedrich List rather than Adam Smith. The country's leader, Park

Chung-hee ... was also deeply familiar with German theories of protectionism. (The economist Robert Wade reported coming across

whole shelves of books by List in Seoul bookstores in the 1970s.)...

"But little did I know that Hamilton (and List) would achieve their greatest influence in post-Mao China. 'The rise of

China resembles that of the United States a century ago,' the Chinese scholar Hu Angang writes. He is not exaggerating."

Now, that's a very interesting article to appear at this moment. I'm not saying that everything the author says in his analysis is entirely accurate, or that all of the conclusions that he draws are necessarily correct. But what he does make clear is that what made America great was the policies of Alexander Hamilton. And what's making China great today are those very same Hamiltonian policies. This realization shows you

that we have a very fertile field for the reception of our so-called Four Laws campaign – Lyndon LaRouche's revival of

Hamiltonian policies. The fight which Lyndon LaRouche has led for decades to liberate the United States from this imposed free market, free trade hoax; this British ideology. To return us to the principles of Alexander Hamilton. What he did simultaneously abroad to educate these other nations on the policies of the American System and Hamiltonian economic policies. That's where China got this from; that's where you can credit the great Chinese economic miracle of the last 15 years. Do not write out of the equation the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played as spokesmen for this great Hamiltonian tradition, and urgently with updates and a profound scientific depth that Lyndon LaRouche has brought to this discussion. But the time is now, and the field is very fertile for the reception of this idea that the time has come for a Hamiltonian coalition of nations. We must join hand-in-hand with China to do exactly that; to bring development to all the nations on the planet using these American, but universal, economic principles. Now, let me just play a very short clip from a broadcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had yesterday. Because the biggest problem that you run into – and I think this is something that you run into as an organizer or as an activist – is that people fail to make the necessary leap in terms of understanding these principles because they have an axiomatic problem. There's a disconnect. The biggest problem that we have when it comes to economics today is that money is essentially God. Money has achieved this status in economics where it is everything to everyone. It's the Genesis of economics; it's the root, it's the

prime mover; it's the measuring rod, it's the purpose, it's the medium. Money is everything. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed exactly this pathology in her webcast yesterday. And she called for a public debate on this. She said, as it begins to dawn on people who have believed that everything that they had believed about economics may perhaps have been wrong, we need to question some of the most basic economic assumptions that we hold dear, and ask ourselves the question, "What is the ultimate purpose of an economy and what is the true source of true economic wealth?"

So, here's Helga LaRouche:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators, so that the rich become richer, and the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking. This article by Bloomberg which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to his theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he says that China is doing everything which according to his theory

are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says, he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections.

There will be a lot more corrections, because I think we need a public debate, what are the economic criteria for a functioning economy? And obviously, the works of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and his development of physical economy, going back to Leibniz, to Friedrich List, to Henry C. Carey, to Wilhelm von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things.

We need a discussion about that, because the notion of what is economy, equating that with money, has really become one of the axiomatic assumptions of a failing system. So we need a debate about that. [end video]

OGDEN: So the time has come. As I said, it's a very fertile field, and this is one of the most important reasons why we've now launched a new LaRouche PAC class series, which gets directly at these principles; not only of economics, but this is what drives global policy. What is the purpose of economy?

What

is the true identity of man? And what should be the collaborative between peoples and between nations, to what end?

So, I'll take that as an opportunity before concluding, to remind

our viewers that tomorrow we will have the second class in our 2018 class series. This class will be titled "The End of Geopolitics, Part I: The History of Geopolitics." The guest speaker will be Harley Schlanger. Again, you can register for this entire class series, which is called "The End of Geopolitics. What Is the New Paradigm?" The registration is now

open. If you have not registered for this class series, I strongly encourage you to. The link is available on the screen

– lpac.co/np2018. You can also visit discover.larouchepac.com which will be the central hub of all of the material for this class series. Again, if you're a registered participant, not only do you have the opportunity to participate in the live public forums, such as the inaugural class that was delivered last Saturday by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, but you also have the opportunity for an in-depth engagement around the syllabus, the

required reading materials, the homework assignments, the live feedback from the teachers and from the leaders of the LaRouche

PAC class series, and also some discussion periods which are only

open to registered participants. Registration has continued to

increase. We have a large number of registered participants from

all across the United States and elsewhere around the world, too.

So, we're putting together the educated grouping, the cadre which

will be able to lead this discussion for a new economics, a
New
Paradigm. The field is wide open. The door is there, and all
we
have to do is walk through it. We are in a unique position to
inform this discussion today; and it is a very urgent debate
which needs to take place as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said.
So, thank you for joining me here today. I thank Paul for
joining me. Please stay tuned to larouhepac.com; we have a
lot
of work to do, and we'll see you next week.

**Rusland og Kina er ikke en
trussel,**

men en stor mulighed.

Politisk Orientering 15. feb. 2018.

2. del:

'Demokrati': Betyder det princippet om det Almene Vel eller partipolitisk lammelse og krige for regimeskifte?

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 14. feb., 2018 – Senatets Efterretningskomites høring i går med lederne af de amerikanske efterretningstjenester, var anti-russiske, anti-kinesiske optøjer fra både senatorer og vidner. Den nye 'politiske korrekthed' i ånden fra McCarthy dominerede enhver diskussion af det faktiske emne, »trusler mod Amerikas nationale sikkerhed«. Hvis der hersker noget tvivlsspørgsmål om, hvorfor, det er mislykkedes præsident Trump at forfølge sine hensigter – stormagtssamarbejde med både Rusland og Kina om bekæmpelse af terrorisme og regionale krige – så blev de besvaret af forestillingen i Senatet i går, og som også omgiver ham i Det Hvide Hus.

De ledende folkevalgte i USA og Europa har, med deres skrigeri om, at Kina og Rusland er en trussel mod »demokratiske værdier«, demonstreret deres totalt manglende evne til at praktisere demokrati succesfuldt. Deres partier gør dem ude af stand til at regere – eller, som vi ser det i Tyskland, blot at danne en regering og forsøge at regere. De kan ikke reducere fattigdom, hvor Kina er ved at fjerne det; de kan ikke stoppe en epidemi af narckoafhængighed og selvmord. De ser et neokonservativt militær/Wall Street-kompleks føre krige for regimeskifte »imod autoritære regimer, og for demokrati«; disse krige er årsag til katastrofale menneskelige lidelser og død, og ødelæggelse af rigdomme, spreder international terrorisme og massive flygtningestrømme. De står nu over for et nyt finanskrak, der er under udvikling, og lammes af Wall Street i at agere for at stoppe det sådan, som Kinas myndigheder har gjort. I stedet skriger de år efter år, at »Kina vil krakke«, mens Kinas bidrag til verdensøkonomiens vækst faktisk konstant stiger.

Det kræver samarbejde med Kina og Rusland at løse disse problemer, hvilket tydeligvis var, hvad Trump havde i sinde, da han indtog embedet. Men selv om gerningsmændene til »Russiagate«, som startede kupforsøget imod ham, nu er godt og grundigt miskrediterede, fortsætter processen med at tvinge præsidenten til at indtage en anti-russisk, anti-kinesisk holdning selv i hans egen administration.

To kronikker i de seneste par dage i en af Kinas førende aviser, *Global Times*, sætter Kinas evne til at tjene sit folks almene vel – regering ved og for folket – i kontrast til USA's ekstreme partipolitiske lammelse og forfølgelse af »demokrati« i fremmede lande ved hjælp af krige. Den anden kronik tog et spørgsmål op, der nu er centralt i denne amerikanske, partipolitiske lammelse: økonomisk infrastruktur.

Som præsidenten gentagne gange har erkendt: USA behandler ikke problemet med sin smuldrende infrastruktur, forsvarer ikke sine borgere mod tilbagevendende oversvømmelser under orkaner,

fatale sammenbrud i transportsystemet, broer og dæmninger, der kollapser, inficeret drikkevand – og forbedrer da slet ikke deres liv med nye infrastrukturplatforme, som Kina, der har udbygget 15.000 mil moderne højhastighedsjernbaner og revolutioneret sit folks bevægelighed. Hvis USA insisterer på, at Kina er dets konkurrent, skrev *Global Times*, »så er infrastrukturbyggeri også en form for konkurrence«.

Dette er en konkurrence om at tjene det almene velfærd. Præsident Trumps infrastrukturplan, påtvunget ham af Goldman Sachs bank, vil ikke gøre det; men der er heller ikke kommet noget tilbud fra nogen af de politiske partier om et brugbart alternativ – til at rette op på mere end et halvt århundredes forfald og sammenbrud.

Det eneste alternativ, der vil virke, er det, der som sit mål har det amerikanske folks og hele menneskehedens generelle velfærd. Dette alternativ begynder med at bryde Wall Street bankerne op – med en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-loven – og udstede for milliarder af dollars ny, produktiv kredit gennem en ny nationalbank eller Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for at bygge en ny, højteknologisk infrastrukturplatform for USA. Denne fremgangsmåde er en del af Lyndon LaRouches nu berømte Fire Love, der også specificerer NASA's tilbagevenden til et niveau af rumforskning, der svarer til Apolloprojektet, samt at genoplive forskning og udvikling af teknologier til fusionskraft gennem et forceret program.

Infrastrukturspørgsmålet bliver nu en del af de partipolitiske valg i 2018. Lad menneskehedens fælles mål og fælles velfærd dømmes i denne konkurrence, som de vil dømmes Kina, Amerika og »demokratiet«.

Foto: State of the Union 2018

Russiagate? Alle veje fører til London!

LaRouche PAC Internationale

Webcast,

9. feb., 2018.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Russiagate? Alle veje fører til London«. Planen er virkelig blevet kompliceret i løbet af en uge til halvanden, med offentliggørelsen af Nunes-memoet fra Husets Efterretningskomite, der efterforsker Christopher Steele; og dernæst afklassificeringen af senator Grassleys brev, som henviser Christopher Steele til Justitsministeriet til efterforskning for kriminelle handlinger. Sandheden bag det, der er blevet kaldt Russiagate, er nu hastigt ved at komme i fokus. Hver eneste tråd i denne historie, når man trækker i dem og følger dem, fører dig direkte til London.

Denne Russiagate-skandale er faktisk blevet til »Londongate«; og historien om det virkelig, aftalte spil er nu ved at blive åbenlys. Der var virkelig en fremmed efterretningstjeneste, der forsøgte at intervenere, blande sig, og forme udfaldet af valget i USA. Men denne efterretningstjeneste havde sit hovedkvarter hvor? I London, på Themsens bredder ved Vauxhall Cross; lige dér, i MI6's hovedkvarter. Historien kommer nu i fokus. Det er præcis, som vi oprindeligt beskrev det i LaRouche PAC's brochure, som vi udgav i september 2017. Det eneste aftalte spil, der fandt sted, var dét mellem USA's og UK's

hemmelige efterretningstjenester, i liga med DNC og Hillary Clintons kampagne. Undermineringen af vores demokratiske valgsystem kom fra vore såkaldte nærmeste allierede – briterne; som ikke skyede noget middel for at forhindre, at deres geopolitiske verdensorden blev afsat, og der i stedet voksede en stormagtsrelation frem mellem USA, Rusland og Kina.

Lad os huske på, hvad denne brochure, som blev udgivet for seks måneder siden, sagde. Brochuren er nu i færd med at blive revideret og opdateret og vil snart udkomme i andet oplag. Men lad os se på brochuren og se, hvad den siger.

»[Præsident Trump] truede det angloamerikanske, britiske imperiesystem efter krigen ... ved at afvise evindeligt krigsførelse, søge bedre relationer med Rusland, kræve gennemførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, gå ind for det, han refererer til som det Amerikanske System for politisk økonomi og love massiv infrastrukturudvikling og en moderne varefremstillingsplatform for produktive jobs.«

»Briterne kræver skalpe, på baggrund af deres opfattelse af at være truet, der specifikt findes i ønsket om en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og en afslutning af den 'unipolære' ramme for relationer mellem nationer.«

Den fortsætter med at sige:

»Kuppet mod Donald Trump startede faktisk i 2013-2014. Den populære forklaring på nederdrægtighederne og forbrydelserne mod præsidenten er, at Hillary Clinton og Barack Obama ansatte deres netværk, inklusive oversiddende loyalister i regeringen og efterretningssamfundet, med det formål at ændre resultatet af det amerikanske valg og at iscenesætte det igangværende kup. Denne forklaring, der primært fokuserer på begivenheder i 2016, overser, alt imens det er sandt nok i en umiddelbart national forståelse, det større billede. Som vi vil vise, så begyndte briterne at kræve Donald Trumps hoved, iflg. deres egen redegørelse, i 2015 og blandede sig og blandede sig i

USA's valg og [har forsøgt at iscenesætte] et kup for at omstøde valgresultatet hver eneste dag herefter.«

Herefter sporer brochuren den relevante historie, der går helt tilbage til kinesernes annoncering af en ny, international, økonomisk orden i 2013, i form af det, de kaldte Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Som de ligeledes annoncerede, ville blive tæt koordineret med Ruslands Eurasiske Økonomiske Union i en bestræbelse på økonomisk udvikling til hele det eurasiske kontinent. Dette er præcis, hvad Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i over 20år har været fortalere for, i form af den Eurasiske Landbro, og som dernæst blev kendt som den Nye Silkevej.



Fig. 1

Denne del af verden, som Kina og Rusland nu aktivt forfølger udviklingen af; dette eurasiske område af verden er, hvad geopolitikkens fader, den britiske geopolitiks fader – Halford Mackinder – kaldte Hjertelandet. Han skrev en artikel i begyndelsen af det 20. århundrede ved navn, »Historiens geografiske omdrejningspunkt«. Den blev udgivet i 1904. Det, han sagde i denne artikel, og som gjorde ham til faderen af moderne geopolitik, det 20. århundredes britiske geopolitik, er, at Hjertelandet er det geopolitiske omdrejningspunkt for hele verden. Vi ser her hans kort [Fig. 1], og lige i centrum finder vi Eurasien med betegnelsen, »omdrejningspunkt«. Hele hans geopolitiske teori opsummeredes i denne udtalelse: »Den, der regerer over Østeuropa, hersker over Hjertelandet. Den, der regerer over Hjertelandet, hersker over verdensøen. Og den, der regerer over verdensøen, hersker over verden.«

Spørgsmålet om, hvem, der regerer over Østeuropa, handler stort set om, hvem, der regerer over Ukraine. Og da den behørigt valgte ukrainske præsident Victor Janukovitj annoncerede, at han ikke ville underskrive Memorandaet for Samarbejde med den Europæiske Union og i stedet ville

opretholde sin tætte relation med økonomisk samarbejde med Rusland, var det det sidste strå. Mange af de samme personer, vi nu ser nævnt i Grassleys og Nunes' efterforskning af Udenrigsministeriet, såsom Victoria Nuland; mange af de samme personer besluttede, at tiden for regimeskifte var kommet. Ved at aktivere et netværk af oversiddere fra højrefløjen og ekstreme ukrainske nationalister, der under Anden Verdenskrig havde samarbejdet med Hitler; denne flok – Victoria Nuland og andre – iscenesatte et voldeligt kup i Ukraine; det såkaldte Maidan. De væltede den demokratiske valgte, ukrainske regering og installerede deres egen regering; Victoria Nuland er berømt for at være blevet taget på fersk gerning i at indrømme dette, på bånd.

Den, der således regerer over Østeuropa, hersker over Hjertelandet. Den, der regerer over Hjertelandet, hersker over verden. Dette er britisk geopolitik, og i årtier har den særlige, amerikansk-britiske relation været et instrument for håndhævelse af dette Mackinders synspunkt af, hvad verdensordenen bør være. Når som helst en præsident; når som helst en ledende, politisk person i USA kom og truede dette synspunkt, ville elementer i de amerikanske og britiske efterretningssamfund slå alarm og på den ene eller anden måde neutralisere denne trussel. Som LaRouche PAC's brochure dybtgående forklarer, så var det præcis, hvad der skete i kampagnen imod Lyndon LaRouche. Som brochuren forklarer, så må man forstå, at dette præcis er tilfældet med den operation, der køres imod præsident Trump. For at kunne forstå operationen imod præsident Trump, må man forstå det ud fra dette perspektiv. Fra det øjeblik, det stod klart, at Trump var en seriøs deltager i kapløbet om USA's præsidentskab, og at han helt tydeligt hældte mod at afslutte Obama-Clinton-Bush-politikken med inddæmning, begrænsning og konfrontation med Rusland og Kina og i stedet hældte mod et gensidigt fordelagtigt, økonomisk og strategisk samarbejde med disse to lande – Rusland og Kina. Og fra det øjeblik blev han mål for dette apparat.

Så vær ikke naiv og lad dig blive indfanget i det daglige mediespin på talkshows på fjernsynet. Dette handler ikke om, hvorvidt du rent personligt støtter eller bryder dig om Donald Trump. Dette er et opgørets øjeblik i den årelange kamp for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl og kampen for at frisætte, befri, USA fra dette britiske Mackinder-synspunkt om geopolitik, der har bragt os helt ud på kanten af atomkrig. I stedet bør USA fuldt og helt deltage i det Nye Paradigme, der nu er vokset frem, med at bringe økonomisk udvikling og moderne økonomisk fremskridt til enorme områder af den tidligere tilbagestående, koloniserede og underudviklede del af verden.

Som vores brochure, der blev udgivet i september 2017, for seks måneder siden, stiller spørgsmålet: »Har vore efterretningstjenester faktisk ulovligt anstiftet aktive forholdsregler for et kontraefterretningsprogram, imod en siddende præsident?« Vi ved nu, at Comey løj eller vildledte Kongressen om aflytningerne af Trump Tower. FISA-kendelserne beviser dette. Senator Grassley har spurgt FBI, hvorfor, hvis I aflyttede en nær medarbejder til præsidenten, ville I ikke advare præsidenten imod ham, som det er sædvanen? Det sande svar er, at præsidenten selv var og er målet for et hidtil uset og illegalt kupforsøg, udført af dem, der har aflagt ed på at overholde Forfatningen og nationens love.

Så nu ved I det. Siden valget, og før valget, har vi siddet fast i et meget uddybende og farligt, britisk svindelnummer; med et hasardspil om vores nations fremtid i et koldt kup imod en valgt præsident. Der er begået regulære forbrydelser; ikke af præsidenten, men mod præsidenten og Forfatningen. Det, der er sket, er, at divergerende, politiske standpunkter, ideer, er blevet gjort til noget kriminelt; den selv samme fare, som de fleste bestemmelser i vores Forfatning og dens borgerlige frihedsrettigheder (Bill of Rights) blev udtrykkeligt udarbejdet for at værne imod. Vi har fortalt jer den virkelige årsag til, at præsidenten er blevet angrebet af en fremmed

magt – briterne og deres allierede i vort land.

Så igen: Denne brochure blev udgivet i september 2017; for næsten seks måneder siden. Men alt det, vi dengang hævdede, bekræftes nu som sandt af kendsgerningerne efterhånden, som de kommer ud; som med tilfældet med Nunes-momoet, Grassley-brevet og hvad vi ellers kan forvente, vil komme ud af disse efterforskninger i den nærmeste fremtid. Hvis man træder et skridt tilbage og ser på det store billede her, og ser på det ud fra dette perspektiv, er det nu uigendriveligt. Hvis man vil identificere den virkelige kilde til forbrydelserne mod vores republik og mod vort demokrati, så træk blot i tråden, og man vil finde, at alle veje fører til London.

I sin ugentlige webcast (torsdag) talte Helga Zepp-LaRouche meget direkte om dette. Jeg vil gerne afspille et kort klip for jer fra dette webcast af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, hvor hun identificerer netop dette aspekt; at alle tråde i denne sag, hvis man følger dem hele vejen, viser, hvorfra den virkelige kriminalitet kommer. Her kommer Helgas klip:

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Planen bliver mere kompliceret, som man siger. Historien er faktisk helt utrolig, og jeg er stolt over at have skrevet en artikel helt i begyndelsen af denne affære, hvor jeg sagde, at der er et aftalt spil med briterne, og ikke med russerne – og det er præcis det, der nu kommer frem og er ved at blive et offentligt spørgsmål. Jeg vil begynde med sagen mod Steele, som det var meningen, skulle for retten i Højesteret i London, hvor Steele skulle møde frem, men i sidste øjeblik blev repræsenteret af sin advokat; argumentet var, at dette kunne berøre britiske nationale sikkerhedsinteresser. Og minsandten, om ikke en repræsentant fra Udenrigsministeriet også var til stede med deres advokater, og de kom med den samme erklæring.

Så den britiske regerings, britisk efterretnings rolle er nu et spørgsmål, og det står helt klart, at Christopher Steele ikke var en eller anden tilfældig, tidligere MI6-agent, men at

han derimod virkelig var en agent for ikke alene briterne, men også for FBI. Denne pointe er kommet frem i en meget interessant artikel på Pat Langs weblog, »Sic Semper Tyrannis«. En fast, respekteret bidragsyder til denne blog, som udlægger på bloggen under pseudonymet »Publius Tacitus«, spørger i sin overskrift, »Forsøgte britisk efterretning at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab?«, hvilket er præcis, hvad vi har for os.[1]

Værten for denne blog, Pat Lang – for folk, der ikke kender ham; han er en pensioneret, højtrespekteret efterretningsmand i USA, og slet ikke en eller anden russer eller en anden kilde, der kunne være tvivlsom i denne sammenhæng – han arbejdede i lang tid for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA) – og han er højt respekteret.

Hvorom alting er, så peger »Publius Tacitus« på den kendsgerning, at de nye memoer, der er kommet frem fra senatorerne Grassley og Graham, og fra Senatskomiteen for Homeland Security og Regeringsanliggender, som alle bekræfter det, der står i Nunes [Husets Efterretningskomite]-memorandaet. Og der er virkelig kommet mange nye aspekter frem. De indikerer, at Comey måske løj under ed, for, da han holdt den berømte pressekonference, der frikendte Hillary Clinton, påstod han, at han ikke havde koordineret dette med nogen andre. Dette står imidlertid i skarp kontrast til nogle flere beskeder, som blev udvekslet mellem Peter Strzok og Lisa Page, to FBI-ansatte, der var involveret i både Hillary Clintons e-mail-affære og ligeledes i Russiagate. I disse beskeder indikerede de, at Hillary vidste, der ikke ville komme nogen anklager mod hende. Der er behov for yderligere efterforskning herom.

Der er desuden fremkommet et andet, meget ildevarslende resultat, og det er en anden udveksling af tekstbeskeder mellem de to, hvor de den 2. sep. 2016 siger, at »POTUS«, dvs. 'President of the United States', nemlig Obama, ønskede at vide alt, de foretager sig. Hvad refererer dette »alt« til?

Det refererer enten til efterforskningen af Hillary Clinton, eller også til Russiagate, og sidstnævnte ville betyde, at Obama nu er direkte forbundet med Russiagate og ikke kun indirekte via betalingen til Fusion GPS og Steele, hvor Obama-administrationen også betalte, sammen med DNC og Hillary Clintons kampagne.

Dette er alt sammen ekstremt, ekstremt varmt, og vi har nu alle disse Senats- og Kongreshøringer og komiteer, der efterforsker det. Kongresmedlem Nunes, der havde offentliggjort dette memo – eller rettere, præsident Trump havde godkendt at få det afklassificeret og offentliggjort sidste fredag – han sagde, dette er kun »Fase 1«. Der kommer flere faser, og de vil blandt andet omfatte Udenrigsministeriet, hvilket selvfølgelig også involverer Victoria Nuland, hvis navn nu er dukket op. Der har ligeledes, omkring et andet spørgsmål, været mange udvekslinger mellem Christopher Steele og Victoria Nuland med hensyn til kuppet i Ukraine, det berømte Maidan-kup i februar 2014.

Dette er alt sammen meget interessant, meget 'varmt'. Russiagate er praktisk taget en død sild, men det, der nu i stedet er på bordet, er den britiske regerings, britisk efterretnings indblanding i valget i USA, der forsøgte at sabotere Trumps sejr, først, og da han alligevel vandt, da at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab ved hjælp af en totalt opdigtet anklage. Det er nu kommet offentligt frem, og det er stort! Jeg kan, selv om dette er foregået i nogen tid, stadig kun være totalt chokeret og overrasket over, hvordan de gængse vestlige medier lykkedes med ikke at dække dette, som tydeligvis er ved at nå dimensioner, der går langt, langt videre end Watergate.

(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet. Hele Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra torsdag kan læses på dansk her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23759>)

OGDEN: So, worse than Watergate, in Helga LaRouche's words. As Helga mentioned in her remarks there, earlier this week, there was a very significant article which was published on the blog "Sic Semper Tyrannis" by Pat Lang, who is former Defense Intelligence, a very high level, very connected person. The article is titled, "Did British Intelligence Try to Destroy the Trump Presidency?" Let me read you few excerpts from Pat Lang's article. He says:

"Last night's release of the memo by Senator's Grassley and Graham asking the Department of Justice to open a criminal investigation of Christopher Steele for possible violations of 18 U.S.C. Â§ 1001 provides critical confirmation of charges presented in the HPSCI memo prepared under the leadership of Devin Nunes, but it also confirms that Christopher Steele was not just some random guy offering good gossip to the FBI. He was an official intelligence asset. He was, in John LeCarre's parlance, our 'Joe.' At least we thought so. But, there is growing circumstantial evidence that Steele was acting on behalf of Britain's version of the CIA—aka MI-6. If true, we are now faced with actual evidence of a foreign country trying to meddle in a direct and significant way in our national election. Only it was not the Russians. It was our British cousins".

"[T]wo developments in the last two days suggest that British intelligence officials, at least some key officials, were witting of Steele's activities in gathering information for the

FBI.

“First, Steele is resisting efforts to face a deposition in a lawsuit over his infamous dossier. Steele’s lawyers argued in a

court in London this week that a deposition would endanger the former spy’s dossier sources as well as harm U.K. national security interests. If the Judge buys this claim then we will not

have to speculate anymore about whether or not Steele was acting

on his own or had a ‘wink-and-a-nod’ from his MI-6 bosses.

“Second, in my mind more telling, were the comments made this week by former MI-6 Chief, Richard Dearlove, on behalf of his former protege:

“Among those who have continued to seek his expertise is Steele’s former boss Richard Dearlove, who headed MI-6 from 1999

to 2004. In an interview, Dearlove said Steele became the ‘go-to

person on Russia in the commercial sector’ following his retirement from the Secret Intelligence Service. He described the

reputations of Steele and his business partner, fellow intelligence veteran Christopher Burrows, as ‘superb.’

But we do not have to rely solely on Dearlove’s glowing remarks about Steele. There is other information indicating that

the Brits played a substantial, if not leading, role in spying on

Trump and building the Russian meddling meme. The *Guardian* reported in April 2017 that:

“|’Britain’s spy agencies played a crucial role in alerting their counterparts in Washington to contacts between members of

Donald Trump’s campaign team and Russian intelligence operatives,

the {Guardian} has been told.

"|'GCHQ first became aware in late 2015 of suspicious "interactions" between figures connected to Trump and known or suspected Russian agents, a source close to UK intelligence said.

This intelligence was passed to the US as part of a routine exchange of information, they added.

"|'Over the next six months, until summer 2016, a number of western agencies shared further information on contacts between

Trump's inner circle and Russians, sources said.'

"So much for our special relationship. As the evidence of British intelligence meddling in the U.S. election piles up, it

will create some strains in our bi-lateral ties. It has the potential to harm cooperation on military, law enforcement, and

intelligence fronts. I suspect there is some scrambling going on

behind the scenes to come up with a strategy to contain the damage while rooting out the sedition. Stay tuned."

Now, speaking of Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI-6 and his relationship to Christopher Steele, there is a very significant article which was published this week in the *Washington Post*. And that article is published under the title, "Hero, or Hired Gun? How a British Former Spy Became a Flashpoint in the Russia Investigation". And under the subtitle

"He's the Spy", the article lays out Steele's pedigree as a very

high-level British intelligence operative, and his extremely close relationship with Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI-6. So, here's what the article says:

"Steele had all the right credentials for the job.

"He was steeped in Russia early on after being recruited to Britain's elite spy service from the University of Cambridge. He

spent two decades working for the MI6 spy agency, including a

stint in his mid-20s in Moscow, where he served undercover in the British Embassy.

“When he returned to work for the agency in London, he provided briefing materials on Russia for senior government officials and led the British inquiry into the mysterious 2006 death in London of Alexander Litvinenko, a former KGB official and Putin critic.

“In 2009, after more than two decades in public service, Steele turned to the private sector and founded a London-based consulting firm, Orbis Business Intelligence, drawing on the reputation and network he developed doing intelligence work.

“Among those who have continued to seek his expertise is Steele’s former boss Richard Dearlove, who headed MI6 from 1999 to 2004.

“In an interview, Dearlove said Steele became the ‘go-to person on Russia in the commercial sector’ following his retirement from the Secret Intelligence Service. He described the reputations of Steele and his business partner, fellow intelligence veteran Christopher Burrows, as ‘superb.’

“In the early fall, he and Burrows turned to Dearlove, their former MI6 boss, for advice. Sitting in winged chairs at the Garrick Club, one of London’s most venerable private establishments, under oil paintings of famed British playwrights, the two men shared their worries about what was happening in the United States. They asked for his guidance about how to handle their obligations to their client and the public, Dearlove recalled.

“Dearlove said their situation reminded him of a predicament he had faced years earlier, when he was chief of station for British intelligence in Washington and alerted U.S. authorities

to British information that a vice presidential hopeful had once been in communication with the Kremlin.

“He said he advised Steele and Burrows to work discreetly with a top British government official to pass along information to the FBI.”

Now, that entire story sounds very much like a scene directly out of a John LeCarre novel, if you ask me. But this character, Richard Dearlove, is somebody of whom Helga Zepp-LaRouche asks “What is his pedigree, and what is he famous for when it comes to dodgy dossiers?” in that webcast that she delivered yesterday. So, here’s what Helga LaRouche had to say about Richard Dearlove:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The fact that Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI6, absolutely defended the reputation of Steele, is very interesting in this respect, because who is this Dearlove? He is the infamous author of the famous dossier which led to the attack on Iraq in the Second Gulf War, supposedly because Saddam Hussein was in the possession of weapons of mass destruction, which we know was a blatant lie, which led Colin Powell to make this infamous speech in the United Nations in February 2003, which he later characterized as the biggest mistake of his life, because it led to the intervention, including the United States, in the war against Saddam Hussein. That is something which eventually must also be tried. And I know that Ramsey Clark tried to make that an issue before the international legal authorities.

So, this is not just the attempt of a coup against the United States, but this is a paradigm of policies which have led to the present condition in the world, including the destruction of much of Southwest Asia, including the refugee crisis. So these are not small things, and I think it is high time that this whole paradigm should come out in the open and is being replaced by a completely different policy.

So, I think the stakes here are extremely high, and I think people should really rethink everything and look at the material which is coming out, because it is an unbelievable scandal.

[T]he dossier which was published by LaRouche PAC, written by Barbara Boyd. This was written half a year ago, but if you read this dossier now, it is incredible, how absolutely on the mark this dossier was, concerning the role of British intelligence. So I think the circulation of this dossier is something which everybody can do very easily. Get it in the social media, get it in the alternative blogs, get it into any newspaper, which has the honesty to follow events in a truthful

way. And right now, things are coming out in the open. There were

articles by Ray McGovern, by William Binney, Pat Lang, by Russia

Today, – naturally, they pick up on the fact that Russiagate is

now completely falling apart. So I think the more people can do,

to get the public attention on what is going on in this absolutely gigantic fight in the United States, the better; because some of these spooks shy away from daylight, and the more

the Sun is shining on them, all the better.

OGDEN: So again, this pamphlet that was put out by LaRouche PAC six months ago, this was a very prescient and very insightful

pamphlet. I guarantee you it has served a major role in informing the threat of the investigations for the people who are

serious about getting at the truth of this. We've witnessed Russiagate transformed into Steelegate, and Steelegate means Londongate. All threads, if you follow them and pull them, will

lead you back to London. This pamphlet is being updated as we speak, and it will be going into a second [sic] printing very soon, and you can expect that this will continue to have a very significant impact.

I just want to, in conclusion, recommend that our viewers, in understanding the context as I went through it earlier, and as

that pamphlet elaborates it very clearly, the context of this entire thing is the fight over the soul of the US Presidency and

the future of US policy on the world stage. We've witnessed decades and administration upon administration of this so-called

US-UK special relationship; which has merely perpetuated this Mackinder geopolitics on the entire planet. It has brought us to

the point of confrontation which could threaten thermonuclear war. This has become all too real. The fight over the paradigm

– will we remain the satrapy of this British geopolitical world

order, or will we break from that? Will we be liberated from that? Will we embrace the New Paradigm which is now sweeping the

planet? That is the question which is at stake here, and the stakes could not be higher.

For that reason, I want to strongly encourage all of our viewers to return here to larouchepac.com tomorrow, February 10th

at 12noon. That's 12noon eastern time. We will be treated by a

live address by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who be delivering the inaugural class in the LaRouche PAC 2018 online class series. That class series, as you can see here on the screen, is titled

"The End of Geopolitics. What Is the Global New Paradigm?"

It

will be hosted at the url, which is on the top of the screen there

– <http://discover.larouchepac.com>. This will be a 12-week class

series, which will follow up on the very successful class series

which we hosted here on larouchepac.com last year during 2017 on

LaRouche's economic discoveries. The invitation to this year's

class series is available there on

<http://discover.larouchepac.com>. Let me just read to you from the invitation:

"The American people are faced with a historic choice: join China's revolutionary New Silk Road program and secure a new paradigm of win-win global development, or continue the suicidal

geopolitical policies of Obama and Bush, guaranteeing confrontation with Russia and China and threatening world war.

While President Trump is inclined to move in the direction of cooperation with China and Russia, he is being threatened with a

palace coup by those desperately clinging to the old geopolitical

view of unchallenged Anglo-American global dominance.

"You can play a role in this decisive point in history. Help

secure the New Paradigm.

“LaRouche PAC is launching a new class series, “What is the New Paradigm?” to prepare you to lead the population at this critical time. 2018 must be the year we end geopolitics.”

Then, it lists what these classes will cover:

“Introduction: What is the New Paradigm?” This is Helga LaRouche’s address tomorrow.

“What is Geopolitics, Part I – History

“What is Geopolitics, Part II – Philosophy

“Culture – Beauty & Freedom vs. the CCF [Congress for Cultural Freedom]

“Confucian and Western Philosophy

“Science: Man’s Relation to the Universe

“Wrap-up and Mobilization – End Geopolitics”

So, the invitation invites you to register now for access to the syllabus, to the homework, to the reading assignments, and to

the special live discussion sessions which will be available only

for registered participants. Registration is now open at <http://discover.larouchepac.com>. Questions can be emailed to classes@larouchepac.com.

We strongly encourage you to register now for this class series, to become an active participant in this class series; to

build class hosting sessions in your location wherever you are in

the United States or even abroad, to build a group of people who

will participate in these classes on a weekly basis with you.

You can host it at your house, or at the local library, or on your college campus. And create a national mobilization of

participants around this series of classes so that we have the cadre of people who are educated and who understand this global

context for the ongoing fight that we now find ourselves in here

in the United States.

So again, tomorrow at 12noon, Helga LaRouche will be addressing this class series live. This will be the inaugural address, and we encourage you to register now for the entire class series for 2018. That brings a conclusion to our webcast

today. But I think if you reflect on the theme here – Russiagate has now become Londongate; all roads lead to London.

Let me put the graphic of our title right back on the screen here

one more time, and you'll see the image there of the MI-6 headquarters. This is where all roads lead; pull the threads and

you'll discover the truth about who really colluded with US elections in 2016, and is continuing to meddle with our political system.

Thank you very much for joining me here at larouchepac.com and please stay tuned.

[1]

http://turcopolier.typepad.com/sic_semper_tyrannis/2018/02/british-intelligence-tried-to-destroy-the-trump-presidency.html

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Lad os konsolidere det Nye Paradigme, Nu, hvor

Det britiske Imperies kup mod Trump er afsløret. pdf og video

Derfor er det så meget desto mere vigtigt, at den eneste løsning på denne finanskriser, nemlig gennemførelsen af Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingen og de Fire Love, min mand, Lyndon LaRouche, har udarbejdet; at de nu kommer frem på bordet, og at der kommer et krav fra befolkningerne i alle landene om, at deres regeringer responderer til Xi Jinpings tilbud om at samarbejde med den Nye Silkevej. Europa, Tyskland, Italien, Frankrig, USA; de har alle et presserende behov for en forbedring og modernisering af infrastruktur.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Britisk efterretning nu afsløret som anfører af

kuppet imod Trump; Vi kan overvinde dem

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 7. feb., 2018 – Brochuren fra LaRouche PAC Action Committee, der afslører historien bag Robert Mueller, den »umoralske, juridiske lejemorder«, som er deployeret for at fjerne Donald Trump fra præsidentskabet, har nu cirkuleret i seks måneder og haft en enorm indvirkning.

Med dele af »Få ram på Trump«-specialstyrken, der nu er totalt miskrediteret, er det muligt at gå efter selve uhyrets hoved – britisk efterretning og britisk geopolitik, som Trump truer med at vælte.

Brochuren erklærer dristigt lige fra begyndelsen, at Mueller og hele fremstødet for at stoppe Trump *siden 2015*, kom fra britisk efterretning og det britiske »imperieoligarki«.

I de seneste 48 timer er det, af det Britiske Udenrigsministerium i en sag for retten i London, og ligeledes af Washington Post i en lang artikel, blevet afsløret, at ikke kun »tidligere« MI6-agent Christopher Steeles dossier, men derimod mange britiske efterretningsagenter er involveret – som f.eks. i Udenrigsministeriet – og fra toppen er deployeret til at få ram på Trump. Og hvem deployerer dem fra toppen? »Tidligere« chef for MI6, sir Richard Dearlove. Samme Dearlove, der kommissionerede sit eget, berygtede »dossier« for Tony Blair, som »beviste«, at Saddam Hussein havde atomvåben og kemiske våben!

Dette dossier vanærede udenrigsminister Colin Powell og lancerede den katastrofale Cheney-Bush-invasion af Irak 2003-2011. Den nuværende, britiske kampagne havde, gennem at bruge »Steele-dossieret«, til formål at diktere USA, at det ikke havde lov at have en præsident, der ønsker samarbejdsrelationer med Rusland eller Kina.

Det var britiske efterretningstjenester, der blandede sig i vore valg i 2016. Londons MI6, den hemmelige efterretningstjeneste, kolporterede britisk skidt om Trump og Rusland gennem Obamas efterretningsfolk og Clinton-kampagnen, med det formål at ødelægge Trumps kampagne, og hans præsidentskab.

Rusland og USA har været reelle eller potentielle allierede i århundreder, gående helt tilbage til det væbnede neutralitetsforbund (First League of Armed Neutrality), der var med til at vinde vores Revolutionskrig, og til den russiske flådes indgriben mod britisk støtte til slavemagten i vores Borgerkrig, frem til det amerikansk-russiske samarbejde mod Hitler, som Sir Winston Churchill arbejdede på at ødelægge.

Det samme er sandt om USA's relationer med Kina, under Anden Verdenskrig og tidligere. Nu inviterer Kina USA til at gå med i forlængelsen af Bælte & Vej Initiativet, et projekt for økonomisk genopbygning og udslettelse af fattigdom i langt større skala end Marshallplanen.

Vi har brug for internationale aftaler for at bygge den mest afgørende, nye infrastruktur på verdensplan og brug for at acceptere Kinas lederskab i dets Bælte & Vej Initiativ. Selve Amerika har enorme underskud med hensyn til ny, økonomisk infrastruktur og må skabe en national (statslig) kreditinstitution for at deltage; en ny Reconstruction Finance Corporation i Roosevelts tradition, eller en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition.

Vi må have en koordineret genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i hele USA og Europa, før City of London og Wall Street bringer vore økonomier ind i et nyt, denne gang langt værre, krak.

USA ville ikke præstere disse ting, hvis det gav lov til, at en præsident med overlæg blev fjernet for at være i

overensstemmelse med den britiske, geopolitiske doktrin for krige for regimeskifte og konfrontation mellem stormagter.

De memoer, der nu er kommet frem fra Husets Efterretningskomite og Senatets Justitskomite, har sprængt Steele-dossieret vidt åbent, med samt dets anvendelse imod præsident Trump. De, der er blevet afsløret af disse memoer, er ret utilfredse og vil forsøge at genvinde fremstødet for at fjerne præsidenten, med mindre de besejres.

Foto: Sir Richard Billing Dearlove, KCMG (født 23. jan., 1945) var chef for den Britiske Hemmelige Efterretningstjeneste (MI6) fra 1999 og til 6. maj, 2004. (Domusrulez / Wikimedia)

Briterne har bekendt kulør

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 6. feb., 2018 – Mandag intervenserede det britiske Udenrigsministerium i en høring i Højesteret i London i sagen om tidligere MI6-medarbejder, Christopher Steele. Steeles advokat forsøger at omstøde en tidligere retskendelse om, at Steele skal fremstille sig til afhøring i forbindelse med en af de mange løgne i det nu berømte dossier, han udarbejdede med det formål at bringe USA's præsident til fald. Sagen er blevet anlagt af en russisk borger, Aleksej Gubarev, hvem Steele løgnagtigt har anklaget for at have hacket ind i det amerikanske Demokratiske Partis computere (hvilket, som tidligere tekniske ekspert i NSA, Bill Binney, har vist, aldrig fandt sted). Detaljerne kan læses nedenstående – men det afgørende er, at Udenrigsministeriet, der fører tilsyn med MI6, sendte en advokat til retten »for det tilfældes skyld, at regeringen fandt det nødvendigt at kræve, at Steeles vidneforklaring blev begrænset, for at beskytte statshemmeligheder«, som det rapporteredes af BBC.

Hvorfor er briterne så interesseret i at forhindre sandheden om Steeles rolle, og briternes rolle generelt, i kupforsøget mod præsident Trump, i at komme frem? Kendsgerningen er, at hele »Russiagate«-sagen mod Trump er ved at nedsmelte, alt imens senator Chuck Grassley og kongresmedlem David Nunes har fokuseret på den primære rolle, som den britiske efterretningsagent Steele har spillet som den kriminelle hovedmedsammensvorne. Briternes desperate bestræbelse for at genvinde kontrollen over deres tidligere koloni, er i alvorlig fare.

Og dette er ikke en isoleret udvikling. Verden er gået ind i en kombineret krise, som ikke kan opretholdes i ret mange måneder, eller endda dage. Finanssystemet er oppustet og står ikke til at redde, med udstedelse af fiktiv gæld for at dække over spekulationsboblen med endnu flere spekulative 'værdi'-papirer. De krav, der kommer fra Wall Streets og City of Londons herrer, om, at verdens nationer skal acceptere nedskæringspolitikker og følge IMF's diktater, finder nu kun døve øren, med næsten hele verdens udviklingssektor, der nu tilslutter sig det nye paradigme, som Kina tilbyder dem gennem den Nye Silkevej, og som bringer jernbaner, vandprojekter, industri og – håb – til verdens tidligere kolonisationer.

Og i USA har præsident Trump forsvaret sig mod de korrupte efterretningschefer fra Obamatiden, fordømt denne heksejagt og endda inviteret de russiske efterretningschefer til Washington (til regimeskifte-slængets absolutte rædsel), med det formål at samarbejde om at løse de vigtige spørgsmål i reelle, globale problemer.

Dette er et gunstigt øjeblik for præsidenten. I løbet af de seneste to uger har han ikke alene arrangeret de russiske efterretningscheferes besøg, på trods af de sanktioner, som Kongressen har påtvunget dem, men han har også afvist Kongressens krav om nye sanktioner mod Rusland. Han godkendte offentliggørelsen af »Nunes-memoet«, der afslører de forbrydelser, der er begået af Steele og oversidderne fra

Obama-tiden i FBI og Justitsministeriet. Han holdt en State of the Union-tale, der fik 70 % eller mere støtte fra det amerikanske folk, netop, fordi han har inspireret til håb om en genrejsning af den forfaldne, amerikanske økonomi, en afslutning af epidemien med opiater og andre narkotiske stoffer, samt en genrejsning af Amerikas tidligere storhed.

Præsident Trump befinder sig således i en relativ favorabel situation til at konfrontere det overhængende kollaps af finansboblen i aktie- og lånemarkederne. Der findes kun én måde, hvorpå de vestlige økonomier kan reddes fra dette uundgåelige sammenbrud – en proces, der har sit fortilfælde i de politikker, som Franklin D. Roosevelt gennemførte i 1930'erne, og som reddede USA fra depressionen og verden fra fascisme. De fiktive kapitaler må fjernes gennem en Glass/Steagall-reform af banksystemet således, at regeringen kan bruge den magt, den er givet af USA's Forfatning, til at etablere en nationalbank, som kan udstede kredit, der dirigeres ind i realøkonomien og igangsætte en proces for massiv videnskabelig forskning og udvikling, for at udforme en optimistisk fremtid for menneskeheden.

Det er dette, LaRouche har kaldt de Fire Love. Resolutioner til støtte for de Fire Love bliver nu introduceret i de lovgivende grene (delstatskongresser) over hele landet. Præsident Trump, der tidligere officielt har krævet en tilbagevenden til en politik for dette »Amerikanske Økonomiske System« i Hamiltons tradition, befinder sig nu i en position, hvor han kan gennemføre det, til trods for den kendsgerning, at han er omgivet af agenter for Wall Street, som er modstandere af det, og som kræver nationens underkastelse under den værdiløse spekulationsgæld selv, hvis det betyder økonomisk kaos og global krig. Den aktuelle ustabilitet på aktiemarkedet er blot en antydning af, at et krak i denne boble er overhængende.

Men, hvis gode mennesker i USA og Europa mobiliserer sig selv, og andre, til at gå sammen med LaRouche for at gennemføre de

Fire Love og gå med i den Nye Silkevej, som LaRouche har været fortaler for og har promoveret i de seneste halvtreds år, så er et Nyt Paradigme for Menneskeheden inden for rækkevidde.

Foto: SIS-bygningen, eller MI6-bygningen, eller 'Legoland', eller 'Babylon-ved-Themsen'; den britiske hemmelige efterretningstjenestes hovedkvarter ved Vauxhall Cross på Themsens sydlige bred. Designet af Terry Farrell og færdigbygget i 1994. (Photo flickr.com/photos/duncanhl/)

Londons udenrigsministerium truer med at forhindre afhøring af Steele for at 'beskytte statshemmeligheder'

6. feb., 2018 – Det britiske Udenrigsministerium sendte mandag en advokat af sted til Londons Højesteret, hvor den »tidligere« MI6-efterretningsgent Christopher Steeles advokat, Gavin Miller, procederede for en omstødelse af rettens afgørelse fra november om, at Steele skal fremstille sig til afhøring i de sager, der er anlagt imod ham og BuzzFeed af russeren Aleksej Gubarev. I Steeles dossier er Gubarev blevet anklaget for at hacke Demokraterne, angiveligt på vegne af Kreml.

Advokat Miller har fremført, at afhøringen potentielt set kunne »kræve en afsløring af følsom efterretningsinformation, som ville udgøre en fare for Det forenede Kongeriges sikkerhedsinteresser og personel«.

Men det er ikke alene Steeles advokat. Det Britiske Udenrigsministerium tager tydeligvis ingen chancer med hensyn til, at hele det britiske kupforsøg – for at genvinde magten over deres tabte koloni hinsides Atlanten – ville blive ødelagt af en sådan afsløring af Steeles rolle. Reuters rapporterer i dag: »Miller sagde, at en advokat fra det Britiske Udenrigsministerium, der fører tilsyn med Storbritanniens udenrigs-efterretningstjeneste, hvor Steele arbejdede frem til 2009, var til stede under mandagens afhøring, for det tilfældes skyld, at regeringen skulle finde det påkrævet at beskytte statshemmeligheder. Regeringens advokat sagde imidlertid, at han ikke ville rejse nogen specifikke indvendinger på det nuværende trin af afhøringen.«

Sidste november kendte en britisk domstol, at Steele skulle underkaste sig en afhøring. Miller sagde mandag til Højesteret, at »sagen vær næsten unik« på grund af den enorme indvirkning, som Steeles dossier havde haft på amerikansk politik, rapporterer Reuters. Han sagde, at påbuddet om afhøring ville blive en »officiel mini-efterforskning« og en »opportunistisk fiskeudflugt«, som kunne udgøre en forhøjet fare for Steeles kilder. »Det er ekstremt bekymrende for en person i hr. Steeles position.«

Indsigelserne på vegne af Steele fremfører, at »kendelsen sandsynligvis vil kræve, at hr. Steele besvarer spørgsmål, hvor hans svar ville ... kræve afsløring af følsom efterretningsinformation, som ville udgøre en fare for Det forenede Kongeriges sikkerhedsinteresser og personel«.

Gubarevs advokater har allerede indgået aftale om at begrænse spørgsmål om Steeles baggrund og de 3 linjer i dossieret, der relaterer til deres klient, »tre meget diskrete emner«.

Det står ikke klart, hvornår en afgørelse vil falde, men det er sikkert, at Dronningen og hendes undersætter følger nøje med og er parat til at angribe.

Foto: To centrale personer i »Russiagate«-kupforsøget mod præsident Trump; den britiske 'tidligere' MI6-agent, Christopher Steele (venstre), der udarbejdede det uvederhæftige dossier om Donald Trump, og den amerikanske, særlige anklager, Robert Mueller, der står i spidsen for den korrupte sammensværgelse mod præsident Trump på vegne af Det britiske Imperium og dets neokonservative allierede i USA, med det formål at gennemføre et regimeskifte i USA og gennemføre den farlige linje for konfrontation med især Rusland, men også Kina, og som bringer hele verden på randen af en ny, denne gang atomar, verdenskrig.

'Grassley-memoet' afslører mere om anti-Trump-kuppet; Det, der står på spil, er enten krig eller udvikling under det Nye Paradigme

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 5. feb., 2017 – Her til morgen kom endnu flere skadelige afsløringer frem om kupforsøget mod det amerikanske præsidentskab, fra offentliggørelsen af det otte sider lange memorandum af senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA), formand for Senatets Justitskomite, der fører tilsyn med FBI. Endskønt det er stærkt redigeret, rapporterer dette dokument, som dækker præsidentvalgperioden i 2016, at Clinton-kampagnen 'shoppede' anti-Trump-påstande fra en ukendt, udenlandsk kilde, som gik til Obamas Udenrigsministerium, hvorfra disse

påstande dernæst blev shoppet videre til »tidligere« britiske spion, Christopher Steele, som så overgav dem til medierne og FBI. Steele udarbejdede et dossier, dateret 19. okt., 2016 – en anden dato end det kendte, »uvederhæftige dossier« – og som hidtil ikke er blevet offentliggjort.

Grassleys memo blev oprindeligt skrevet den 4. jan., da han, med tilslutning fra senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC), leverede det til det relevante kontor i Justitsministeriet og til FBI-myndigheder med krav om en efterforskning af Steele for kriminelle handlinger. Memoet fremfører, »Det er allerede foruroligende, at Clinton-kampagnen finansierede hr. Steeles arbejde; men at disse Clinton-medarbejdere samtidigt gav hr. Steele beskyldninger, rejser yderligere spørgsmål om hans troværdighed«. Grassley har krævet, at der iværksættes anklager om kriminelle handlinger imod Steele og andre indblandede i denne beskidte operation.

Udviklingerne i dag åbner for »Fase To«, som kommer efter udgivelsen af »Nunes-memoet« den 2. feb. af Devin Nunes (R-CA), formand for Husets Efterretnings-udvalgskomite. Nunes-memoet fokuserer på anti-Trump FBI- og justitsministerietoppersoners og Steeles ulovlige brug af FISA-processen til opnåelse af en overvågningskendelse. I dette nye Grassley-memo er Udenrigsministeriet indblandet. Der kommer flere »afsløringsfaser«. Dette kan offentligt afsløre de personer i London og Washington, der var ansvarlige for det, der skete i Ukraine med det formål at tvangsindføre et nazistisk regimeskifte gennem den 'farvede' Maidan-revolution i 2013-14. Intet under, at Victoria Nuland i går forsøgte at lægge afstand til Christopher Steele på CBS News. Nuland, der er tidligere viceudenrigsminister i Obamas regering, samt Steele et. al., promoverede direkte Maidan-kuppet.

Impulsen til denne strøm af afsløringer og udsigt til fængsel for de skyldige, er LaRouche PAC's Særlige Efterforskende Rapport, »Robert Mueller er en amoralsk, juridisk lejemorder: Han vil gøre sit job, hvis I giver ham lov«, som blev udgivet

første gang i september 2017.

Det, der står på spil i alt dette, er ikke blot sandheden i en abstrakt betydning, men derimod, om der bliver krig, eller der kommer et Nyt Paradigme for udvikling – den Nye Silkevej. Det Gamle Paradigme for monetarisme og geopolitik er dødt, men stadig farligt. De, der støtter det, er rede til at udløse krig. Et udtryk for dette er forsiden af Londonavisen *The Economist* af 27. jan., der erklærer, »Den næste krig: Den voksende fare for stormagtskonflikt«.

Det eneste, vindende antikrigs-fremstød er mobiliseringen for et Nyt Paradigme, især i det transatlantiske område, for de hasteforholdsregler, der fremlægges i LaRouches Fire Love og tilslutningen til Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

Præsident Trump har atter udtalt sin støtte til en genopretning af vareproduktion og jobs i USA, i en tale, han holdt i dag på en fabrik nær Cincinnati, Ohio. Hans banner lød, »USA – Åben for business«. Det var en dyb ironi, da Tv-speakeren åndeløst afbrød live-dækningen af hans tale for at rapportere, at Dow Indekset netop var styrtdykket med 1600 points!

Kendsgerningen i verden er, at det Nye Paradigme med den Nye Silkevej er i gang. Det er modellen, der virker. Det er LaRouche-parrets årtier lange dagsorden in action. Fremtiden for menneskeheden er vores.

Foto: Præsidenten og vicepræsidenten mødes med Senatets lederskab. De demokratiske senatorer Feinstein og Schumacher til venstre, og de republikanske senatorer McConnell og Grassley til højre. 24. jan., 2017. (Whitehouse Photo / twitter)

Kampen for at afslutte 'Russiagate' er ingen sportsbegivenhed; Vi må intervenere for at stoppe det

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 4. feb., 2018 – USA befinder sig ved et vendepunkt i sin årtier lange, »interne« kamp mod britisk efterretnings brug af amerikanske efterretningstjenester til at kontrollere og afpresse præsidenter. Det er også et vendepunkt i udenrigspolitik, der enten vil føre verden hen mod en umiddelbar konfrontation med atomkrig, eller også et nyt paradigme for samarbejde mellem stormagter omkring at afslutte regionale krige, bygge storslået infrastruktur, overvinde fattigdom og besejre international terrorisme.

Disse to vendepunkter har samme mål – bekæmpelse af britisk geopolitik. Det langvarige kupforsøg imod denne amerikanske præsident, skandalen med »Russiagate«, hvor tidevandet nu måske er ved at vende, blev bragt til Washington af chefen for britisk MI6-udenrigsefterretning, for næsten to år siden. Spydhovedet i denne bestræbelse var et britisk »dossier«, og misbruget af dette dossier er nu blevet afsløret af Husets Efterretningskomite. Dets formål var at afpresse USA med hensyn til den udenrigspolitik, som dets præsident kunne få lov at gennemføre.

Storbritanniens Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) udstedte den 25. jan. instruktioner til Amerika om at »se Rusland som en trussel« og erklærede, at, »at indgå en aftale« om samarbejde med Rusland – f.eks. om bekæmpelse af international terrorisme – »implicit ville acceptere, at den

nuværende verdensorden ikke længere er i kraft«. RIIA kunne ikke have sagt det tydeligere: at den britiske, geopolitiske verdensorden er beroende på konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland. Ultimatummet til præsident Donald Trump blev overleveret af cheferne for efterretningstjenesterne allerede under et møde den 6. januar, 2017, i Trump Tower; konfronter og angrib Rusland (og Kina), eller også vil vi skandalisere dig med dette britiske dossier og smide dig ud.

Dette er deres kriminelle, ja forræderiske handling, som nu bliver afsløret. Men verden lever imidlertid med konsekvenserne heraf, med den voksende trussel om en *virkelig* atomkrig, og vi vil leve med det, indtil, og med mindre, denne britisk-amerikanske sammensværgelse godt og grundigt bliver ødelagt.

Nogle kongresmedlemmer har nu krævet det næste skridt – en efterforskning for kriminelle handlinger og en potentiel retsforfølgelse af de efterretningsfolk, der handlede med den hensigt at udelukke og diskvalificere præsident Trump fra præsidentskabet, udelukkende på grund af hans politik over for Rusland. Formand for Husets Efterretningskomite, David Nunes, kaldte sammensværgelsen mod Trump for »noget, der finder sted i banarepublikker«.

Faktisk har der i længere tid ikke været nogen bananrepublikker i Sydamerika, kun republikker, der samarbejder med Kina og BRIKS, og som lykkes med at blive ledere inden for industri og videnskab. Med andre ord: at overtræde den britiske, geopolitiske verdensorden. Og præsidenterne og de tidligere præsidenter for *disse* republikker – Brasiliens Lula og Dilma Rousseff, Argentinas Fernández de Kirchner, Ecuadors Rafael Correa – har været udset som mål for skandale og afsættelse, præcis, som Trump skulle afsættes, og af de præcis samme teams i FBI og CIA, under anførsel af Robert Mueller, James Comey et al.

For 30 år siden anførte Robert Mueller, som daværende

vicestatsanklager i Boston, den retsforfølgelse, der havde til formål at fjerne Lyndon LaRouche som politisk leder. I 1984 udfordrede LaRouche den britiske, geopolitiske verdensorden som ingen anden. Han havde øvet indflydelse på præsident Ronald Reagan for at tilbyde amerikansk-russisk missilforsvarssamarbejde i det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI)**, og han arbejdede for store infrastrukturprojekter og foreslog oprettelse af internationale udviklingsbanker for at sprede de revolutionerende SDI-militærteknologier til industrien i hele verden.

Mange republikanske ledere bekæmper nu det angreb mod præsident Trump, der havde sin oprindelse i britisk efterretning, mens de på samme tid selv arbejder for den britiske politik for skarp konfrontation med Rusland og Kina! Som chef for den kendte München Sikkerhedskonference (Wolfgang Ischinger) netop har bemærket, så forhindrer Kongressen præsident Trump i at gennemføre presserende tiltrængte forbedringer i de amerikansk-russiske relationer.

Det amerikanske folk, og lederne af dets valgkredse, må intervenere for at redde nationen, i de kommende midtvejsvalg 2018.

Vi har brug for en koordineret indsats for at genindføre Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i hele USA og Europa, før City of London og Wall Street bringer vore økonomier ind i endnu et, denne gang langt værre, krak.

Vi har brug for internationale aftaler om på verdensplan at bygge den mest afgørende infrastruktur, med en accept af Kinas lederskab i dets Bælte & Vej Initiativ. Amerika selv har et enormt underskud af presserende nødvendig, ny økonomisk infrastruktur og må skabe en national kreditinstitution, der kan medvirke i dette; et nyt Reconstruction Finance Corporation i Roosevelts tradition, eller en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition.

Og vi kunne få en international aftale om at udvikle forsvar med ny teknologi, der er effektiv i elimineringen af atommissiler. Det er for nyligt blevet bekræftet («The British Sabotaged the Second Try for an SDI with Russia»[1]), at Rusland i 25 år har været parat til at genoptage Reagans SDI sammen med USA for at udvikle reelle anti-missilforsvar og nye spin-off teknologier – og at Storbritannien kraftigt er gået imod dette.

Måden at intervenere på er at tilslutte sig LaRouche Political Action Committees mobilisering for **LaRouches »Fire Økonomiske Love«** i forbindelse med det kommende midtvejsvalg, 2018.

Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump i Det Hvide Hus, 22. jan., 2018. (Official White House Photo by Joyce N. Boghosian)

[1] *EIR Daily Alert*, Jan. 23, 2018