

# Ruslandsekspert Rahr siger, Putin og Trump vil have lange møder under G20-topmøde

24. juni, 2017 – I et interview med RT i Potsdam i forbindelse med Russisk-tysk Forum den 22.-23. juni, sagde forskningsdirektør og ruslandsekspert, Alexander Rahr, at han er overbevist om, at G20-mødet mellem Putin og Trump vil finde sted, og at de to ledere vil have et langt møde. »Jeg håber, mødet vil finde sted. Der er kræfter, der ønsker at forhindre dette møde i at finde sted. Jeg tror, det vil finde sted, og at de to mænd vil have lange drøftelser«, hvor de diskuterer samarbejde om strategiske hovedspørgsmål.

Rahr sagde også, mht. dialogen mellem EU og Rusland, »Rusland er gidsel i interne konflikter i EU«.

Der er i øjeblikket ingen kanaler for dialog mellem EU og Rusland, sagde Rahr, men heldigvis har vi Potsdamer-dialogen og mange netværk i Tyskland, hvor folk, der har kendt hinanden i 20-40 år, kan tale sammen.

»Hvis Tyskland alene kunne bestemme mht. de bilaterale relationer med Moskva, ville Tyskland for længst have gjort det. Men vi har en situation, hvor Tyskland er indlejret i en EU-konsensus. Dette gør tingene vanskelige. Folk i Moskva forstår ikke altid dette, men den tyske elite vil ikke ændre på dette, ønsker ikke at ændre det. De vil altid søge konsensus i EU.«

Og i EU, fortsatte han, har vi fem stater, der ikke ønsker at have relationer med Rusland, og endda ønsker at øge sanktionerne. Og vi har fem andre stater, der gerne ophævede sanktionerne i morgen. Rahr nævnte Polen og de Baltiske Lande

som hardliners. EU er splittet i mange spørgsmål, og »Merkels politik, som jeg forstår det, gå ud på at bevare konsensus for enhver pris. Tyskland er bange for, at hvis det markerer sig med en stærk holdning til et bestemt spørgsmål, der kraftigt modgås af andre, så kunne EU ende i en krise.«

»Rusland er gidsel for disse interne konflikter eller, lad os sige, for disse vanskeligheder internt i EU.«

*Foto: Alexander Rahr, forfatter og politolog, gav et interview til RT under Potsdamer-begivenhederne.*

---

# **Hvorfor briterne bliver ved med at myrde amerikanske præsidenter. LPAC kortvideo**

De nylige trusler mod præsident Trumps liv, der kommer fra mange kendte personer, New York City Public Theatre Company, samt nedskydningen af kongresmedlem Scalise, bør ikke ses som isolerede tilfælde; som forbrydelser, begået af enkeltindivider, der handler af egen vilje. Vi bør snarere af USA's egen historie lære, at der ikke findes nogen 'enlig skytte'. Det er briterne, der myrder vore præsidenter, af en særlig grund.

Lad os se på de af vore præsidenter, der blev myrdet; hvad er mønstret? Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, JFK og, endskønt han ikke var præsident, men er relevant for os i dag, Alexander

Hamilton. Hvad fortæller mordet på disse præsidenter os om vor nations unikke rolle i historien? Hvis man ser på deres handlinger, så anvendte de, eller havde tydeligvis til hensigt at anvende, det Amerikanske Økonomiske System, for at fremme vor nation, og de kæmpede udtrykkeligt mod Det britiske Imperiums gennemførelse af 'frihandel' i USA. Disse præsidenter vidste, til forskel fra de fleste amerikanere i dag, at Det britiske Imperium er vores fjende, og de vidste, at det var deres job at beskytte vore borgere mod den elendighed, vi ville stå overfor, hvis britisk imperiefrihandel blev praktiseret. Og, hvad der var allervigtigst, så indså de, at britisk frihandel ville kvæle vores mest dyrebare resurse; det amerikanske folks kreative gnist i en naturlig hældning mod at bidrage med vore evner hen imod en positiv og varig virkning på vore efterlevende. Det Amerikanske System opmuntrer udtrykkeligt denne gnist og bruger den til udvikling af gennembrud inden for varefremstilling, landbrug, videnskab og kultur.

I dag henviser præsident Trump udtrykkeligt til Det Amerikanske Økonomiske System som sin politiske programerklæring. Bortset fra Lyndon LaRouche og hans bevægelse, så er der ingen i det 20. århundrede, der har identificeret det Amerikanske Økonomiske System som værende dét princip i vores historie, der fuldstændig adskiller os fra Det britiske Imperium. Trumps plan om at genoplive den produktivitet, vi har mistet i de seneste 50 år, siden mordet på JFK, og hans beredvillighed til at samarbejde med Kina og Rusland om skabelsen af en ny, økonomisk orden, vækker rædsel i briterne. Trumps præsidentskab udgør en trussel mod selve Det britiske Imperiums eksistens. De ved, der ikke er plads til deres Imperium i en ny, international, økonomisk orden på denne planet, og de vil ikke dø uden kamp.

Lær om Lyndon LaRouches fremsættelse af det Amerikanske System, kendt som de Fire Love til USA's omgående redning, gennem viste videolink, [\(dansk tekst her\)](#) og gå med i LaRouche

PAC (Schiller Instituttet, DK!) for at skabe en ny æra for menneskeheden, *uden* Det britiske Imperium.

*Offentliggjort den 24. jun. 2017.*

---

## **USA tilslutter sig Bælte & Vej – Ideer flytter verden!**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 23. juni, 2017* – Fire begivenheder i løbet af de seneste par dage har vist, at USA nu responderer til det krav, Lyndon og Helga LaRouche fremsatte for tre år siden: USA tilslutter sig den Nye Silkevej.

\* Den 22. juni mødtes Kinas udenrigspolitiske topregeringsperson Yang Jiechi med præsident Trump, der sagde, at USA er villig til at samarbejde om projekter relateret til Bælte & Vej Initiativet;

\* Den »9. Amerikansk-kinesiske Dialog mellem virksomhedsledere og tidligere seniorregeringsfolk«, sponsoreret i fællesskab af USA's Handelskammer og Kinas Center for Internationale Økonomiske Udvekslinger, mødtes i Beijing den 20.-21. juni og erklærede i en fælleserklæring, at »begge sider aftalte, at de to lande kan indlede fuldt samarbejde under 'Bælte & Vej' initiativet og gennem flere andre midler«. De aftalte at holde en fælles konference om Bælte & Vej inden for de næste 12 måneder;

\* i San Francisco mødtes 200 kinesiske og amerikanske regeringsfolk og repræsentanter for infrastrukturselskaber i »Forum 2017 for Amerikansk-kinesisk Transportsamarbejde«, hvor den kinesiske konsul sagde, at »Kinesisk og amerikansk samarbejde på infrastrukturfronten er klar til at blive det

nye fokus i de to landes handelsengagement«;

\* i Detroit Michigan var 3000 mennesker proppet sammen i Cobo Center den 20.-21. juni til en konference, sponsoreret af Ali Baba-direktør Jack Ma. Michigans viceguvernør Brian Calley, der talte ved arrangementet, sagde om handel med Kina: »Det er den traditionelle win-win-situation.« Ma sagde til forsamlingen: »Hvis I går glip af Kina, går I glip af fremtiden.«

Under en diskussion af disse historiske begivenheder i dag bemærkede Helga Zepp-LaRouche, at vores organisation har kæmpet for, at USA gik med i den Nye Silkevej, i mindst tre år, siden udgivelsen af *EIR*-rapporten, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. »Først var vi de eneste«, sagde Helga, »men nu er det blevet almindeligt. Vi bør høste anerkendelsen – tænk på, hvor mange arrangementer, vi sponsorerede, i hele verden, for denne idé. Dette viser, at ideer virker!«

»Folk bør bestemt være optimistiske«, understregede hun. »Hvis dette udvikles yderligere, så kan alle problemer løses. Gå ud med en optimistisk rapport til befolkningen – vores politik virker!«

Foto: *USA's præsident Donald Trump møder Kinas statsrådgiver Yang Jiechi i Det Hvide Hus torsdag. (Photo @ChinaDailyUSA / twitter)*

---

## **Trump vil samarbejde med Kina**

# om Bælte & Vej / Indsats for Glass/Steagall optrappes: LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 23. juni, 2017

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

**Matthew Ogden:** Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg Paul Gallagher, redaktør for *EIR's* økonomiske stof, og som har været meget aktiv i Washington, D.C., i den eskalerede kamp for genindførelsen af Glass/Steagall og resten af hr. **LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love** i Hamiltons tradition. Han har mange opdateringer til os på denne front. Og via video har vi Diane Sare, LaRouche PAC Policy koordinator for New York, med os fra Manhattan. Hun har netop skrevet en artikel med titlen, »Gullivers rejse til Manhattan! Kun LaRouches Fire Love og Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ kan løse Manhattans infrastrukturkrise.« (*EIR*, 23. juni). Som vi alle ved, venter »Helvedessommeren« forude i New York City, mht. transportinfrastruktur.

Jeg vil straks begynde med nogle meget signifikante

udviklinger i kampen for at bringe USA ind i den Nye Silkevej, ind i Kinas Bælte & Vej Initiativ. For det første vil jeg rapportere direkte, at *Xinhua*, et kinesisk nyhedsmedie, rapporterer, at præsident Donald Trump i går mødtes med Kinas statsrådgiver Yang Jiechi i Det Hvide Hus, og til statsrådgiveren Yang sagde, at USA er villig til at samarbejde om projekter relateret til det kinesiske Bælte & Vej Initiativ. De to havde dette møde i Det Hvide Hus som en del af statsrådgiver Yangs besøg til Washington; dette var et møde på højt niveau. Og, iflg. nyhedsrapporter, sagde Yang til præsident Trump, at Kina var meget tilfreds med, meget glad over og satte meget stor pris på det faktum, at Trump-administrationen havde besluttet at sende en repræsentant på højt plan – Matthew Pottinger – til at deltage i Bælte & Vej Forum i Beijing i sidste måned. Vi har rapporteret, at denne repræsentant for USA var en beslutning i sidste sekund fra Trumps side, og at det var en meget god beslutning. Rådgiver Yang sagde også til Donald Trump, at Kina ville være villig til at arbejde sammen med USA om Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Ifølge det Kinesiske Udenrigsministeriums rapport om mødet, responderede præsident Trump til denne udtalelse fra rådgiver Yang ved at sige, at han – præsident Trump – ville være åben over for at samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej Initiativet og hermed relaterede projekter. Han sagde, han er tilfreds med de positive fremskridt, der er sket i de kinesisk-amerikanske relationer, siden sit møde med præsident Xi i Mar-a-Lago. Og han meddelte, at han planlægger at besøge Kina inden for det næste (nuværende) år. Dette blev bekræftet af udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson i en pressekonference, han holdt onsdag. Præsident Trump rapporterede ligeledes, at han ser frem til igen at mødes med præsident Xi Jinping ved G20-topmødet i Hamborg, Tyskland, i juli måned. Det var første punkt, og det er naturligvis en meget signifikant udvikling.

Det andet punkt er, at der samtidig, dagen før dette møde mellem præsident Trump og statsrådgiver Yang, var en møde på højt niveau mellem tidligere kinesiske regeringsfolk og

amerikanske erhvervsledere på højt niveau, i regi af et bilateralt eller fælles møde, der fandt sted mellem USA's Handelskammer – der repræsenterer førende, amerikanske erhvervsinteresser – og Kinas Center for Internationale Økonomiske Udvekslinger, der er en regeringstilknyttet tænketank med base i Beijing. Under dette møde udstedte disse to grupper et fælleskommuniké, der promoverede fælles samarbejde mellem USA og Kina.

*Her følger resten af webcastet på engelsk:*

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



Chinese and U.S. companies to cooperate in third countries. Significant participation by U.S. companies, including in partnership with Chinese companies, can make new contributions to the furtherance of China-U.S. economic and trade relations. In certain areas, U.S. companies can offer the world's best technology and management capability, thereby helping to insure smooth and efficient completion of Belt and Road projects. Infrastructure building in the U.S. will generate an enormous need for investment, and the new U.S. administration has indicated that this is a major priority. China has strong capabilities and cost advantages in infrastructure building, including the building of urban roads, expressways, fly-overs, high-speed rail, and ports."

It goes on to say: "Chinese companies and financial institutions are ready to contribute to this effort through financing and through the provision of goods and services. Chinese investment in certain areas of U.S. infrastructure development has the potential to help strengthen business relations between the two sides, and in some cases, speed up completion of the needed projects at lower cost and with greater efficiency. Both sides agreed that the two countries can engage in full cooperation under the Belt and Road Initiative and through a number of other means, including the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, the World Bank, and other multilateral investment and financing institutions."

Then it has a subtitle: "Agreed Action"

"Within the next twelve months, the CCIEE and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce will organize a conference on the Belt and Road in China or in the United States; which will allow the Chinese side to brief the U.S. side on the Belt and Road plans, including initiative content, current progress and projects

that  
might be appropriate for U.S. company participation, including  
in  
partnership with the Chinese companies. The U.S. side will  
brief  
the Chinese side on the latest infrastructure developments in  
the  
United States and share reflections on pathways for Chinese  
companies to participate in U.S. infrastructure revitalization  
initiatives.”

So, this is a very important development. And now, third,  
here’s an article from {China Daily} which reports on a rather  
extraordinary forum that happened in San Francisco yesterday,  
which was titled “2017: U.S.-China Transportation Cooperation  
Forum.” Before I get to the next slide, just see here, the  
beginning of the article. It’s titled “Chinese Builders  
Wanted

in the U.S..” The beginning of the article says, “Chinese  
infrastructure techniques are urgently needed to rehabilitate  
America’s poorly maintained and in some cases dilapidated  
bridges

and road system, industry experts from both countries agree.  
The

fact that the U.S., the world’s most economically and  
technologically powerful country, should import fast-train  
know-how from a developing China, reflects a new normal for  
China-U.S. cooperation and communication.” Then, the article  
quotes Chinese Consul-General to San Francisco Luo Linqun,  
who

gave the keynote. He said, “China and the U.S. cooperation on  
the infrastructure front is posed to become the new highlight  
in

the trade engagement between the two countries. California  
along

with its neighboring states has especially close trade  
relations

with China,” he added. “The import and export volume between

this

region and China has mounted to more than \$201 billion in 2016.

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

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

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

as Helga LaRouche said when she was briefed on these developments

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

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

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

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

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

She

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

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

And

I think we can also see some dramatic developments between the potential for a bilateral meeting – and this is becoming more solid as the days go on – between Trump and Putin. But, as the lead article on the LaRouche PAC website states very clearly today, although it's widely expected that President Trump and President Putin will meet for the first time on the sidelines of this G20 summit, it's very clear that the opponents of this world-changing event of the United States-Russia-China cooperation, are doing everything they can in an hysterical fashion, to try to undermine this before it ever happens, to force the cancellation, to cause it to become totally hostile, or to cause there to be no positive progress that can be made out of such a summit. You see this crazy Russian sanctions bill that was rammed through the Senate 98-2; you can see the efforts by the U.S. forces shooting down this Syrian jet over Syrian territory, which has the potential to develop very rapidly. This forced the Russians to again terminate the non-confliction hotline between the United States and Russia. You can see Steve Mnuchin's efforts to levy new sanctions against 38 Russian and Ukrainian firms and individuals. Then you can see this F-16 that buzzed the military aircraft that was carrying Russian Defense Minister Shoigu. All of these are very dangerous, and are obviously planned to try to derail any potential for a positive relationship between the United States and Russia. One only has to read this hysterical article in the {Washington Post} today, "Obama's Secret Struggle to Punish Russia for Putin's Election Assault," which only continues this false narrative.

PAUL GALLAGHER: Not so secret.

OGDEN: Not so secret. So, that gives you a picture of where we stand, but a very optimistic picture, as Helga LaRouche underlined; if we see in terms of the potential for this United States New Silk Road, New Paradigm consolidation. But it's very urgent that this happen as well. That was why I asked both Paul and Diane to join me on the show today. First, I'd like to ask Diane to go through a little bit of what you have in this article. As I said, it's titled "Gulliver Travels to Manhattan! Only LaRouche's Four Laws and the Belt and Road Can Save Manhattan Infrastructure Crisis." So Diane.

DIANE SARE: Sure. I was inspired, if one can call it that, by my attendance at a Cranes, New York real estate conference, where they had three panels. The way it was billed was that – and they had the CEO of the Port Authority, and the building trades union, and Staten Island and Brooklyn. And given what's about to happen here, which people may or may not be aware of, basically we are at a total breakdown point in the greater Manhattan area. During the day in Manhattan, you have about 3.1 million people; at night, it's about 1.8 million. There's something between 1.5 million and 1.8 million who commute into the city to the island of Manhattan on a daily basis. That's a very large traffic flow. Penn Station handles about 650,000 people a day; I think that's triple what it was built for. Similarly, every other major transit point, whether it's coming

in from Long Island and Brooklyn across the East River, or coming in from New Jersey on the western side, everything is completely overloaded; at or well above capacity. So now, the system itself is anywhere from 70 to 100 years old, and very little maintenance or repair or upgrading has been done. We're using switching systems which were built before World War II largely; I think they've modernized one line so far, and another one will be done in a few years. It really is insane.

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

At any rate, these repairs start on the 10th of July, and they're going to be going on for at least six weeks or longer. Who really knows, frankly?

There's no redundancy. This is a system that any section of

it that you shut down, if you're talking about transit points that are already functioning or not functioning I should say, at over capacity. And you're going to add 20% more traffic, or 30% more traffic, or 50% more traffic to it; you could have a total breakdown of everything. None of the plans I've seen so far really are adequate. I don't know what they're going to do as they get closer; maybe they're going to have to have people come into work on rotating shifts, people's hours are going to change, I don't know. But at any rate, I was hoping that this conference might address it. What I heard there – and it's not as though these speakers were completely incompetent or were not aware of the crisis in some way – but what you saw was that people's thinking has been so warped. One, as I said in the article, by this Bertrand Russell legacy that there's no such thing as a creative idea, or a new idea; but that everything is an algebraic system of linear deduction. Of course, from that standpoint, you could never conceptualize where this region should be in 50 or 100 years. So, the things that they were proposing be done, like turning Rikers Island into a part of LaGuardia Airport – LaGuardia Airport, as people may know who have travelled into New York, is very much overloaded. They don't have the space for the number of flights that are coming in, and they're projecting that by 2030 there will be another 30 million people per year

trying

to fly into the city. So, how do you handle this? They said, well we need 75 more flight operations per hour. Taking over all

of Rikers Island for this and a new wastewater treatment plant,

only gives you an increase of 30 more flight operations per hour.

So, why would you do that? What is the point of investing in something that doesn't even meet either the current needs or what

you are projecting? It's really insane. So, you have that factor; and the other factor is the funding, which I think Paul

may deal with more; but the idea that everything can only be done

through public-private partnerships. As people know, my colleague Bill Roberts has an article in the same issue of {EIR}

about the Soo Locks, where of course they figured out in 1986 that this is a key transshipment point for coal and other things

in the United States; and they really needed to be repaired and

modernized. So, this was approved in 1986, but they concluded that you'd only make back 75 cents on the dollar of what was invested. Clearly by Bertrand Russell-type methods, where it's

all linear, because if you cause 11 million people to be unemployed, which is what would happen if this thing wasn't done,

that's not taken into account.

Similarly, the speaker at this conference from Brooklyn, showed pictures of the damage from Hurricane Sandy, which were horrific; I was here in New Jersey when that occurred. We didn't

have electricity for about two weeks; it was very damaging,



very

devastating. There were several proposals made in 2009 at a conference in Manhattan for storm surge barriers. My favorite was a five-mile one that went from Sandy Hook in New Jersey to the Rockaways. So you go across the whole area before you even

get to Staten Island, and it would have an underground tunnel and

it would have gates that came up; but normally the ocean would be

flowing through. I think that would cost something like \$6 billion. I can see these silly accountants with their mathematical methods saying \$6 billion, what's the profit? Well,

how about saving \$80 billion? \$6 billion versus \$80 billion in

damage when you get one of these storms. But nonetheless, they

decided not to build it, and we got what we got with Hurricane Sandy. So, because of the way people think in terms of worshipping money, as opposed to seeing money as a means of credit generation, or as a means of figuring out how to measure

the cost of an improvement that you need; which will lead ultimately to the increase in the productivity of your population.

What does it mean when you say we want our standard of living to be higher? Well, that doesn't mean having seven television sets in every room as opposed to one, or something like that. When you say the standard of living, we mean things

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

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

English language, which is our language in this country. In other words, how many Americans know how to read music? How many Americans have conducted basic scientific experiments in school; have ever tried to make a painting or a work of art or write a poem? In other words, by standard of living you mean that there's a life expectancy which allows for a young person to be educated to the age of 22, 25, 28; and then that person has an adult lifespan in which they're still developing and learning. You can get human beings developing a quality of genius which contributes to the future for all mankind. The only reason for money, is to create a situation where you can think in those terms. That the people living 100 and 200 years from now will live longer, be healthier, be better educated, and be better; which is what you would want. Who really wants to be the best of all time? That means, in effect, that your life is meaningless, if everything coming after you is going to be worse than you. So, that's the point of economy; but none of these people was thinking that way at all. It really struck me that here we are sitting on potential complete chaos; you already had two weeks ago, there was a subway that got stuck, and it didn't have air conditioning because the power was out. So you had people packed in this car, and the temperatures were getting to 100 degrees, it was like a sauna in there. No one could move for 45 minutes and they were on the brink – as you might imagine – of getting completely panicked. Happily, no one had a heart attack or other medical disaster, but it does make

people nervous. A few days ago, another subway car was stalled out, so people went out the back exit and got down on the track and started walking to the station. That's extremely dangerous.

What happens if you lose all order because people just panic because they don't know if they're going to reach their destination? They don't want to be stuck in a subway for hours

on end. We're really on the brink of a situation like that. People would be prepared to tolerate hardship if they knew that there was a plan to actually address it.

For example, if President Trump, as a result of his dialogues with Xi Jinping and President Putin, were to say "Look,

we actually think the Bering Strait tunnel should be built within

the next decade; and we're going to launch a crash program with

China and Russia to develop high-speed rail corridors across the

United States. So that Manhattan really should be connected with

Paris; and that's something that will happen. I'm going to initiate that in my Presidency, and it's something that will be

completed during a future administration." Now knowing Trump, he'd probably say "Well, it has to be done within my first term."

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

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

northeastern

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

like under those circumstances? Maybe we have to consider taking

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

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

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

thinking in this way.

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

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

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

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

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

up with a certain amount of hardship; probably very happily, knowing that their children were going to live in a much more beautiful and functioning location than we currently do now.

So, this is the battle. And I think Matt, what you reported just at the beginning of this show, in terms of the commitment of

President Trump to work with the Chinese, the commitment of

the

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

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

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

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

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

I'm

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

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

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

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

regard to infrastructure in North America and infrastructure in

the United States.

But on Glass-Steagall, let me just indicate, you have a very stark comparison in terms of infrastructure investment between the United States and China. In the United States, about \$300 billion is invested in infrastructure every year, and that is, every school, every hospital, every road job, every subdivision's

new sewer and water and optical fiber, and so forth – that is absolutely everything, public, private, local, Federal, amounts

to about that much investment. In China, the four major state banks which provide the credit for the infrastructure breakthroughs that have been made in China, those four banks issue about \$140 billion worth of credit annually for high-speed rail in China alone. And just that form of advanced infrastructure and just that public investment by those four national banks: the Exim Bank, the China Development Bank, the other China policy banks, as they're called. That investment in just high-speed rail is half of the total investment made by the United States – public, private, in every form, on every kind of infrastructure and every public band-aid that's put on, and claimed as infrastructure, every year. In addition, those banks in China have invested and committed \$300 billion just in the three years since the Belt and Road Initiative of President Xi began to take off, and that \$300 billion invested and committed by those banks is outside China. So that's going on simultaneously with the large-scale investments in completely frontier, including things like maglev subways, in the major cities of China, and there are many, many, many major cities in China as people know. So this is widely in the financial press in the United States and Europe, the old imperial liberal order defends itself by saying, "This credit issuance of China can't possibly be sustained. There will be a tremendous, earthshattering collapse of all of this infrastructure credit, because the banks – it

has dwarfed even what the Federal Reserve has done for the banks here, and for a good purpose, and it can be sustained; it'll all blow up." There is a very fundamental difference here, though, in that China, for the last 20 years has had bank separation; it has many shadow banks, it has a lot of investment companies involved in broker-dealers, but they are completely separated from the both private commercial banking system, which they want to build up further, and also from this kind of public banking. So that these banks are not involved in the \$550 trillion derivatives exposure of the banks in London and New York. These banks are not involved in securities speculation. They are able to handle bankruptcies; they're able to handle non-performing loans when they appear in various sectors as the economy develops. So, Glass-Steagall, although they don't call that law "Glass-Steagall" in China, that bank separation is important to what they are able to do and the fact that they've been doing it now for 20 years on a level of spending nearly 9% of their GDP on new infrastructure every year, for more than 20 years. Compare that to the United States, which spends about 1.3% of its GDP now on infrastructure annually. They've been able to do that, and keep it up. Now, we've been fighting for Glass-Steagall in Washington. It's really taken on much more of the characteristics of a

good

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

half months ago with 25 sponsors. They now have about 55



sponsors as a result of fighting for it publicly since then. This is a much faster rate of getting sponsors onto the bill than was the case in the last session, where eventually there were about 85 sponsors after two years of work. But in this case, the week before last they had a congressional briefing for the staffs of Congressmen throughout the House, about somewhere between 35 and 40 other Congressmen sent their staffs to this briefing, so it was really quite a packed event in one of the office buildings, to take notes and report back to their Members of Congress. And not only Kaptur and Jones, but also experts from the AFL-CIO, from the Americans for Financial Reform, from Public Citizen; Nomi Prins, an independent, former investment banker and author on banking, independent expert – they all testified. And this is causing a tremendous amount of discussion throughout the House in particular. On the Senate side, the leading sponsors have all made it a point to draw out the Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, and make it clear that what he was advising Donald Trump to do during the campaign essentially, was not the real Glass-Steagall or anything like it; but rather Mnuchin's advice to Trump during his campaign, was to talk about Glass-Steagall while Mnuchin privately was designing something which was really Wall Street deregulation like the bill that recently passed the House. So the fact that they have really broken Mnuchin down on

this and made him say “No, no, no, I don’t believe in anything like separating commercial and investment banking.” This has also dramatically clarified issues for people in both the Senate and the House. And secondly, we have begun to get close to the mobilization of large organizations, large trade unions, coalition organizations like Public Citizen, and in this I don’t mean them endorsing Glass-Steagall, I mean them mobilizing their hundreds and hundreds of thousands of members to demand this from Congress. We’ve come very close to getting to that stage, and in particular you saw last week a broadcast that Public Citizen ran on their Facebook page with Rep. Marcy Kaptur, in which they were motivating and calling on their reportedly 400,000 members to go after Congress to get this. So the objective is to get from the 55 sponsors now to 100 – fast. Because it’s not so important in the Senate, to pile up a lot of sponsors – there are only a 100 Senators. It’s very important in the House, when the leadership of both parties is against Glass-Steagall, which they are: Both the Republican and the Democratic leadership do not want to see it; the Democratic leadership wants to cling onto this failed Dodd-Frank Bill, and pretend that Obama came up with something nice there. And the Republican leadership wants to give Wall Street every kind of deregulation that they’ve ever asked for. So in that situation, it is crucial to get to 100 sponsors.

This is the stated objective of the major sponsors in the House and when they do that, then they really want to go public and start to hold the kind of press conferences and press bugging of other Members which will get widely covered in the media and really make this into a bigger brawl. So that's just an indication of some of the things we have been getting going. And one of the arguments that Jones and Kaptur have started to use, for example when they – I didn't mention this, but they also went to the Rules Committee when it was marking up this crazy Republican deregulation bill called the "Financial CHOICE Act." They went to the Rules Committee with an amendment that said, strike CHOICE Act, take it away, and put Glass-Steagall reinstatement in its place, and that's our amendment." So they got to make a fight in front of the Rules Committee on that. But they've begun to make the very coherent argument that not only did Glass-Steagall's elimination lead directly to the crash in 2008; there's no need to go over this now, it's the most obvious thing in the world to most thinking Americans. It's like the guy who ate nothing but McDonalds food for four months and after four or five months his organs were failing, he was catastrophically obese, he was near death! And this is like saying "there was no connection, there were other factors that brought this guy into this condition. It wasn't the McDonald's Big Macs that he was eating." That's what it amounts to to tell Americans that less than 10 years after getting rid of Glass-Steagall, the whole banking system blew up simultaneously,

which has never, for all of the major banks to be bankrupt at the same time, as Ben Bernanke admitted they were, has never happened in the entire history of the United States. It took less than 10 years without Glass-Steagall to bring that about. So they also are now arguing that the period in which Glass-Steagall was in effect, which is also the period in which the biggest infrastructure investments in new infrastructure in the United States were being made, from the '20s, up through the end of the '60s and into the '70s, that that was a golden era of productivity in the United States. We had a banking system then, which concentrated not only on loaning to – but you see it in many examples of the history of that period – concentrating on making commercial and industrial loans to businesses for expansion and for participation in major projects. You don't have that kind of a banking system without Glass-Steagall; instead, you have a banking system which wants to underwrite bond issues for only the biggest corporations, with which they can play around with their stock prices and so on. And it brings the entire economy down. It gets us right back – and they're making now the right argument and very powerful argument, that if we want to rebuild the United States, and particularly build new, frontier new infrastructure in the United States, we have to have a commercial banking system which is separated from securities broker-dealing

and speculation in the derivatives markets; and which is concentrating on household lending and commercial and industrial

lending to the companies participating in these great projects.

Now, public-private partnership is, again, back to Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, the conference that was held in Washington last week, SelectUSA, which was a conference trying to get foreign investment in the United States. So this is the Treasury

Department; you've already given the context for this, along with

what Diane reported, in terms of the imminent potential, absolutely imminent potential for large-scale investment, particularly from China in an infrastructure build in the United

States. instead, what the Treasury Secretary went there and offered was, he said: We want this kind of investment and public-private partnerships are critical.

Suffice it to say, never in the United States has a major infrastructure project or major new element of the infrastructure

of the United States, {never} has such a thing been constructed

with a public-private partnership, let alone by private investment alone. The Transcontinental Railroad was by no means

a public-private partnership. And these things simply don't work. The investors in them want their capital back in 10 years,

and they want 10-12% rates of interest in their invested capital

during that 10 years. Well, that means they want it back, if it's anything major, while the thing is still not finished, and

still not being used to a full extent; and they want to absolutely rob the public taxpayers whose money is going into

such a project. It simply cannot work, and it will sabotage foreign investment in new infrastructure building in the United

States if this method is used.

We have a threadbare public investment in infrastructure now. What President Trump has spoken about, the time has run out

for him and for the Congress to implement it. They have to now

create, immediately, a National Bank on the order of \$1-2 trillion in capital, in the way that Alexander Hamilton and his

successors in the American System built such National Banks starting in 1790, through the 19th century. They have to create

such a bank {now}, so that there is a credit institution here, to

cooperate with the credit institutions like those in China that I

was discussing earlier.

Otherwise, we are really facing disaster. I'll give you an example: I went to a Congressional hearing yesterday and talked

to some of the witnesses who were involved in exactly trying to

organize some of the infrastructure developments that Diane indicated are so needed in the New York area. One of them is a

bridge over the Hackensack River near Secaucus, New Jersey, called the Portal Bridge, which is 108 years old. It was designed in the 19th century, completed in 1910. It has ships go

under it by splitting the bridge, but opening as a drawbridge.

All of the rail traffic, freight and passenger, between Florida

and Massachusetts goes over that bridge – all of it! And that bridge, when they open it to get a ship go through, when they

try

to close it now, 9 times out of 10, according to the fellow who spoke to me there, 9 times out of 10 it doesn't close properly,

so that rails don't align. And they then send workers out on the

concrete abutment of the bridge with sledgehammers, and they hammer at the iron trusses of the bridge to get the rails to align.

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

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

Mesabi Iron Range, and all of the ships which are carrying all of

the strategic metals, the iron, the coal coming out of Northern

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

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

would be lost.

So you say, "well of course, they're replacing this bridge at Hackensack," but actually, they're not! They don't have the

funds! They have a plan, it's all worked out, it's engineered,

but the replacement is not under way.

So you have here, the makings of a movie you could call it, a suspense thriller: "The Bridge over the Hackensack River."

But

with 10% of the U.S. economy hanging on the guys banging those rails back into place, but there is not any funding arranged

to

replace that bridge. And you can multiply that for all the other

things that have to be done.

We're very far from the frontier, national high-speed rail network, nuclear desalination plants, the Western water management systems, – we're very far from the frontiers in space infrastructure that we have to be building. We're actually

threadbare in terms of just continuing to use, and have an economy, what we already have.

So there's no time at all left, for these wonderful prospects by the discussions with the Chinese now at the highest

level, between President Trump and one of the top people in the

Chinese government, State Councilor Yang Jiechi, for these wonderful prospects to be backed up by the institution which issues credit for the United States, a Hamiltonian bank for investment. It must be formed. It must come out of the Congress

with the drive from the White House in order to get it done.

OGDEN: As you said, time is running out: We're five months now into the Trump administration, and you highlighted the role

of Steve Mnuchin: I think this continues to be a very bad element in the Trump administration. And the kind of support that Trump gained from his support for Glass-Steagall during the

Presidential election campaign, is something that has now – that

has to become visible. That has to become a visible, vocal, sort

of element from the population, from the constituency. And I just want to put on the screen the URL that we have for the mobilization that we have for H.R.790: That's the bill that's



in  
the House, the "Return to Prudent Banking Act" –

GALLAGHER: The Glass-Steagall bill.

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

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

GALLAGHER: We don't know how much time, because it's impossible to put a finger on a date when a really huge and

increasing unproductive debt bubble, in this case, as Representative Kaptur identified, the corporate debt bubble in the United States, when it's going to blow up. But, the size of

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

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

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

of this new corporate debt.

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

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

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

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

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

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

–

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

to

a bubble about to collapse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

none of my constituents are talking about "Russia," when I go home. They're talking about jobs, drugs, poverty. They're talking about exactly what we're discussing here! Hmm, gee, maybe we shouldn't be pumping anti-Putin propaganda all day every day.

So, I wanted to ask Diane, you know, we've had some surprising reports – or surprising for some – from the streets of Manhattan, where you would assume because of the 24-hour-a-

day

anti-Putin propaganda that people are being inundated with, that

this would be the only thing that's on people's minds. But as we

saw, the reality on the ground in New York is the collapsing infrastructure. This is what people are actually interested in

talking about. And we've had some rather surprising readings from the population there in New York and northern New Jersey, in

the recent weeks.

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

And many people are coming up to our tables and we're actually getting a very hot response, much more intense than at any period

since the election, with people coming over saying, "You know, I

thought I was the only one. The propaganda is so intense, I don't dare to say that I supported Trump at my workplace."

We had a very strong response also in Connecticut, Long Island, Jersey and Manhattan per se, where we are getting this type of response.

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

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

Congress, in South Carolina and Georgia, where the Democratic candidates, one of whom I think spent \$33 million or some

absolutely obscene amount of money, and still lost the election.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

of the further consolidation of this idea that the United States

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

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

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

for a complete bankruptcy reorganization of the economy. It was

initially the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act and that became

this idea of the Four Laws.

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

OGDEN: That's right. So now we're coming up on 10 years! I think that's widely recognized, the leadership that the LaRouche movement has played, including on Capitol Hill from the sponsors of this legislation. So this decision now to mobilize and to really enter into a brawl, the fight is on on that front and we have a responsibility to pour as much as we can, from around the country, in mobilizing on that front, too. I think that's a good conclusion for our webcast here, today. Thank you Diane, for joining us from New York, and thank you very much Paul for joining me here.

GALLAGHER: A pleasure.

OGDEN: Stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com) and we'll talk to you soon.

---

**»Gør amerikansk-kinesisk samarbejde om den Nye Silkevej til**

# hjertet af menneskehedens fælles skæbne« Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter og formand for Schiller Instituttet, indspillede denne videotale den 16. juni til en Schiller Institut-konference i Detroit, USA, den 17. juni, 2017.*

*Vi befinder os stadigvæk i den menneskelige races udviklings barndom. Jeg mener, vi er meget heldige at leve og kunne forme fremtiden på dette tidspunkt; men jeg mener, at det mest afgørende aspekt for, at hele dette perspektiv skal lykkes, er: Få det amerikansk-kinesiske samarbejde om de Nye Silkevej til at fungere i den umiddelbart forestående periode.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Hvad alle lader som om, de ikke bemærker

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 22. juni, 2017 – Der er en udbredt forventning om, at præsidenterne Trump og Putin vil mødes personligt for første gang, blot to uger og én dag fra i dag, på sidelinjen af G20-topmødet i Hamborg, 7.-8. juli. Dette møde har potentiale til at blive en begivenhed, der forandrer verden. Den russiske senator Alexander Pushkov sagde den 20. juni, at dette møde, hvis det finder sted, vil blive højdepunktet af G20. »Meget vil afhænge af dette møde«, sagde*

han, og »det er grunden til, at det allevegne imødeses med så store forventninger – fra Tallin til Lissabon, fra Beijing til Kairo«. Jo, det er afgørende vigtigt – og alligevel taler ingen om det! Det »skjuler sig for alle at se«, et begreb, som Lyndon LaRouche ofte har nævnt, fra Edgar Allan Poes historie 'The Purloined Letter' (Det stjalne brev).

Vore modstandere i den britiske imperiefraktion siger absolut ingenting om dette snarlige Trump-Putin-topmøde, fordi de er forfærdelig bange for, hvad der kunne ske dér. For hvorfor skulle de neokonservative og neoliberale ellers i så mange måneder have løjet, så det driver, om, at præsident Trump og hans medarbejdere på en eller anden måde skulle være russiske agenter? Nu er dette forventede topmøde, der hastigt nærmer sig, så vigtigt, at de nægter så meget som bare at nævne det!

I stedet har de åbenlyst gjort ting, i forsøg på at få Trump-Putin-mødet aflyst – eller, hvis de ikke kan få det aflyst, da at forsøge at sikre, at det bliver ødelagt, og at det blive fuldstændig fjendtligt, så der ikke kan udvikle sig nogen positiv, personlig relation.

Det er baggrunden for, at et sindssygt lovforslag om russiske sanktioner blev banket igennem Senatet gennem et skævt 98-2 flertal for blot en uge siden i dag – og dernæst fejlagtigt benævnt som »Trump-sanktioner« af de løgagtige, britiskførte medier – til trods for, at Trump-administrationen er modstander af loven og forsøger at standse den, før den vedtages som lov. Det er også grunden til, at amerikanske styrker nedskød et syrisk jetfly den 18. juni, hvilket tvang russerne til atter at afslutte den hotline, gennem hvilken amerikanske og russiske styrker havde 'dekonfliktet' – altså reduceret risikoen for sammenstød mellem fly og luftskyts i et område ved at koordinere deres bevægelser – deres operationer i Syrien. Det var af denne grund, at Steve Mnuchins Finansministerium den 20. juni gennemtvang sanktioner mod 38 russiske og ukrainske firmaer og individer og herved tvang Rusland til at aflyse et planlagt møde mellem



viceudenrigsminister Ryabkov og USA's understatssekretær i Udenrigsministeriet, Shannon. Og hvis F-16 fly var det, der cirkulerede rundt om den russiske forsvarsminister Shoigus fly, blot i går?[1] Og hvilke, endnu værre forræderiske handlinger vil disse folk begå i morgen, i deres hysteri over udsigten til bedre relationer mellem USA og Rusland?

Disse dystre kræfter har nægtet at anerkende det amerikanske folks forfatningsmæssige valgbeslutning fra dag ét, og de nægter stadigvæk. De af os, der støtter præsidenten og Forfatningen, må træde frem for at knuse de forræderiske kræfter, og for at støtte præsidenten i at opnå sine mål gennem at slutte USA til Rusland og Kina i den Nye Silkevej og genskabe amerikansk infrastruktur gennem massiv statskredit, og i partnerskab med Kina, gennem Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Nye Love« fra juni 2014. Og, i morgen kunne være for sent.

En yderligere indikation på de britisk-elskende lags hysteri ved udsigten til et samarbejde mellem Putin og Trump kan findes i den tyske finansminister Schäubles bemærkninger den 20. juni (da han modtog Henry Kissinger-prisen):

»Jeg tvivler på, at USA virkelig tror på, at verden ville være lige så god, hvis Kina eller Rusland udfyldte svælgene, efterladt af USA, og hvis Kina og Rusland simpelt hen fik frie hænder til at dominere de indflydelsessfærer, de har defineret for sig selv. Det ville være afslutningen af vores liberale verdensorden.«

Han lyver, og han ved, at han lyver – men kan I ikke føle hysteriet bag hans løgne?

*Foto: Vladimir Putin holdt et møde med regeringsmedlemmer om forholdsregler til beskyttelse af rettigheder hos folk, der er involveret i byggeprojekter med delt egenkapital, og om at definere den juridiske status for folk, der er selvstændige erhvervsdrivende. 22. juni, 2017. (foto en.kremlin.ru)*

**[1]** Et NATO F-16-fly forsøgte at komme tæt på den russiske

*forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigus fly over neutrale, baltiske vande nær Kaliningrad i dag, men blev jaget væk af et russisk Su-27-kampfly, rapporterer Sputnik Internationale i dag (21. juni).*

*Shoigu var en route til den vestligste, russiske by, Kaliningrad, da F-16-flyet forsøgte at nærme sig. Ruslands Sukhoi Su-27 kampfly, et af de fly, der eskorterede Shoigus fly, viste dernæst sine våben, hvilket fik F-16-flyet til at trække sig.*

---

## **New York til LPAC: Tak for, at I forsvarer præsidentskabet. LPAC kortvideo, 22. juni, 2017**

»God eftermiddag, jeg er Michelle Fuchs fra LaRouche Political Action Committee, der rapporterer live fra gaderne i Manhattan. Vi står her på krydset mellem 32. Gade og Broadway, på Greeley Square, hvor vi fører kampagne til forsvar for Donald Trumps administration imod kuppet og for en succes for hans økonomiske program, med LaRouches Fire Love. Jeg kan rapportere, at vi har fået en masse støtte her i dag, med mange mennesker, der kommenterer, at de er glade for, at vi er her, og at de påskønner, at der kræves meget mod for at gøre det, vi gør.

Én meget sød dame rapporterede, at hun var glad for at finde en organisation, fordi hendes mand mener, han er den eneste,

så hun ønsker, han skal kontakte os.

Jeg vil opfordre jer til at gå med i LaRouche-bevægelsen og hjælpe os med at uddele vores avis, 'The Hamiltonian', hjælpe os med at få opringninger ind til Kongressen og til Det Hvide Hus til støtte for denne administration og til forsvar for denne nation. Slut for nu.«

*Offentliggjort den 22. jun. 2017*

*LaRouche PAC organizers in Manhattan have been reporting a sense of gratitude from the population when they see our organizers, 1. Because we've got the guts to be on the street defending the Presidency and 2. Because we pull no punches in discussing the orchestrated coup against Trump. Here's Michelle Fuchs on Greeley Square.*

---

## **Giv amerikanerne nogen anerkendelse / kredit!**

*Leder fra Larouche PAC, 21. juni, 2017* – Med det rette lederskab afviser amerikanere det britisk-ansporede forsøg på at »kuppe« præsident Trump, tvinge ham ud af embedet gennem impeachment, tilbagetrækning eller endda mord, fordi han ønsker samarbejde med Rusland og Kina. Dette kup, der implicerer Obamas efterretningstjenester og FBI-direktør, har drevet det Demokratiske Parti vanvittigt med antirussisk McCarthy-isme imod Trump – og det taber fortsat valg på grund af det.

Med hensyn til anti-Trump-intrigemagernes motivering, lyt blot til den fanatisk nærige, tyske finansminister, Wolfgang Schäuble, der i går angreb Trump i en tale i Berlin:

*»Jeg tvivler på, at USA virkelig mener, at verdensordenen ville være lige så god, hvis Kina eller Rusland ... simpelt hen fik frie hænder til at dominere de indflydelsesfærer, de har defineret for sig selv. Det ville være enden på vores liberale verdensorden.«*

Fuldstændig rigtigt – den »liberale« verdensorden, som afindustrialiserede USA's økonomi og gjorde den til en rustbunke, og som amerikanerne stemte for at blive af med. De betroede Trump atter at gøre Amerika til en industrimagt, en teknologisk magt, en magt i den nuværende og fremtidige udforskning af rummet. Kongressen – begge partier – skal omgående gå i gang med at genopbygge og erstatte nationens forældede, økonomiske infrastruktur. Samarbejde med Kina, med dets »Bælte & Vej Initiativ«, der er mange gange større end Marshallplanen, kan på dramatisk vis hjælpe, lige fra højhastigheds-jernbanenet og til Månelandinger.

I en tale for USA's Handelskammers »topmøde« for udenlandsk investering i mandags, sagde finansminister Steven Mnuchin:

*»At arbejde med udenlandske investorer vil blive en afgørende del af enhver infrastrukturplan, vi fremlægger.«*

Fint. Mange kinesiske ledere af foretagender blandt de 1.200 deltagere ønsker at se Kina investere i byggeri af ny, amerikansk infrastruktur, gennem amerikanske, statslige kreditinstitutioner som de fire, store nationalbanker, der har finansieret Kinas utrolige infrastrukturgenembrud i de seneste tyve år.

Men dernæst sagde Mnuchin:

*»Partnerskaber mellem det offentlige og det private er afgørende ...«*

for byggeri af ny infrastruktur – den mislykkede »liberale verdensorden«. Sådanne PPP'er (Public Private Partnerships), hvor investeringselskaber vil have deres kapital tilbage

inden for 10 år, og 10-12 % årligt afkast, bygger IKKE nye infrastrukturplatforme.

Et netværk af højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer over hele nationen?

Systemer af sluseporte, der ville have beskyttet New Orleans fra orkanen Katrina, og New Yorks transportsystem fra superstormen Sandy?

Afsaltningsanlæg og vidtrækkende vandføringsystemer til kunstvanding af det vestlige USA?

Baser til menneskelig beboelse på Månen?

PPP'er skaber ikke sådanne ting!

Men det gør *statskredit*. *EIR's* stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, sagde for et par år siden:

*»Vi taler om en investering over mere end én generation. Alle de store projekter, som vi nu behøver, ligesom i fortiden, er projekter, der kræver flergenerationsinvestering. Det er at påtage sig gæld, en gæld, der løber over flere generationer. Og én af de ting, vi må mestre i denne henseende, er, hvad er menneskets natur ...*

*For det første, så er ideen om kredit menneskelig. Det eksisterer ikke for noget som helst, undtagen for mennesket, så vidt vi ved. Vi udarbejder derfor et monetært system, eller et finanssystem, baseret på et system med kredit, hvilket vil sige udviklingen af en person, der videregiver noget, der er til fordel for den næste generation. Og dette er ikke en proces, hvor noget fortsætter; det er en proces, hvor noget udvikles. Og udviklingsenheden er det, vi bør kalde 'kredit'.«*

Store projekter ved hjælp af statslig kredit, en gæld, som den næste generation vil kunne »tilbagebetale« ved at bruge infrastrukturen på et højere, teknologisk niveau til at producere og til at leve på et højere, og mere produktivt, menneskeligt niveau. Kun nationer kan skabe den form for

kredit, individuelt og gennem internationale udviklingsbanker, som LaRouche har foreslået det i femogfyrre år.

Der er ikke mere tid til at »tale om at bygge en ny infrastruktur«. En nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition til sådan kredit, må skabes nu.

*Foto: Finansminister Steven Mnuchin aflægger ed i det Ovale Kontor. (Photo V.P. Mike Pence's Twitter)*

---

# **Menneskeheden på en ny kurs: Rusland og Kina udvikler Arktis – Vil USA tilslutte sig?**

*Rusland og Kina er i færd med at optrappe deres indsats for at udvikle en af Jordens sidste, fremskudte grænser for menneskeheden – Arktis' udstrakte vidder med et rigt resursegrundlag. ... Vil USA, under præsident Trump, gå med i denne proces? Svaret på dette spørgsmål vil spille en afgørende rolle i det større spørgsmål, der i betydelig grad vil afgøre menneskehedens skæbne – nemlig, om Trump fuldt ud vil integrere USA i Bælte & Vej Initiativet (BVI); den Nye Silkevejsproces, der først blev fremmet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i 1990'erne, og som nu er blevet fuldt ud vedtaget og implementeret af Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, på vegne af alle Jordens nationer.*

*Af Mike Billington, EIR.*

*12. juni, 2017 – Rusland og Kina er i færd med at optrappe*

deres indsats for at udvikle en af Jordens sidste, fremskudte grænser for menneskeheden – Arktis' udstrakte vidder med et rigt resursegrundlag. Alt imens Ruslands enorme kystlinje langs det Arktiske Hav er den primære base for deres operationer, så er Kina stærkt engageret i byggeriet af den infrastruktur, der er nødvendig for at gøre udnyttelsen af disse resurser mulig.

Vil USA, under præsident Trump, gå med i denne proces? Svaret på dette spørgsmål vil spille en afgørende rolle i det større spørgsmål, der i betydelig grad vil afgøre menneskehedens skæbne – nemlig, om Trump fuldt ud vil integrere USA i Bælte & Vej Initiativet (BVI); den Nye Silkevejsproces, der først blev fremmet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i 1990'erne, og som nu er blevet fuldt ud vedtaget og implementeret af Kinas præsident Xi Jinping, på vegne af alle Jordens nationer.

En betydelig, fysisk drivkraft bag dette initiativ er den kendsgerning, at Nordøstpassagen – ruten fra Asien til Europa via det Arktiske Hav – i stigende grad er blevet sejlbart på grund af den arktiske iskappes tilbagetrækning. Alt imens den 'grønne' bevægelse er hurtig til at proklamere, at (ikkeeksisterende) menneskeskabt klimaforandring er ansvarlig for denne, de arktiske iskappes vigen, så har den russiske regering og russiske videnskabsfolk (blandt andre) bevist, at dette er et cyklisk fænomen uden forbindelse til kulstof – og som faktisk er til stor fordel for menneskeheden. Ikke alene fremmes handel af iskappens tilbagetrækning, men resurserne i Arktis gøres også mere tilgængelige – hvis verden vælger at drage fordel af de nye omstændigheder.

## **Ét Bælte; én Vej; én Cirkel**

Hu Angang, en førende, kinesisk økonom ved Tsinghua Universitet, opfandt begrebet, »Én Cirkel« – hvorved refereres til indkredsningen af hele den eurasiske landmasse gennem at

fuldstændiggøre Nordøstpassagen – som føjes til politikken med »Ét Bælte, én Vej, som initieredes af præsident Xi Jinping i 2013. Det Nye, Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, der forbinder Asien, Europa og Afrika over land, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, der forbinder Eurasien, Afrika og de amerikanske kontinenter over hav, kan nu få tilslutning af »En Cirkel«, den arktiske rute, der reducerer sejltiden fra Østasien til Europa med mere end 30 %.

Ud over sejltiden, så omfatter de resurser, der venter på at blive udnyttet – blot venter på, at menneskeracen skal udvikler teknologierne, der skal til for at muliggøre denne udnyttelse i et barsk miljø, på en måde, der er acceptabel for menneskelig beboelse – enorme aflejringer af guld og andre mineraler, så vel som også skønsmæssigt 30 % af verdens endnu ikke-opdaget naturgas og 13 % af ikke-opdaget olie, iflg. U.S. Geological Survey.

Alt imens spørgsmålene om suverænitæt er relevante for resurserne nær grænserne af de arktiske nationer (Rusland, USA, Norge, Finland, Sverige og Danmark), så er det udstrakte, arktiske territorium uden for territoriale farvande og er således udelukkende underkastet FN's Havretskonvention (UNCLOS), der kun giver mulighed for fælles udvikling af resurserne under konsensusaftaler. Arktisk Råd med de seks arktiske nationer, og med andre til stede som observatører, inkl. Kina, styrer denne proces. Kina anser sig selv for at være en »nær-arktisk« stat og påpeger, at området har »den af hele menneskeheden arvede rigdom«. Det seneste topmøde i Arktisk Råd, som finder sted hvert andet år, var i Juneau, Alaska, i marts, hvor Finland overtog formandsskabet for den nuværende toårs-periode.

På vejen til at besøge præsident Trump i Florida i april stoppede præsident Xi Jinping op i Finland for at diskutere Finlands rolle i Bælte & Vej, men han arrangerede også, at Finland repræsenterede Kina i Arktisk Råds møder.



Alt imens Rådets overvejelser hidtil har undgået bestræbelser på at introducere geopolitiske konflikter, så har nogle medlemmer af USA's Kongres brugt den kendsgerning, at Rusland har sikkerhedsinteresser langs sin udstrakte arktiske grænse, til at kræve, at USA udarbejder militære kapaciteter til at udfordre russisk dominans i området. Dette er absurd i betragtning af, at USA alt i alt har én fungerende isbryder, mens Rusland har 40 og er i færd med at bygge eller bestille (primært fra Sydkorea) byggeriet af yderligere flere dusin.

Netop i denne uge overværede præsident Putin navngivningen af verdens største isbryder-fragtskib til flydende naturgas (LNG) i Skt. Petersborg, bygget til Rusland af Sydkoreas Daewoo Skibsbygger- og Havingeniørselskab. Tydeligvis ikke tiltænkt militære formål, vil skibet blive anvendt i Yamal-projektet på den arktiske Yamal-halvø, ved Uralbjergenes nordlige ende. Dette område har enorme naturgasdepoter, der udvindes af et konsortium, som omfatter Ruslands Novatek, Frankrigs Total og Kinas Nationale Olieselskab. Skibet er det mest moderne af højklasse-isbrydere (dvs. forstærket) og vil blive flagskibet i en flåde af 15 lignende skibe. Yamal-projektet tilsigter at producere 16,5 million tons LNG om året.

Ved skibsdåben sagde Putin:

*»Yamal-projektet banede vejen for den arktiske rute. Det vil bidrage til udviklingen af energiindustrien i hele verden, udover Rusland og Europa ... Yamal-LNG spiller en vigtig rolle i udviklingen af den Nordlige Sejlroute og i den yderligere undersøgelse og udforskning af Arktis. Jeg regner med den succesfulde lancering af nye, lovende, storstilede projekter sammen med vore franske, kinesiske og udenlandske partnere, så vel som også vores voksende samarbejde i det ekstremt rige, arktiske område.«*

Rusland er også i færd med at bygge en Nordlig Breddegrads-jernbane, der forbinder Yamal med Ural-områderne mod syd og nationens transportårer, der vil sikre, at områdets

mineralresurser kan transporteres hele året rundt.

I en anden, stor udviklingszone, nemlig Arkhangelsk-regionen syd for Murmansk nær ved den norske og finske grænse, planlægger Kinas Poly Group Corp. et udviklingsprojekt til \$5,5 mia., og som omfatter en ny dybvandshavn og en jernbaneforbindelse mod syd. Det er planen at udskibe kul, gødning, olie og andre råvarer fra Sibirien og Ural-området via Arktis, og dernæst mod syd via jernbane. Igor Orlov, Arkhangelsks guvernør, skønner, at projektet vil skabe 40.000 jobs, når det står færdigt i 2023.

En langfristet plan for den russiske udvikling af arktiske faciliteter er at afprøve strukturer, der kræves for menneskelige forposter på Månen og Mars.

### **Amerikansk samarbejde**

Et møde på ministerplan i Arktisk Råd i Fairbanks, Alaska, den 11. maj, forudsås at blive omstridt af dem, der forsøger at sabotere præsident Trumps bestræbelser på at etablere samarbejdende og venligtsindede relationer med Rusland. Disse forudsigelser viste sig at være forgæves. Blandt resultaterne af mødet, som USA præsiderede, var underskrivelsen af en bindende aftale om at fremme samarbejde omkring videnskabelig forskning i området, og som vil sikre, at videnskabsfolk og deres udstyr og data kan strømme mere frit hen over internationale grænser inden for Arktis. En Arktisk Skibstrafik Database er blevet oprettet, mens et nyt Arktisk Økonomisk Råd og en Specialstyrke for Forbedret Forbundethed er i færd med at blive operationelle.

David Balton, USA's viceassisterende udenrigsminister for hav og fiskeri, og som repræsenterede USA ved mødet, modgik de neokonservatives drømme om konfrontation med Rusland og sagde, at Arktis forbliver stabilt og fredeligt.

*»I Arktisk Råd har vi et mødested, der har gjort det godt mht. at promovere internationalt samarbejde blandt alle otte nationer, inklusive Rusland«, sagde Balton og tilføjede, at »Uanset, hvilke andre vanskeligheder, der måtte eksistere mellem USA, Rusland og andre medlemmer af Arktisk Råd, og mellem Rusland i relation til andre dele af verden, så manifesterer de sig ikke i Arktisk Råds verden. Det er fortsat en meget samarbejdende organisation.«*

Wilson-centrets Arktisk Cirkel Forum er vært for en konference i Washington 21.-22. juni, med titlen, »USA og Rusland i Arktis«. Balton vil være taler sammen med mange andre fra USA, Rusland og andre nationer i Arktisk Råd. Det er netop denne form for samarbejde – hvor vi forcerer udviklingens fremskudte grænser og den menneskelige videns fremskudte grænser – der, ligesom den Nye Silkevej, er i færd med at bevæge verden ind i et nyt paradigme for fred gennem udvikling.

*Denne artikel publiceredes første gang i EIR, 16. juni, 2017. Artiklen er ikke tidligere udgivet på dansk.*

---

## **Gør New York til et vendepunkt i historien**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 20. juni, 2017 – De hastigt voksende spændinger mellem USA og Rusland over de seneste dages udviklinger i Syrien, har bragt hele planeten ind i en meget farlig og skrøbelig situation. Vi er nu tættere på udbruddet af en global atomkrig, end vi har været på noget tidspunkt, siden Barack Obama og hans klon, Hillary Clinton, blev drevet ud af Det Hvide Hus.*

Uanset nogle nyttige skridt, væk fra randen af krig, i løbet

af de seneste 24 timer – inklusive meddelelsen fra det amerikanske militær om, at det »tager forsigtighedsforholdsregler for omplacering af fly over Syrien«, i lyset af den russiske advarsel om, at deres mest avancerede radarsystemer ville »være indstillet til at spore sig ind på« ethvert, og alle, fly over syrisk luftrum vest for Eufrat; samt Australiens beslutning om helt at suspendere deres deltagelse i koalitionsflyvninger i området – så kan situationen udløses af det mindste pres. Der er gentagne erklæringer, der kommer fra diverse dele af Trump-administrationen og Kongressen, om, at amerikanernes nedskydning af det syriske fly (over syrernes eget, nationale territorium!) var berettiget; at »vi vil ikke tøve med at forsvare os eller vore partnere, hvis vi trues«, ligeledes i fremtiden; og at Syrien i realiteten skal deles.

Ingen af disse politikker er Donald Trumps – ikke som kandidat, og ikke som præsident. De er politikker, der kommer fra de selv samme kræfter, der arbejder på at vælte hans præsidentskab, eller simpelt hen myrde ham. De repræsenterer lag inden for efterretningsetablisementet, militæret, medierne og Wall Streets finansinteresser – der alle køres fra toppen af Det britiske Imperium – der har lanceret disse operationer for at forhindre Trump i at handle på sin erklærede dagsorden. Velinformerede kilder har rapporteret, at Trump belejres og distraheres af de endeløse, grundløse, juridiske trusler, der samles omkring ham – hvilket præcist er deres hensigt.

Vi må optrappe vores mobilisering for at vække den amerikanske befolkning til denne fare, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche til medarbejdere i dag, og standse det igangværende kup imod Trump. Med folkelig opbakning til de presserende nødvendige forandringer, som vi må organisere, kan Trump befries til at handle for at skabe en helt ny ramme for økonomiske og politiske relationer, med Kina og Rusland i særdeleshed.

Men en stykkevis fremgangsmåde vil ikke virke, erklærede Zepp-

LaRouche. En total erstatning af det bankerotte, transatlantiske finanssystem kræves, med en ny, der er bygget op fra bunden, langs linjen af den politik, som Lyndon LaRouche har specificeret i sine Fire Love: en global Glass/Steagall-bankreform og skabelsen af et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition for at skabe højteknologiske infrastrukturprojekter og relaterede udviklingsprojekter. Det er præcist, hvad Kina har lanceret med sit epokeskabende Bælte & Vej Initiativ, og som USA nu må tilslutte sig.

Der er intet tydeligere eksempel på dette end situationen omkring New York City og byens smuldrende infrastruktur. Ethvert stykkevisse »fiks« af ét problem vil kun gøre situationen værre andetsteds. Hele New York-området infrastruktur, især transport, må totalt udskiftes, fra bunden og op.

Lad os tage denne krise og vende den til en mulighed, fremførte Zepp-LaRouche. Problemet er så alvorligt, at det ikke kan løses på kort tid. Men hvis man har en plan, vil folk få en fornemmelse af, at en løsning er i sigte, og de vil være optimistiske og vil deltage i problemets løsning. Hvis der kun er kaos, så vil vi stå med et oprør – nationalt, så vel som i New York City.

Så lad os gøre New York til et vendepunkt i historien!

*Foto: 29. maj, 2013, blev et tog på vej mod syd afsporet, lige uden for 125. station i New York.*

---

## **Vil Trump overvinde sabotage**

**og få USA  
med i Kinas og Ruslands nye  
paradigme?**

**RADIO SCHILLER, 20. juni,  
2017**

[https://soundcloud.com/si\\_dk/vil-trump-overvinde-sabotage-og-f-a-usa-med-i-kinas-og-ruslands-nye-paradigme](https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/vil-trump-overvinde-sabotage-og-f-a-usa-med-i-kinas-og-ruslands-nye-paradigme)

Briefing af seneste politiske begivenheder v/ Tom Gillesberg.

---

**Forrædere står bag både  
økonomiske og  
militære operationer for at  
stoppe Trumps  
bestræbelser på at opbygge  
relationer med  
Rusland og Kina**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 19. juni, 2017 – I løbet af den seneste uge har korrupte senatorer banket nye sanktioner igennem mod Rusland (og Iran), der i realiteten var rettet imod at fjerne præsident Trumps forrettighed til at afslutte de ulovlige sanktioner, der blev gennemtvunget af Barack Obama*

gennem en eksekutiv ordre, baseret på løgne mht. russisk indblanding i de amerikanske valg. Søndag nedskød dernæst amerikanske styrker, der (ulovligt) er deployeret i Syrien, et syrisk kampbombefly, der var engageret i et angreb på ISIS, hvilket fremprovokede en barsk respons fra Rusland, der gik ud på, at alle yderligere sådanne ulovlige, udenlandske angreb på den suveræne stat Syriens styrker ville løbe risikoen for russiske forsvarsoperationer.

Hvem gav ordre til dette angreb? Det Russiske Forsvarsministerium har erklæret, at aftalen med USA mht. dekonfliktion i militære operationer, er suspenderet, og de har krævet, at »USA's Kommando gennemfører en omhyggelig efterforskning og rapporterer om sine resultater og de trufne forholdsregler«.

Sådanne handlinger, der udgør en krigstrussel mellem verdens to, førende atommagter, er sindssyge, rent militært. Man erindre sig, at det amerikanske missilangreb på den syriske luftbase i april var baseret på de falske efterretningsrapporter om, at den syriske regering havde brugt kemiske våben, uden noget militært eller strategisk formål, mod sine egne borgere.

Den farvede revolution, der nu udspilles imod præsident Trump, og som involverer falsk britisk efterretning, der kanaliseres via britiske aktiver i de amerikanske efterretningstjenester, Kongressen, massemedierne og elementer i det amerikanske militær, må standses. I modsat fald vil verden blive kastet tilbage til det økonomiske kaos og den strategiske katastrofe, der blev orkestreret under præsidenterne Bush og Obama.

I UK er Imperiets magt udsat for en alvorlig prøve i sin hjembase, og amerikanere gør klogt i at følge det nøje. Tory-premierminister Theresa May og de faktiske Tory'er i Tony Blairs »Nye Labour«-fraktion af Labour-partiet trues med at blive droppet i kølvandet på Mays chokerende tab af et flertal i de nylige valg, som dernæst efterfulgtes af den forfærdelige

brand i et socialt højhus-boligbyggeri, der kan have kostet så mange som 100 uskyldige menneskeliv. Kilder i UK fortæller *EIR*, at May-regeringen lyver om dødstallet i håb om, at raseriet vil lægge sig, men også, fordi enhver hændelse med flere end 100 døde iflg. loven skal efterforskes som en kriminalsag. Den »gamle« Labour-kandidat, Jeremy Corbyn – hvis program omfatter en afslutning af krigsførelse for regimeskifte, en infrastrukturfond for at kickstarte økonomien, en afslutning af de russiske og iranske sanktioner, udvikling af atomkraft og deltagelse i den Nye Silkevej – ses i stigende grad som en sandsynlig vinder i ethvert nyt valg, alt imens Tory'ernes skrumpning i stigende grad indikerer, at de vil blive nødt til at udskrive et nyvalg.

Husk, at det var Tony Blair, der skabte det første »uærlige dossier«, der opfandt falske efterretninger om, at Irak havde masseødelæggelsesvåben, og som lancerede Irakkrigen, spredningen af terrorisme og flygtningekatastrofen. Det aktuelle kupforsøg imod Trump blev lanceret af »uærlige dossier nr. 2«, som blev forfattet af MI6-agent Christopher Steele, der opfandt historier om Trump og Rusland, som skulle spredes via deres netværk i USA, en operation, der nu har nået niveauet for 'ansporing til mord'.

Hidtil har Putin-regeringen nægtet at lade sig provokere ind i en konfrontationspolitik med den nye administration i Washington, hverken som respons til sanktionerne eller til angrebene i Syrien. Udenrigsminister Lavrov refererede, efter nedskydningen af det syriske fly, til »deeskaleringszonerne« implementeret af Rusland, Iran og Tyrkiet i Syrien, som »en af mulighederne for i fællesskab at gå fremefter« og tilføjede: »Vi opfordrer alle til at undgå ensidige handlinger, respektere syrisk suverænitet og gå med i vores fælles arbejde, der er aftalt med regeringen for den Syriske Arabiske Republik.«

Det er USA's borgeres ansvar at erkende og identificere de kriminelle personer og institutioner, der forsøger at ødelægge



regeringen og vor nations suverænitet. Kina har udsendt førende politiske ledere og industriledere til USA i denne uge, efter invitation fra Trump-administrationen, for at drøfte samarbejde om Bælte & Vej Initiativet – den Nye Silkevej – omkring byggeri af infrastruktur, investering i industri og landbrug og samarbejde med amerikansk industri om udviklingsnationer i Asien, Afrika og Sydamerika. Det er denne, USA's deltagelse i det nye paradigme for fremskridt og samarbejde for alle nationer og folkeslag, der nu er på plads under kinesisk og russiske lederskab, som det henfaldne Britiske Imperiums og dets Wall Street-aktivers dinosaurer er desperate for at ødelægge. Deres dødbringende kupforsøg må stoppes, og det amerikanske folk befriet til at bidrage til menneskehedens fremtid.

*Foto: Præsident Donald J. Trump, 9. juni, 2017. (Whitehouse Photo)*

---

## **Forslag om anti-russiske sanktioner i USA's Senat: Putin ubekymret; Merkel rasende**

*17. juni, 2017* – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin bedyrede i et Tv-interview i dag, efter det amerikanske Senats fremsættelse forleden dag af sanktioner imod Rusland, at Rusland ikke vil lade sig puffe ind i et dødvande mht. dets relationer med Washington. »Det er vigtigt at bemærke, at, uanset, hvad der foregår – vist, sandsynligvis; lad os se, hvad det sluttelige resultat bliver. Men uanset, hvad og

hvilke beslutninger, man tager udenlands, så vil dette ikke puffe os ind i et dødvande«, understregede Putin. »Vi må sandsynligvis korrigere noget og træffe yderligere forholdsregler, være ekstra opmærksom på nogle ting, men dette (stramningen af sanktioner) vil ikke føre til et dødvande eller et sammenbrud«, advarede han. »Jeg mener, dette er skadeligt«, sagde Putin. »Men det er endnu tidligt at tale om gengældesskridt (henimod en forstærkelse af sanktioner), men lad os se, hvad resultatet bliver.«

Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel er derimod rasende over lovforslaget. Merkels talsmand, Steffen Seibert, sagde, det er »besynderligt«, at sanktioner, rettet mod at straffe Rusland, også kunne føre til straffe over europæiske selskaber. »Dette må ikke ske«, sagde han. »Vi afviser generelt sanktioner, der har virkning på udenforstående områder, altså en virkning på tredjelande.« Den tyske økonomiminister Brigitte Zypries sagde til Reuters, at Berlin ville blive nødt til at tænke på modforholdsregler, hvis lovforslaget bliver til lov. »Vi må overveje, hvad vi skal gøre imod det.«

Afsnit 257 af lovforslaget, der handler om USA's politik for ukrainsk energiforsyningssikkerhed, rammer, blandt andet, forsyningen af russisk gas til Europa, inklusive den foreslåede Nordstream 2-ledning, der efter planen skal løbe langs det Baltiske Hav fra Skt. Petersborg, Rusland, til Greifswald, Tyskland, for det meste langs samme rute som den aktuelt eksisterende Nordstream-ledning. Lovforslaget gør modstand mod Nordstream 2 til amerikanske politik pga. dens angivelige »skadelige virkning på den Europæiske Unions energiforsyningssikkerhed, udviklingen af gasmarkedet i Central- og Østeuropa og energireformer i Ukraine«. Det, som europæiske kritikere af lovforslaget virkelig falder over, er imidlertid den følgende klausul: »USA's regering bør prioritere eksporten af USA's energiresurser med det formål at skabe amerikanske jobs, hjælpe USA's allierede og partnere, og styrke USA's udenrigspolitik.«

*Foto: Angela Merkel er rasende over de antirussiske lovforslag om sanktioner i USA's Senat.*

---

# Og foråret gik over i sommer

...



Lyndon H. LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, november, 2013.

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 18. juni, 2017* – Fremtidige generationer vil se tilbage på disse dage i midten af 2017 som en hovedkorsvej i hele menneskets historie frem til i dag. De grundlæggende kendsgerninger, der stadig er stort set ukendte for de fleste amerikanere i dag, vil være velkendte for dem. Den måde, hvorpå Lyndon og Helga LaRouche i årtier, og på trods af intens forfølgelse, havde udarbejdet et Nyt Paradigme for en global civilisation, hvor mennesket endelig ville blive fuldt ud menneskeligt, og som var knyttet til et udstrakt program for en Verdenslandbro og for udvikling af fusionskraft og en genlancering af udforskning af rummet som et globalt rumprogram.

At dette LaRouche-program for Verdenslandbroen blev officielt vedtaget som kinesisk statslig politik i 2013 og i løbet af fire år fik tilslutning fra flere end 100 nationer, der repræsenterede flertallet af menneskeheden. At, takket være dette program, begyndte håb atter at indfinde sig i Afrika, efter årtiers fortvivlelse. Vejen var åbnet for en afslutning af Det britiske Imperium og det oldgamle imperiesystem, der

havde forkrøblet menneskers sind, siden mindst begyndelsen af den optegnede historie.

At det var inden for en sådan sammenhæng, om end de amerikanske vælgere blev holdt uvidende om det, at de afviste Det britiske Imperiums præsidentkandidat, Hillary Clinton, og i stedet valgte den kandidat, der lovede venskab med Rusland og Kina, afslutningen af udenlandske aggressionskrige og genindførelsen af Franklin Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov – Donald Trump.

USA bevægede sig mod det Nye Paradigme.

Det britiske Imperium kæmpede indædt for at skaffe sig af med præsident Trump gennem et FBI-kup, eller gennem ethvert andet middel, de kunne udtænke. De fleste amerikanere hældede til at støtte deres valgte præsident og udviste ikke alene støtte, men også entusiasme, når de blev vist tillid. Men, for faktisk at kunne handle på dette, havde de brug for et virkeligt begreb om den globale proces og LaRouche-parrets mission, som var blevet dem nægtet.

Og her står sagerne i øjeblikket. Som en digter har sagt, »det sidste kapitel er endnu ikke skrevet«.

*Foto: LaRouche-parret: Lyndon H. LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche, november, 2013.*

---

## **Oliver Stones Putin-interviews, sidste del**

**Vladimir Putin taler med Oliver Stone om valget af Trump**

15. juni, 2017 – TASS udgiver visse højdepunkter af den

russiske præsident Vladimir Putins interview med Oliver Stone. Ifølge en oversættelse af Salon.com sagde Putin, »Jeg tror ikke, nogen kan udfordre resultatet af dette valg. De, der blev slået, burde i stedet have draget konklusioner af det, de gjorde, af hvordan de byggede deres arbejde; de burde ikke have forsøgt at lægge skylden på noget udefrakommende.«

### **Bemærkninger om Oliver Stones interview med Vladimir Putin, sidste del.**

Putin: [Jeg har haft med] fire amerikanske præsidenter at gøre, og der er ikke mange forandringer, bureaukratiet er meget stærkt.

Om indblanding i valget: Dette er meget tåbeligt. Selvfølgelig er vi glade for, at Trump ønsker at genoprette relationer med Rusland. Vil han gøre det? Vi får se. Vi hackede ikke – hvis der var nogen, der hackede (DNC), så kunne det komme fra hvor som helst, men det kunne ikke have fået nogen indflydelse på valget. Under alle omstændigheder var der ingen løgne, kun sande ting blev afsløret, skaber falske historier.

Om den amerikanske befolkning: De fleste amerikanere tror på traditionelle værdier, en puritansk tradition, i hvert fald i mange dele af landet. Dette appellerede Trump til. Jeg synes, han undertiden gik for vidt

– De, der tabte valget, bør tænke over, hvorfor. Obama og hans hold skabte en landmine for den næste administration.

Om den 24 sider lange efterretningsrapport om russisk indblanding: Jeg læste den. Alt dette minder mig om antisemitisme. Alle problemer, »jøderne gjorde det«. Nu er det Rusland.

Om [senator John] McCain [vises en af hans tirader]: Han er patriotisk, ligesom romeren Cato, der afsluttede alle sine

tale med, »I øvrigt mener jeg, at Kartago bør ødelægges«. De lever i en bestemt verden, de ser ikke, at verden forandres, kan ikke lægge fortiden bag sig. Og dog var vi allierede i Første og Anden Verdenskrig.

Alle løgnene om russisk indblanding i valget, de er alle våben i den interne krig i USA, der tilsigter at stoppe normaliseringen af relationerne med Rusland.

Mange i USA ved, at dette er falsk. Til syvende og sidst løj hackerne jo ikke – de fortalte sandheden om Amerika. Og der er ikke fremlagt beviser, kun beskyldninger.

Forespurgt om USA's indblanding i valgene i Rusland i 2000 og 2012: Jeg sagde til både Obama og Kerry, at det er en skandale, at I har regeringsfolk og penge, der åbenlyst støtter demonstrationer imod regeringen [der afspilles et langt stykke med Victoria Nuland, der praler med støtten til oppositionen, støtte til folk i eksil, til journalister, der angriber regeringen, osv.]. De finansierede stævner og NGO'er, der forsøgte at vælte regeringen – også østeuropæiske lande.

[Afspilles et klip fra Stones Snowden-film om aflytning af vore allierede, forberedelser til sabotage af Japan og andre, i tilfælde af, de skulle vende sig mod USA] Putin: For at være helet ærlig, så bekymrede vi os ikke om cyberkrig efter 1990. Vi troede, den Kolde Krig var forbi. Vi købte vestligt udstyr uden at være bekymrede.

Da vi så, at Obama og Biden sagde, at Rusland havde blandet sig i valget, og at de ville respondere på en tid og et sted, de valgte, mindede det mig om det kommunistiske regimes sidste dage, hvor de uddelte æresbevisninger til hinanden.

Om cyberkrig – Vi foreslog en cyber-aftale i august 2015 – det blev afvist.

Om Stalin – Churchill var indædt antikommunist, men da Hitler angreb mod vest, kaldte han Stalin en stor krigshelt. Dernæst

startede han selvfølgelig den Kolde Krig. Der har været mange blodige diktatorer i historien; Oliver Cromwell, men der er statuer af ham i hele England. Napoleon, et katastrofalt nederlag, med der er stadig statuer. Så vi har altså stadig statuer af Stalin. Russerne elskede ham under krigen. Vi glemmer ikke grusomhederne, men vi ærer ham. Dæmoniseringen af Stalin i Vesten er i virkeligheden blot endnu en måde at angribe Rusland på. Men Rusland har ændret sig.

Om oligarkerne: Da jeg kom til Moskva, var jeg forbløffet over, hvor mange skurke, der var. Ingen skrupler. Oligarkerne interesserede sig kun for rigdom, ikke for forretninger eller landet. Det var min opgave at skelne mellem forretninger og oligarker. Nu er der halvt så mange, det er ikke et stort problem, men der er stadig for mange.

Forespurgt om rapporter om, at han skulle være den rigeste mand i verden, korrupsion: At være rig bringer ikke lykke. Man har et talent, og evnen til at bruge dette talent til at gøre en forskel i verden – det er det, der tæller.

De langvarige hilsner mellem Stone og Putin endte således:

Putin: Tak for Deres tid og spørgsmålene. Tak, fordi De har været så grundig. Er De nogensinde blevet slået?

Stone: Slået? Åh jo, jeg er blevet slået.

Putin: Så det bliver altså ikke noget nyt, for De kommer til at lide for det, De har gjort.

Stone: Åh ja, helt sikkert, det ved jeg, men det er det værd. Det er det værd, hvis det bringer mere fred og bevidsthed til verden.

*Se opsummering af første og anden del.*

---

YouTube, The Putin Interviews, part 1 – 4 (English subtitles):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xej07e2xUJc>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xej07e2xUJc>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0e0cnng0to>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=avr4gGxNP4k>

Showtime:

<http://www.sho.com/the-putin-interviews>

---

**Trumps eneste valg for vort  
land er at  
implementere LaRouches Fire  
Love  
i Hamiltons tradition.  
LaRouche PAC Internationale  
Webcast,  
16. juni, 2017**

Matthew Ogden: ... Jeg vil gerne begynde i dag med direkte at referere tilbage til lederartiklen, der blev udgivet på larouchepac.com sidste lørdag, og som fortsat er meget relevant og har vist sig at haste mere og mere, som ugen er skredet frem. Jeg viser den på skærmen. Som I kan se, var



artiklens overskrift, »Lyndon LaRouche: Stop FBI's bedrageri; Stop kuppet mod præsidenten – Hvad de løgnagtige medier ikke fortæller«

Hr. LaRouche kom med en meget klar advarsel.

Lyndon LaRouche lancerede en appel til det amerikanske folk om at stoppe det igangværende kup imod præsident Trump, som torsdag fik yderligere næring gennem den fyrede FBI-direktør, James Comeys løgnagtige vidneforklaring for Senatets Efterretnings-Udvalgskomite. LaRouche sagde, at kuppet er en FBI-operation, der forsøger at ødelægge USA, og hvis det ikke standses, vil verden stå over for generel krig.

Som I husker, så forklarede artiklen yderligere:

*»Den 7. juni afslørede tidligere direktør for Nationalt Efterretningsvæsen, James Clapper, den faktiske motivation for kuppet imod Trump, med bemærkninger i Australien. Han sagde, at Trumps åbenhed over for fred med Rusland – det valprogram, som Trump blev valgt på af det amerikanske folk – i sig selv var totalt imod USA's sikkerhedsinteresser og i realiteten at sidestille med forræderi. Det var allerede før valget almindeligt kendt i det officielle Washington, at præsident Obama, i aftalt spil med briterne, kandidat Clinton, DNI-chef Clapper, CIA-chef Brennan og FBI-chef Comey, havde styret USA på en kurs for krig med Rusland og Kina, som efter planen skulle aktiveres fuldt ud med valget af Hillary Clinton. I stedet blev Trump valgt, hvilket udløste kuppet, der fulgte.«*

Hr. LaRouche kom med en meget afgørende pointe:

*»Præsident Trump har holdt sit løfte og etableret bedre relationer med både Rusland og Kina, der begge søger samarbejde med USA omkring udvikling af verden, baseret på store infrastrukturprojekter. Det er det virkelige, og eneste, spørgsmål her.«*

Jeg har gentaget vores reference til denne artikel, for det er

en meget afgørende advarsel fra hr. LaRouche, Og som jeg sagde, er den kun blev mere relevant og mere presserende, som ugen er skredet frem. Som I måske har set, udlagde vi også en video på LaRouche PAC's webside, med titlen, »Stop kuppet mod præsidenten«, som allerede cirkleres temmelig vidt omkring og bør fortsætte med det.

[<https://larouchepac.com/20170614/stop-coup-against-President>]

Men, præcis som hr. LaRouche advarede om i denne erklæring, jeg netop oplæste, så, hvis denne kampagne mod præsidenten ikke stoppes, kan det føre til meget alvorlige konsekvenser for USA, og for verden.

*(her følger resten af udskriftet på engelsk):*

Although the very disgusting propaganda and even direct threats against the life of President Trump began very early on in his administration – practically immediately after his inauguration, as we saw with the article in the German news magazine {Der Spiegel} – over the last week and a half, we saw a very alarming escalation of such threats in increasingly explicit form. Such as comedienne Kathy Griffin holding an image of President Trump's severed head, or the ongoing production of {Julius Caesar} in Central Park which depicts a caricature of President Trump and his wife, First Lady Melania Trump. These threats are serious; they should be stopped immediately. They're very dangerous. They create the environment, as is characterized correctly, "a climate of violence" in which very deranged and disturbed individuals such

as the shooter in Alexandria act out this kind of propaganda and act on those threats. Thanks to the Capitol Police detail of Rep. Steve Scalise, a massacre was thankfully averted at that Republican baseball practice on Thursday. But responsible parties in this country must recognize Lyndon LaRouche's warning that this coup attempt and this climate of violence must be stopped immediately, or it will lead to chaos and even general war. As Mr. LaRouche said later in that same statement, "[I]t is time for the people to speak and end this disruptive and highly dangerous attempted coup." We are seeing a shifting attitude among certain sectors of the population around the United States, due to the very vocal and direct intervention by LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche movement; including in New York City and elsewhere. A push-back against this propaganda campaign, including an increasing recognition that the never-ending, round-the clock Russia-gate hearings happening practically every day in the U.S. House and Senate are, in fact, nothing more than a McCarthyite witch-hunt – President Trump correctly used that term; and have been ongoing now for several months with unlimited resources invested in them, and have turned up zero evidence so far. What the American people {do} want to hear about is not this fabricated media narrative, but rather how their duly elected government – be it Republicans or Democrats – but the people who they voted to represent them plan to solve the truly urgent life or death issues that are facing the American people every single day. Collapsing infrastructure. As we know, we have the

so-called "Summer of Hell" coming upon us in New York City; collapsing living standards; collapsing wages; a failing health

care system; epidemic proportions of drug addiction and drug overdose deaths. A Wall Street bubble which is about to explode,

which would have consequences worse than 2008. It's exactly those issues which the Trump administration was elected to address; but the Trump administration must now begin to deliver.

It's not a question of piecemeal form, a little fix here, a little bit there, but it's a national mission which we require from the U.S. Presidency which will mobilize the American people

in the way that Franklin Roosevelt did; in the way that John F.

Kennedy did that. Getting this infrastructure project moving in

a very big way and really delivering on this front is crucial for

the President, as we've made the point over recent days; not to

mention making good on his campaign promise to restore Glass-Steagall. Frankly, if there's anybody who this President

should be firing right now, it should be this clown, Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin; who is repeatedly going in front of Senate committee hearings and lying through his teeth that the

Glass-Steagall that Trump was talking about, was not the Glass-Steagall that was in the Republican platform, is not the Glass-Steagall that is called the 21st-Century Glass-Steagall.

This has been called out correctly by a number of sitting U.S. Senators; Senator Warren, Senator Sanders. But these are

concrete steps which must be taken immediately, if President Trump is to mobilize the American people and to effectively counter this mass propaganda assault and recruit the citizens to

mobilize behind the duly elected Presidency of the United States.

One thing that I know we're going to address in the course of the discussion in this show today, is Mr. LaRouche's {emphatic} point that what we need now is directed, Federal credit on a massive scale in a Hamiltonian form. Helga Zepp-LaRouche has reiterated that point several times in discussions this week. What keeps coming up in discussions around so-called infrastructure, including a major event that Diane Sare attended up in New York City a few days ago, is this

question of privatization of major infrastructure and funding new

infrastructure through so-called private investment.

As Helga LaRouche said, this is not only grossly inadequate and will never work, but it is also criminal in fact. As we saw

in the very real criminal privatization after the collapse of the

Soviet Union, the mass privatization of state-owned utilities there in Russia and the former Soviet countries and privatization

of infrastructure; which plunged the population there into a demographic collapse and a real dark age while a few criminal oligarchs looted the entire region. What we need is not that, but

what we need is the American System; as President Trump himself

referred directly earlier during his administration. That is, Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln; that is the American System

which built the United States.

What I want to shift to right now, before we get into a deeper discussion on that, is what Mr. LaRouche also made a very

strong point about in that warning that I referred in the beginning of the broadcast. He said the fact that Trump was

elected, triggered this kind of coup from these factions which had been trying to keep him out of office and escalate the war confrontation between the United States and Russia and China. Instead, you've seen President Trump reach out to China, continue

to reach out to Russia despite massive pressure not to. And you

see these countries seeking cooperation with the United States on

developing a new paradigm, a new international system based on great projects and development. That is what the underlying issue here is; and nothing else. Do not get distracted.

What I want to do right now, before I get into the discussion with Michael, is to share with you a little bit of footage; some excerpts from a dialogue that President Putin of Russia had with the people of his country and also with people internationally on his annual direct webcast call-in show. This

lasted over four hours. I'm going to put up on the screen for you a couple of pictures from these and I'm going to read some questions and then the answers that he had, because these statements from President Putin are directly addressing this question that Mr. LaRouche just raised. What is the perspective

for a peaceful relationship between the United States and Russia?

So, as you'll see, this is a picture of President Putin [Fig. 2]; this was a call-in show where he received questions live. This was the first question from an American. It said, "Greetings, Mr. Putin! My name is Jeremy Bowling. I live in Mesa, Arizona in America. I'm a big supporter of you. I am very pro-Russian, and I wish you much health and success in your life.

My question to you is this. As an American who sits here in America and sees the racist Russian phobia running crazy in my country, what advice would you give me to help set the record

straight, to help my fellow Americans understand that Russia is not the enemy?"

President Putin replies: "To begin with, I am very grateful to you for this call. I can tell you as the current head of the Russian state, that I know the attitudes of our people. We do not consider America our enemy. Moreover, twice in history when we were going through very rough times, we pooled our efforts; we were allies in two world wars. In the past, the Russian Empire played a substantial role in helping America gain independence and supported the United States. We see that Russo-phobia is running high in America, and think this is primarily a result of the escalating political infighting. I do not think I have the right to give you any advice. I simply want to thank you for this stance. We know that we have very many friends in the United States. My American colleagues tell me so, and public opinion polls show the same results. At any rate, those polls taken a month ago, show that we have many friends there. True, regrettably, such hysteria is bound to affect the frame of mind, but let me assure you that there are also very many people in Russia who have deep respect for the achievements of the American people and are hoping that eventually our relations will get back on track, in which both we and the United States are extremely interested."

So, that was his answer to the first question, and then coming up next, he had a question from an editor of a Moscow-based Russian-language newspaper, who also asked about

the

same question. He said "One of the current trends is that bilateral relations are deteriorating and there is Russo-phobia,

along with daily reports about new anti-Russian initiatives including sanctions. At the same time, there is a growing demand

not only for stabilizing, but also for improving Russian-American

relations. At a Senate hearing the day before yesterday, U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said something to the effect that every time he meets with his foreign colleagues since his appointment, they have asked him to stabilize relations with the

Russians." He went on to say, "In three weeks' time, the G20 will convene in Hamburg, where you are to meet with U.S.

President Trump. Is it possible that these talks will help prod

this negative trend towards a more positive one, and possibly even towards a radical improvement in our relationships with the

United States? In what areas and on what issues can Russian-U.S.

cooperation be productive and mutually beneficial? I believe these questions are of concern not only to people in Russia and

in the United States, but many other countries as well."

President Putin answered as follows: "You know as well as I do the areas in which we can work together with the United States. This includes above all control over non-proliferation

of weapons of mass destruction. We are the biggest nuclear powers and so our cooperation in this area is absolutely natural... Cursing and trading barbs and insults with the U.S. administration would be the worst road to take... We must work together to fight poverty in the world... There is a disastrous situation in many parts of the world, and this is one of the



sources of radicalism and terrorism, this poverty around the world; and we must decide together how to address this problem.”

Then President Putin continued by saying: “By the way, we worked

together with the United States to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue, and we did reach an agreement, we did find a solution. There are positive examples of cooperation, then. The previous

U.S. administration directly recognized the substantial role that

we played in resolving this issue. We can reach agreements and

work together then. Of course we can. On the Syrian problem and

Middle East in general, it is clear to all that no progress will

be made without joint constructive work. We hope greatly too, for the United States’ constructive role in settling the crisis

in southeast Ukraine.” Then he said, “A constructive role as I

said. You see then that there are many areas in which we must work together. But this depends not only on us. We see what is

happening in the United States today. I have said before and say

again now, that this is clearly a sign of an increasingly intense

domestic political struggle, and there is nothing that we can do

here. We cannot influence this process, but we are ready for constructive dialogue.”

So again, this was from a four-hour dialogue that President Putin engaged in with the Russian people and people internationally. But it’s a very important point that he makes

there, that the Russians are ready for a constructive dialogue.

Obviously, President Trump has a very good opportunity now in three weeks' time with the G20 summit which is coming up, to sit

down directly with President Putin and engage in that dialogue directly.

I also just want to point out that during the course of this week, there was a real blockbuster feature presentation on Showtime, of a four-part series of interviews that were produced

by the film director Oliver Stone. This was based on interviews

with President Putin which occurred over the last two and a half

years before the election, and then a final one that occurred after the election. There's far too much to go through, to summarize these interviews in any detail. But it really is a chance that Americans rarely get, to hear President Putin in his

own words talk about how we reached this point; his view of perspective points of collaboration with the United States; the

Russian view of what has been done to encircle and threaten Russia over the recent 10-15 years; and his understanding of what

the strategic necessities and the strategic realities are, not only of the present moment, but as he repeatedly said, there are

very few people who have the ability to think 25 or even 50 years

in the future. And to see the present from what the challenges

are that the future generations will have to resolve together.

At one point, he even calls for a "new paradigm of international

relations"; very similar to what the LaRouche movement has

been  
calling for, for several years.

II           With that said by way of introduction, let me just  
invite  
Michael to come in, add a few points here, and then I think we  
can get a little bit more going in terms of the discussion.

MICHAEL STEGER: OK, sure. It's probably worth to start  
from where you left off, Matt; which is this interview between  
Oliver Stone and Putin. There are a number of layers to the  
interview. It's 20 hours of recording, only 4 hours are  
presented, edited down. But what you see from the discussion

—  
and it's useful because it's not simply an interview with  
Vladimir Putin; but what Putin does provide — as you  
referenced

— is a 25-50-year perspective. He captures a sense of  
leadership in a way that's unseen in American culture for some  
time, except for probably Lyn. It recognizes that what  
governs

an individual's value and life is a sense of immortality. He  
references the 25-50 years; he discounts the questions of  
money

and power and says the reason he continues to be President is  
not

that he's gotten so accustomed to power that he couldn't do  
without it, but that he's committed to a single objective of  
the

economic development of his country. That really does capture  
on

that 25-50-100-year perspective, a sense of immortality of an  
individual. What are we contributing our lives to? That's  
actually the basis of political leadership. That's why Putin  
has

become so successful on the world stage; why he's been able to  
handle the failures of leadership from Clinton — especially

from  
the end of his term – but more so obviously Bush and of  
course,  
Obama. And why he's able to deal with the insanity inside the  
United States today. But the other layer which is important  
to  
point out, is that Oliver Stone has clearly made a shift in  
terms  
of his intervention. He recognized at some point, that we  
were  
converging again on another potential nuclear annihilation and  
nuclear war. There's a courage and a vulnerability in Oliver  
Stone himself in the intervention; because he's there to have  
a  
very open and vulnerable dialogue with Putin. And he's  
intending  
to make a political intervention into the United States. I  
think  
people have to realize this: He's taking on what's become  
this  
kind of perverse political culture in the United States; this  
so-called Obama left wing, which is now calling for a coup by  
the  
CIA and FBI, war with Russia, police state-like measures,  
complete control of the media, assassination of the President.  
This is the Obama left now; it's just fascism, as Lyn had said  
in  
the last couple of days. But he's intervening on that, but on  
the entire culture; a certain kind of courage is expressed by  
this interview and by what he's presenting. Clearly, people  
should engage it, watch it, find ways to access it.  
Hopefully,  
it becomes more public. There is footage on YouTube that  
people  
can capture.  
But there is an intervention, and I think it makes it clear  
what kind of intervention is now necessary. Lyn has set the

standard on this kind of political intervention in the United States.

Let's put it in context. As you mentioned, there is an ongoing coup against the United States Presidency. This is something that was stated clearly after President Trump was elected. That either he is going to have to resign, be impeached, or assassinated. And you have the {Weekly Standard},

a number of publications throughout Europe – especially Great Britain – who are very focussed on Trump's removal by any means

necessary. I think what we've seen over the last seven months is

a very sad attempt at trying to link Trump's campaign to Russian

collusion. The enemies targetting Trump knew the entire time there was no collusion with Russia; this entire thing is a made-up fraud. But what they did hope for was that, one, they could either prevent him from taking the oath of office.

Remember, soon after he won, there was attempt to prevent him from even taking the oath because of allegations and concerns that maybe he was a Russian agent. That didn't prevent him from

taking the oath. Since then, we've seen an escalation towards this so-called Russian collusion question. They attempted to capture the Presidency with an attempted coup run through the National Security Council, as we saw with the Syria attack; but

that also then failed. So, you're now beginning to see a regurgitation of the same stories. Jeff Sessions was called in

to testify in the Senate; it went nowhere. He called out; you're

calling me, who served this country for 35 years? Regardless of

where Jeff Sessions stands on policies, he served the country for

35 years; he's not a Russian agent, he's not a traitor to the country on behalf of Russia. These allegations are just wild; they're almost inconceivable, if you didn't understand the broader context. And so, this Russia-gate story is dying. The independent counsel that was appointed when Trump fired Comey is now not even investigating Russian collusion per se, it's now just investigating obstruction of justice. And President Trump has been sharp on this with his Twitter account, and pointed out that since there's no Russia story, so now it's just obstruction of justice on the Russia story. It doesn't add up. In that context, what do we see happen? As they continue to push this – and they will continue to push it; they're now going to bring in other former Obama people, Jay Johnson, Homeland Security Secretary; they'll continue to regurgitate or hold hearings, to keep the media story going. But clearly what we've seen over the last couple of weeks, you see it in the New York play of {Julius Caesar}, where a Donald Trump character, or Julius Caesar dressed as Donald Trump, is ritually stabbed, night after night after night on the stage in New York City. This is backed by CNN, this is backed by the {New York Times}; it's backed by other media companies ["Shakespeare in the Park"]; it's backed by the City of New York. You see the Kathy Griffin ISIS pose with the beheaded Trump mask. So you see there is an intention to escalate the violence. And then you see a mass murder attempt against up to 15 people, members of Congress, Senate and House, House leadership; all of

the Republican Party, targetting them because they {are} Republican. And this [the shooter] is a guy who apparently left

his wife and his home, to live in a van for two months in Alexandria, Virginia, well-known for targetting the LaRouche organization and falsely targetting us for prison sentences in the so-called "rocket docket." So, of course, swarming with FBI,

CIA, swamp-like creatures. This guy sets up camp for two months,

targets Republicans for mass murder, and simply perhaps because

of just circumstances, that there were a couple of Capitol Police

members there because the gates were locked on one side of the ball field, it didn't end up in a full massacre. And hopefully,

everyone recovers; two people are still in critical condition.

But that's a clear message: You are associated with Trump, you're associated with Trump's Republican Party; a Republican Party, by the way, that Trump took over, away from much of the Republican establishment. But yet, now you're Republicans associated with Trump, you're now targetted for mass murder.

This is an assassination attempt directly targetting the Presidency of the United States. Not surprising, because they stated this is where they were going to go. I think the fact that's shown by all of this is the desperation and panic and hysteria by our enemies, by a British Empire, is increasing.

The

panic is increasing, the desperation is increasing, for the very

reasons we've covered on this website and in these discussions.

Because the Belt and Road paradigm, a growth paradigm between Russia and China, is now becoming consolidated throughout Eurasia, in Africa. There were attempts by the U.S. Senate, just

the last couple of days to increase sanctions on Russia, targetting even their oil and natural gas exports. Germany, the foreign minister and the Austrian Chancellor Kern, who have been opposed to Trump on everything, have now just come out and backed

Trump and Secretary of State Tillerson in opposition to these sanctions, because, one, it hurts Germany; it also hurts the United States and it hurts the world.

So there is a constantly changing situation, and yet the people in the U.S. Congress are rabidly off. They've gone rabid on this Russia question. They're being pulled by the nose by the media on this question.

The question is, what do the American people do? What do you do in the face of an attempted coup by the FBI, CIA, Wall Street, British Empire factions, and now, an outright call for murder and violence on anyone associated with Trump, including the President himself, or the direct overthrow of our government.

This is why it's so important to understand what Putin presents in these interviews, and what he and China and Belt and

Road Forum present. There is an option. And the main reason this coup is taking place is because there is a threat from the

Trump Presidency to go with the full LaRouche option: not just to

work with Russia and China, not just to take away the threat of

war – that was a critical factor, in the entire Obama Presidency, especially in the second term. But not just to end

the danger of war, but to create an all-out collaboration of these nations around a paradigm of growth and development,



something Putin himself is committed to growing and developing the Russian people, the Russian economy; the same thing China is

committed to, growing more people. You see this in Africa: Africa is burgeoning with new levels of growth because of Chinese

investments. We could do a whole show, and maybe we should, on

just the developments in Africa alone: The Congo Basin is facing

huge potential developments to provide electricity to all of Sub-Saharan Africa. So there's real growth potential.

There's

an option in the United States to do the same thing. That's the

LaRouche program.

Now Donald Trump has raised much of these issues for the U.S. economy, the space program, infrastructure, there's been a

whole week on infrastructure; job training programs, apprenticeship programs, an entire week this week, on apprenticeships in jobs training programs. He's called for the

Glass-Steagall fight. But what we don't see, with all of this talk of infrastructure, even from Democrats who have commended Donald Trump for his commitment to infrastructure, but nobody's

presenting the question of how do you finance these projects?

How do you develop the country?

We are, personally, as an organization; Elliot Greenspan gave a very thorough briefing last night on the Thursday night Activists' Call on this website

[[http://action.larouchepac.com/fireside\\_chat\\_june\\_15](http://action.larouchepac.com/fireside_chat_june_15)], on the event that we attended in New York City: There is a lot of discussion and we can go through more of that, Matt, if you want

to in a second. But the point is this: There is a chance to

go

with the full LaRouche program, to create the public credit,  
to

create the national banking system, to shut down this Wall  
Street

fraud, to shut down the bail-in orientation; and to go with  
the

program of unleashing trillions of dollars of U.S. credit,  
immediately. Staged over time, but trillions of dollars to  
begin

to rebuild and develop the country.

What this will accomplish, if Trump moves on this, the  
LaRouche program, Glass-Steagall, the National Bank, it will  
eliminate the artificial political divide of the country. It  
focusses the nation on the nation's potential for development,  
pulling people out of poverty, giving young people a sense of  
a

future, and it puts us directly in coherence with Russia and  
China on a growth perspective. That's how Trump can outflank  
this attempted coup, that's how the American people can  
participate in this kind of historical fight.

And it takes courage, but there's a pathway by which we win  
this fight, with an enemy that is increasingly panicked and  
desperate by any means possible to shut down what is a very  
viable LaRouche option. And I think that really captures  
where

we are today, and why we have to be so aggressive, joyfully  
aggressive, about the potential mankind has if we can win this  
fight in the United States, because it's certainly winnable  
today.

So I'll add that, and see what else we have to discuss.

OGDEN: Great. You mentioned this event up in New York  
City, I think that also actually goes to the point, of, number  
one, the LaRouche movement – Lyndon LaRouche, Helga LaRouche –  
when it comes down to it are the leading authorities in the  
room,

and the representatives of the LaRouche movement are the leading authorities in the room, on exactly this question: How would Alexander Hamilton apply the American System in this present situation? But number two, it makes the point that the world is a completely different place, following this Belt and Road Forum that happened in Beijing. One of the organizers of that event in New York obviously had been at the Belt and Road Forum, changed his attitude. Helga LaRouche's presence at the Belt and Road Forum is a very key reference point; I think that this really allows us to put two bookends on maybe the last 20 years of history at least, from the collapse of the Soviet Union and the proposal of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, this New Silk Road idea, when it originally came out of the LaRouche movement in 1990-1991. And then the adoption of that in 2013 by Xi Jinping, and then this world-historic forum with Helga Zepp-LaRouche herself, personally in attendance. And so, she continues to make the point, the world has completely changed. The world is a different place, now that this dynamic has begun to consolidate itself. And this is the reality which Americans continue to fail to recognize, and must be presented with. The opportunities are {so} strong for a direct participation, by the United States in this initiative, coming from China but also with strong support from Putin in Russia, and it's already changing the reality on the ground, as you said, in places like Africa, has a strong potential to be the key to peace in the Middle East and so forth. But you made the point, there is nobody, even despite all

the best intentions to say “we need to build infrastructure, we need to create jobs, we need to increase manufacturing,” there’s nobody who understands the science of economics behind how you do that, other than the leadership of the LaRouche movement right now. People should remember in the context, obviously, of what we’ve been talking about with these threats against President Trump – I mean, he did make these two speeches referencing the American System, several months ago now, but they were a leading feature of his economic initiative. But who was the founder of the American System? It was Alexander Hamilton. What fate did Alexander Hamilton meet? It was Aaron Burr, it was the duel which killed Alexander Hamilton: {This has been the fight in the United States} since the founding of the United States, and before. Will the United States adopt a scientific approach to economics as it was elaborated by Alexander Hamilton, which is based on the recognition that the creative powers of the human mind {are} what creates wealth? This is what changes the platform over time, as new technologies are introduced, step by step; or, will the United States continue to be a satrapy of the British Imperial system, as we’ve seen, increasingly over the last 50 years. This is the role that the United States has played.

And now we have the opportunity from outside of the United States, from elsewhere, from China and other countries who are adopting exactly this kind of development perspective for the United States to reclaim its birthright, and to become, again, that Hamiltonian type of nation that we were founded to

become.

So, as people continue to become disillusioned with the kind of propaganda that they're being fed, day in and day out, about

what this Russia-gate thing is all about, the proper perspective

is needed, and you need to be able to step back and say, "what's

the real issue here? What is the conjunctural point in world history that we find ourselves at? And what's the decision-making

point, which we're being confronted with?"

So that's the kind of leadership I think, but it's not just a question of where does the United States go? It's a question

of do we recognize that the world has completely changed, and are

we at the point of saying, "Yes, that's the change, that's the next 25 years, that's the next 50 years, and we have to put behind us the failed system which is now collapsing."

I don't know if you want to say a little bit more about the change in the attitude of the American people, Michael. I mean, I

would like to see what the effect is if this Oliver Stone interview receives more widespread circulation, what people's reaction to that will be, but even up to this point.

STEGER: Yeah, we can say, we know for certain an increasing number of the American people are getting fed up and frustrated

by the outright obstruction of the Trump Presidency. I mean, Trump does have a real base in the American people, and most Americans don't want to see their government overthrown by a CIA/FBI/{New York Times}/Wall Street operation – they just don't. They might be intimidated; there might be a {vox populi}

kind of French mob out there. But most Americans are not of

that  
nature.

And they're fighting back. We see this in field squads in New Jersey and throughout other parts of the country, that many

people are wanting to come over to the table and discuss it. You

know, we have signs "Defend Trump, Stop the Coup, Support Trump.

Stop here." "End the British Empire, Arrest Obama." So it's very

clear that people are willing to fight if there's a quality of leadership. But we have to make it very clear to the people around President Trump and to him directly, you will not be able

to accomplish anything, if you don't change the system.

Perhaps we put it in the form of an analogy: You know,

Trump can change the building all he wants to – he can put in new walls, he can expand it, he can build it taller, he can build

it bigger, he can change the electrical system, he can change the

plumbing system, he can do all those things if he wants to, to the building. The problem is, he's not going to actually give the building long-term survival if he doesn't change the foundation.

The foundation of a nation's economy is the system which allows it to grow and develop, it's its credit system, and right

now our credit system is locked into Wall Street. Just a couple

of numbers stand out: \$6 trillion was spent on the wars over the

last 15 years, since we launched the war in Afghanistan.

There's

\$4 trillion apparently on the Federal Reserve books, largely from

buying junk speculative assets from Wall Street banks. That's \$10 trillion. So the credit of our country has been locked up for 15 years in these wars, in these bailouts, – like you said, 20, 25 years, the American people have been living under a reign of psychological and political terror for 20, 25 years. Now, at the same time, China's been creating this development perspective. So if Trump's going to create a change in the orientation, he's really going to fulfill what he intends to – and you see it, he references the Hoover Dam, the Erie Canal, he talks about the big infrastructure projects that have transformed the nation's industry and its political direction, like Roosevelt did, like Hamilton did. But if he's going to do it, he's going to have to change the fundamental foundations of how that system is functioning. He's going to have to move the nation's credit back into the hands, of a focus of industry, science, and agriculture of the country. He's going to have to not just repair some infrastructure projects but set an entirely new platform and let that platform, which will last for another hundred years, it'll be a century-long platform – much like our infrastructure today is nearly a century old. But upon that platform will allow an understanding of how to make the immediate repairs we need to. This is what he's got to do. This is the LaRouche program, the Four Laws. And I know from what Diane Sare and Elliot

Greenspan have described, we are clearly increasingly collaborating with members and leadership from China; there were leadership from China at this event in New York City just the other day. We'll be having further conferences with leading figures from China on infrastructure. We're in discussion with people throughout New York City. There is a potential and Elliot described it last night [on the Activitists' Call]: If we work with the Chinese today, if we started today, within just two years we can resolve immediately the infrastructure and transit crisis in New York City, as a first step move, setting a new platform for every nation's cities and the connection between those cities on a regional and national basis. There is an outlook we can take, but you have to change the foundations of the system the way Hamilton established, the way Lincoln and Roosevelt applied it. And that's critical. The American people see the coup. They don't like it. They're ready if there's leadership, but they also have to be given a direction and they also have to be given a chance, to begin to build the country. And Trump's really got to take on these big challenges. And again, I think the question for Trump, as Putin himself expressed, and as any real President – you maybe can say more on this about John Kennedy, Matt, since his 100th birthday just passed – but the question any true President faces is a question of immortality. Because what are you really there to do? And the tough questions challenge that sense, and I think the recent



political attack we saw in Virginia, the murder attempt, are going to confront this Presidency, and the leadership around him,

to have to make a decision: Are they really going to fight for the future of the American people? Putin had to make the same decision when he came into office in 1999-2000; every true President, as Lincoln did, FDR did – he faced near assassination

before his inauguration; Kennedy certainly faced it, and knew it.

And that's the question that Trump has to face, but the LaRouche

program provides the alternative link, not only to end this coup,

but to really launch a Renaissance for the United States.

OGDEN: About John Kennedy, he made numerous speeches which addressed that question of the immortality of the leadership of

the country, in directly the terms of infrastructure. He went down to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and he said, – this was

1961 or 1962 – and he said, it was because of the decisions that

Franklin Roosevelt took 30 years before, that we are able to even

stand here today and look at these wonderful projects and it transformed this entire region of the country. But it makes us

ask the question: Thirty years from now, once we are out of office and once we are dead and gone, what will future generations say about us? What great projects will we have built, just as FDR did for us at that time; and in 1991 or 1992,

what will people living at that time say that we did for the future of the United States and for the human race?

Obviously, Kennedy's greatest legacy was the space program.

But it's that same kind of question, which now must be asked, and

always must be asked by any great leader of any country. So I concur: That's the kind of question which President Putin very eloquently put on the table and repeatedly. And he said, unfortunately, there are very few people within the United States

who think in these terms – although there are some. And I think

those are the people who are responsible for taking the leadership of the United States and consolidating this, making it work.

Michael, I think you make the point very clearly: If President Trump is going to outflank this coup attempt, not only

must it be exposed in no uncertain terms, head on; but also, he

must deliver on the vision and the campaign promises which the American people elected him around. And it cannot be in a piecemeal way, it has to be from the standpoint of a Hamiltonian

national vision, funded by, as you say, trillions of dollars of

direct Federal credit. It can't be done in any other way.

But

if he begins to deliver on that, the American people will be on

his side and will give him the backup which he's going to need.

So: Thanks a lot Michael. We're going to be circulating even more – there was an email that went out to all of the subscribers to the LaRouche PAC email list, on some of the background material that you need to understand the timeline behind this attempted coup against the Trump Administration going

all the way back to the inauguration, if not before. And I

think

we covered a little bit of that in detail.

And I continue to emphasize the importance of this statement that Lyndon LaRouche put out now a week ago, last Saturday, titled: "Stop the FBI Fraud: Stop the Coup against the President

– What the Lying Media Are Not Telling You!" We already know that this has received pretty wide circulation, but it's something which can continue to be circulated.

Thank you very much Michael. I think we can probably have a countdown to this G20 summit which is coming up in less than three weeks; and look forward to some real changes in the same we

had the relationship between the United States and China; now some changes in terms of the potential for cooperation between the United States and Russia.

I'd like to thank people for tuning in tonight. Please subscribe to our YouTube channel if you haven't yet; subscribe to

our daily email list. You can get active at the Action Center at

larouchepac.com, and join in what we're doing here with the LaRouche movement across the United States. So thanks a lot, and

good night.

---

**Hvad er de virkelige**

# spørgsmål bag alt dette?

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 15. juni, 2017 – Briterne har gentagne gange myrdet amerikanske præsidenter, efter at de først myrdede vort forfatningssystemes fader, Alexander Hamilton. Men man skal helt tilbage til Abraham Lincoln for at finde den slags gentagne trusler mod en præsident, i særdeleshed trusler om mord, som nu fremsættes mod præsident Trump, mens dette læses – under britisk direktiv. En »komiker« cirkulerer et fotografi af sig selv på Internet, hvor hun fremviser en kopi af præsidentens afskårne hoved. Samtidig opføres jævnligt det langtrukne knivmord på præsident Trump foran stort publikum i New Yorks Central Park, stolt sponsoreret af, og med gentagen energisk støtte fra, forræderne i det britisk-elskende *New York Times* – under absurd forklædning af Shakespeares »Julius Cæsar«. »Skuespilleren«, der angiveligt portrætterer Julius Cæsar i denne blodige farce, er udklædt og udstyret til fuldstændigt at ligne præsident Trump – alt imens hans hustru taler med slavisk accent og ser ud som og klæder sig præcis som præsidentens kone, Melania. Der er selvfølgelig ingen, der tror på *New York Times*, at dette skulle repræsentere »ytringsfrihed«. Det repræsenterer overlagt ansporing til politisk mord, eller endda 'ret til at dræbe' (*license to kill*) – og det endda samtidig med, at et uskyldigt amerikansk kongresmedlem, og endnu en uskyldig mand, befinder sig i kritisk tilstand på et hospital i Washington efter at være blevet skudt i går morges af en gal skytte, der leder efter »Republikanere« at dræbe.

Der kunne fremføres meget mere som dette, som I alle ved.

Det Britiske Imperium, hvis blodtørst står bag alt dette, har netop her til morgen opfordret til Trumps afsættelse ved en rigsretssag i deres flagskib, Londons *Financial Times*.

Årsagen til parallellen til det samme, morderiske hysteri, der blev pisket op mod Abraham Lincoln, er, at nutidens spørgsmål

i realiteten ikke er mindre vigtige nu, end de var dengang. Dengang drejede det sig om spørgsmålet om denne Republiks overlevelse i lyset af dette samme, Britiske Imperium – et spørgsmål, der involverede fremtiden for hele menneskeslægten. Lyndon LaRouche har nu gjort det klart, at en sejr for Jim Comey og Bob Muellers FBI, med deres kupforsøg mod præsident Trump, ville kaste verden ud i atomkrig, der ville ødelægge vor civilisation, og muligvis vor art.

På den anden side, så bevæger fortsættelsen af den forfatningsmæssige institution, som er præsidentskabet under den legitime præsident Donald Trump – og retsforfølgelsen af og domsafsigelsen over de udenlandsk sponsorerede forrædere, der ønsker at ødelægge denne institution – USA ind i det »Nye Paradigme«, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har kæmpet for i næsten et halvt århundrede, gennem præsident Trumps åbne og oprigtige forpligtelse til fred og partnerskab med Rusland og Kina. Vi må genindføre Roosevelts Glass/Steagall-lov, som præsident Trump har lovet, som en del af Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Love« fra juni 2014, og som indbefatter statslig bankpraksis, massiv udstedelse af statskredit, udvikling af fusionskraft og et komplet rumprogram i en international samarbejdsindsats.

Valget ligger nu foran denne generation, foran hver enkelt af os, og foran dig, personligt.

*Foto: Lincoln Memorial.*

---

# **Giv pokker i hypen omkring**

# Russia-gate

## – Lyt til LaRouche: Statskredit nu!

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 13. juni, 2017* – Mandag skar Lyndon LaRouche igennem al snak frem og tilbage om infrastruktur – og hysteriet omkring 'Russia-gate' – og understregede: Statskredit! Se at få udbetalingerne i gang! Om nødsituationen i New York sagde han: »Der skal omgående udstedes statslig finansiering til byggeri af ny infrastruktur i New York City. Staten (i USA, 'federal government', -red.) må gå ind og overtage krisen; det er den eneste kilde til en lovmæssig form for kredit til dette problem ... Vi har hørt nok tale uden konkrete specifikationer, uden, at der kommer reelle betalinger på bordet. Det skal vedtages – både midlerne, og deres anvendelse – nu.«

Uden for New York City – som udgør en vigtig national krise, og hvis løsning hele nationaløkonomien afhænger af – indløber der dagligt anmodninger om indgriben pga. de forfaldne tilstande inden for transport, vand, elektricitet og alle andre nødvendige, offentlige tjenesteydelser.

I går var senator Bob Casey (Dem.-Pennsylvania) ved Monongahela-floden (nær Pittsburgh) for at opfordre Kongressen og præsident Trump til at finansiere restaureringen af tre gamle sluser, før der sker en fatal fejlfunktion. Disse strukturer daterer sig tilbage til 1917, på en vandvej, der endnu i dag, f.eks., fører 6 million tons kul om året til U.S. Steel koksovnene i Clairton til det, der er tilbage af områdets stålindustri. Restaureringen af sluserne begyndte for 25 år siden og er endnu i dag ikke færdig efter gentagne udskydelser. Senator Casey fremlægger imidlertid ingen overordnet plan for, hvordan de nødvendige arbejder skal finansieres.

Der er ikke muligt, at nogle af de punkter, der ofte tales om – det være sig partnerskaber mellem det offentlige og privatsektoren (PPP'er), lokal- eller delstatsfinansiering, og heller ikke 'frimarkeds-wing-dings', kan, eller vil, finansiere en genrejsning af nationaløkonomien. Wall Streets krav om 10 + % i afkast, der skal komme fra bompenge, told, afgifter, billetter osv., er fuldstændig umuligt. »Få kendsgerningerne i orden« omkring dette, som LaRouche atter i dag understregede.

Vi må løfte folk op til den rette fremgangsmåde. Dette begynder med at genindføre Glass-Steagall til beskyttelse af gavnlig, kommerciel bankvirksomhed, og fryse spekulativ finansvirksomhed ud; etablerer dernæst en statslig, national kreditinstitution og udsteder statslig og privat kredit til storstilede, prioriterede projekter og aktiviteter, og lancerer en videnskabsmotor til fremme af rumforskning og forskning i fusionskraft.

I New York City responderer 'folk på gaden' med stor forbløffelse og lettelse til ideen, 'Vi kan gøre dette her!' Til gengæld stikker fjenderne af denne fremgangsmåde så meget desto mere grelt ud.

I Senatet i dag var finansminister Steven Mnuchin 'en rotte i hjørnet' mht. Glass-Steagall. Under en høring om statsbudgettet responderede han til spørgsmål fra senator Bernie Sanders (Uafh.-Vermont) ved at sige, at der er tre forskellige »Lovforslag til det 21. Århundredes Glass-Steagall«, og han er modstander af sen. Elizabeths Warrens lovforslag om genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, og også forslaget fra Republikanernes partiprogram. Mnuchin sagde, at der ikke bør være nogen tvungen adskillelse mellem kommerciel bankvirksomhed og investeringsbankvirksomhed: »Vi mener, det ville skade økonomien, at det ville ødelægge likviditeten på markedet.« Med andre ord, Mnuchin er en dræber. Han støtter med fuldt overlæg finansielle betingelser, der fører til tab af liv og tab af fremtid for nationen.

I direkte opposition så vi lidt af »ånden fra Silkevejen« i Iowa i går. Under et Iowa-Kina-symposium i Des Moines blev et forståelsesmemo underskrevet mellem repræsentanter for kinesiske og amerikanske tænketanke om at fortsætte med at udveksle ideer for sammen at fremme deres respektive økonomier. Den kinesiske generalkonsul fra Chicago rapporterede om kinesisk involvering i varefremstilling, handel og landbrugsanliggender i de ni midtvestlige delstater, som han relaterer til. Trump-administrationen annoncerede færdiggørelsen af Kina-USA-handelstraktaten, under hvilken amerikanske eksport af oksekød til Kina nu kan begynde. Xinhua, CGTN og andre kinesiske medier spørger, 'Er Iowa-Kina modellen for den nye amerikansk-kinesiske relation?'

Den 21. juni vil Trump tale i Cedar Rapids, Iowa, ved et møde i anledning af Terry Branstads, den tidligere guvernør for Iowa, udsendelse til Kina som den nye amerikanske ambassadør til Kina. Branstad er mangeårig ven til præsident Xi Jinping.

Vi opfordrer folk til at hæve sig op over, og besejre, Trumpgate/Russiagate-operationen og den onde, britiske imperieflok, der står bag den. Som Vladimir Putin sagde herom, i første afsnit af hans interview til Oliver Stone i går aftes: Den anti-russiske hype i USA er tåbelig. Det kan måske give dem en fordel på kort sigt, men problemet med dem er, at de nægter at se 25, 50 år ud i fremtiden og konsekvenserne af deres handlinger. Vi må have samarbejde.

*Foto: Lyndon LaRouche, her i diskussion med Diane Sare og Michael Steger fra LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.*

---



# Ruslands ambassadør Kislyak forventer, amerikansk-russisk samarbejde snart begynder

*13. juni, 2017* – I en tale før en konference for Koordinationsrådet for Russiske Landsmænd i USA (KSORS) i Washington, sagde Ruslands ambassadør til USA, Sergei Kislyak, han forventede, at samarbejde mellem Rusland og USA snarest ville blive genoptaget.

»Jeg er ikke en naiv optimist, men jeg er overbevist om, at livet selv vil få amerikanerne til at forstå, at de, sammen med Rusland, kan opnå meget mere end ved at handle imod Rusland«, sagde ambassadøren.

Ifølge TASS sagde han senere til reportere, at dette »bygger på almindelig sund fornuft. Amerikanerne gennemgår en svær periode i deres politiske liv. Man ser, hvor mange modsigende ting af forskellig art, der er her i USA, og desværre påvirkes de russisk-amerikanske relationer negativt af det hele«, sagde han.

»Men livet går imidlertid videre, og de globale udfordringer er der stadig. De kunne endda vokse. Jeg mener, vi sammen kan bekæmpe mange kriser langt mere effektivt, end hvis vi hver især handler på egen hånd. Vi har faktisk mange fælles interesser, og jeg mener, at dette bliver grundlaget, når det går op for USA, at problemer bør tackles i fællesskab«, sagde Kislyak.

Alt imens han sagde, at Trump-administrationen endnu ikke havde defineret en politik for Rusland, så »er en dialog ikke desto mindre kommet i gang, og vore ministre er i kontakt med hinanden«.

Under sin tale for konferencen påpegede Kislyak de begivenheder, hvorved »Ruslands bidrag til amerikansk historie blev understreget. De er ekstremt nyttige for fremtidige generationer«. Han påpegede også voksende kontakter med russiske videnskabsfolk, der arbejder i USA.

Sputnik rapporterer, at KSOR-konferencen diskuterede måder, hvorpå kontakter mellem USA og Rusland kunne forbedres, sær indend for felter som ungdom og kultur, russisk sprog, historisk arv og forretninger, videnskab og innovation. Dette inkluderer »oprettelsen af bånd mellem russiske og amerikanske universiteter i diverse former«, for at fremme fjernstudier, såvel som forskningsprojekter og innovationer.

Oleg Zhiganov, repræsentanten for Rossotrudnichestvo (Ruslands Føderale Kontor for Statssamfundet af Uafhængige Stater, Landsmænd i Udlændighed og Internationalt Humanitært Samarbejde) i USA, og direktør for det Russiske Kulturcenter, sagde til reportere, »Det er vores mål at forbedre kontakter mellem folk«. Implementeringen af begivenheder og projekter, såsom fejringen af 210-året for diplomatiske forbindelser mellem Rusland og USA, »vil være med til at forbedre relationerne mellem landene på længere sigt«, sagde Zhiganov. »Her i USA ved folk meget lidt om, hvad Rusland handler om. Jo mere, amerikanere hører om vores store kulturelle og historiske arv, desto mere vil de lære om vort land.«

*Foto: USA's præsident Donald Trump mødes med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov (venstre) og Ruslands ambassadør til USA, Sergei Kislyak, i Det Hvide Hus i Washington, 10. maj, 2017.*

---

# Lyndon LaRouche: Statslig kredit til New Yorks transportkrise, Nu – Nationens økonomi står på spil

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 12. juni, 2017 – I seks måneder har amerikanske vælgere ventet på, at præsident Donald Trump og Demokraterne skulle handle: Nu skal statskredit udstedes til fornyelse af nationens infrastruktur på et højere niveau. Der har været løfter, men ingen kredit, og ingen plan for, hvordan den skal anvendes.*

Meget af Amerikas økonomiske infrastruktur fra begyndelsen af det 20. århundrede er ikke blot i færd med stille og roligt at »smuldre«; den er livstruende. Det farligste tilfælde er sammenbrudskrisen i transport, der rammer flere end 20 million mennesker i New Yorks storbyområde. »Helvedessommeren«, der er indledt i New Yorks transportårer, truer i realiteten hele den amerikanske nationaløkonomi.

*EIR's stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, har bebudet pause i al »snakken« om infrastruktur:*

*»Staten må nu omgående udstede finansiering til bygning af ny infrastruktur i New York City«, sagde LaRouche. »Regeringen må gå ind og overtage denne krise; staten er den eneste kilde til en lovmæssig form for kredit for dette problem. Dette er en betydelig national krise, og USA's nationaløkonomi er afhængig af, at den løses. Vi har haft nok snak uden konkrete detaljer, uden opfølgning af direkte handling.*

*Det skal på bordet – både finansieringen og en plan for dens anvendelse – nu.«*

I mellemtiden har Demokraterne taget regeringens tid med »Russia-gate«, sammensværgelsen om at drive præsidenten ud af embedet for at ville have samarbejdsrelationer med Rusland. Den fyrede FBI-mand James Comeys vidneforklaring har gjort det meget klart, hvad dette gik ud på: et indstuderet forsøg fra efterretningssamfundets side på at opstille en fælde for præsidenten, og afsætte ham; med en politisk veterans ord, en »ynkelig, død sild« for en vildt distraheret Kongres.

Drop »Russia-gate«. Det Hvide Hus og Kongressen må komme i omdrejninger for at forhindre økonomien i at kollapse, og forhindre, at amerikanerne yderligere forarmes og dør. Genindfør Glass/Steagall-loven, så bankerne udlåner penge. Opret en statslig kreditinstitution til byggeri af det, der skal bygges; det være sig en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition, til infrastruktur og vareproduktion; et nyt 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation, RFC' – Finansieringsselskab til Genopbygning – baseret på Franklin Roosevelts oprindelige RFC; eller et bevillingskontor for statslig finansiering af projekter. Inviter til samarbejde med verdensmestrene i nye infrastrukturplatforme, Kinas »Bælte & Vej Initiativ«.

Uden at gennemføre disse skridt, sagde LaRouche, »er alle drømme om at genopbygge nationen døde«.

*Foto: NTSB (National Styrelse for Transportsikkerhed) undersøger en bil, der var involveret i dødelig Metro North togulykke ved Valhalla, New York, 4. februar, 2015.*

---

**Seniorrådgiver i USA's**

# Transportministerium: Vær opmærksom på Bælte & Vej

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

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

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

Vej-relaterede markeder samtidig med en fokusering på de formidable problemer mht. at flytte og levere materialer internationalt«, skriver Padilla.

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

*Foto: USA negligerede infrastruktur smuldrer.*

---

## **Glass/Steagall- bankopdelingslov præsenteres atter i USA's Kongres**

9. juni, 2017 – Kongresmedlem Marcy Kaptur talte igen i dag for en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, og imod »Choice«-bankreguleringsloven, hvor hun sagde:

»Hr. formand, jeg taler i dag for at modsætte mig Financial CHOICE Act, der overgiver det amerikanske folk, såvel som også tryghed og stabilitet, til fordel for Wall Street.

Seks storbanker kontrollerer nu to tredjedele af finanssektoren i vort land og høstede rekordstore profitter på mere end \$170 mia. i 2016. Det er for meget magt på for få hænder ...

I denne uge foreslog kongresmedlem Jones og jeg at suspendere det aktuelle lovforslag og erstatte det med vores tværpolitiske forslag, [Tilbagevenden til] Klog og Forsigtig Bankpraksis, der genindfører beskyttelse gennem Glass/Steagall-loven ved at adskille 'klog og forsigtig' bankpraksis fra risikabel Wall Street-bankpraksis, der udtømte vores økonomi i 2008.

Rules Committee nægtede at give vores lovforslag mulighed for at komme til afstemning. Vi forbliver dog beslutsomme. Glass/Steagall-loven var en del af præsident Trumps, såvel som Bernie Sanders, valgkampagne, og i 2016 omfattede både Republikanernes og Demokraternes valgprogram politikken for en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-lovens beskyttelse.

Amerikanere bør vide, at der er en voksende, tværpolitisk konsensus for at beskytte de fremskridt, vi har gjort, tøjle Wall Street og holde ulvene borte fra jeres pengepunge.«

Kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (Dem.-Hawai) talte også i salen for at erstatte CHOICE Act med Glass/Steagall-loven. Kaptur og kongresmedlem Walter Jones (Rep.-NC) planlægger, med 50 medsponsorere, mere handling for at intensivere Glass/Steagall-debatten.

Under pres omkring spørgsmålet om Glass-Steagall sammenlignede modstandere af Glass-Steagall, kongresmedlem Jeb Hensarling (Rep.-TX) fejlagtigt sin CHOICE Act med en »Glass/Steagall-lov for det 21. Århundrede« i bemærkninger, rapporteret af *The Hill*.

En respekteret ekspert inden for en genindførelse af Glass/Steagall, forfatter og tidligere investeringsbankier, Nomi Prins, offentliggjorde i dag et stærkt og langt argument for Glass/Steagall, der var stilet til præsident Donald Trump. Artiklen findes på flere sites, inklusive:

[https://www.opednews.com/articles/3/Nomi-Prins-In-Washington-by-Tom-Engelhardt-Banks\\_Glass-Steagall\\_Government\\_Washington-Greed-170608-188.html](https://www.opednews.com/articles/3/Nomi-Prins-In-Washington-by-Tom-Engelhardt-Banks_Glass-Steagall_Government_Washington-Greed-170608-188.html)

**Se også:** Video: Marcy Kapturs fremlæggelse for Rules Committee, for at erstatte CHOICE Act med forslag for Glass/Steagall: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=19987>

---

## **Ruslands og USA's udenrigsministre, Lavrov og Tillerson hhv., og Qatars udenrigsminister diskuterer krise i Qatar**

*11. juni, 2017* – Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov og USA's udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson talte i dag sammen i telefon om et bredt udvalg af udenrigspolitiske spørgsmål. »De diskuterede konsekvenserne af en række arabiske landes beslutning om at afbryde de diplomatiske forbindelser med Qatar. Sergei Lavrov og Rex Tillerson påpegede behovet for at løse uoverensstemmelser gennem forhandlinger og udtrykte beredvillighed til at bidrage til sådanne bestræbelser«, iflg. TASS, der citerer en erklæring fra det Russiske Udenrigsministerium.



Tidligere på dagen havde Lavrov et møde med Qatars udenrigsminister Mohammed bin Abdulrahman al-Thani i Moskva. Lavrov indikerede, at det diplomatisk-økonomiske angreb på Qatar, anført af saudierne, var diskussionens hovedspørgsmål. »Som politisk princip blander vi os ikke i hverken andre landes nationale anliggender eller deres bilaterale relationer«, sagde Lavrov. »Vi kan imidlertid ikke være tilfredse med en situation, hvor disse relationer mellem vore modparter forværres.« Moskva går ind for at afgøre enhver konflikt, inklusive den forværrede situation omkring Qatar, ved forhandlingsbordet, sagde Lavrov.

Lavrov understregede, at den hovedtrussel, man bør interessere sig for, er terrorisme. »Det er meget vigtigt at fokusere på samarbejde, på at forene indsatserne for at forhindre og stoppe denne trussel«, sagde han og understregede, at enhed mellem regionens stater og staterne uden for regionen er nødvendig »for maksimalt effektive handlinger« imod terrorisme.

Ud over at takke Rusland for dets støtte – en række russiske selskaber har tilsyneladende tilbudt at erstatte underskuddet af fødevareimport, forårsaget af den arabiske embargo – citeredes al-Thani flere steder for at sige, at Qatar ønsker normale, positive relationer med Iran. Han sagde til RT i et interview, at påstandene mod Qatar ikke kunne stikke særlig dybt, eftersom relationer med de andre stater i Golf Samarbejdsrådet »var venligtsindede selv to dage før optrapningen«. En informationskampagne for at dæmonisere Qatar er pludselig gået i gang«, sagde al-Thani og hævdede, at alle anklager imod Doha hidtil har været »grundløse og improviserede« og uden specifikationer. »Hvis der er klare anklager, var det bedre, om de var blevet diskuteret ved bordet. Før man traf nogen forholdsregler, burde Qatar have fået muligheden for at svare på beskyldningerne«, sagde han.

*Foto: Qatars udenrigsminister Mohammed bin Abdulrahman al-Thani (venstre) og Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov i*

# Når USA først tilslutter sig Bælte & Vej Initiativet, kan et Nyt Paradigme for menneskeheden begynde Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Det vigtigste aspekt af ideen om USA's tilslutning til Bælte & Vej-initiativet vil imidlertid være at inspirere hele befolkningen med håb for fremtiden, en bedre fremtid for de kommende generationer, noget, der er gået tabt i løbet af de seneste fem årtier. Det ville ligeledes demonstrere, at præsident Trumps løfte om atter at gøre Amerika stort ikke står i modsætning til andre landes interesser, men at et sådant win-win-samarbejde tværtimod kan bevæge hele verden ind i en ny æra af menneskelig civilisation. Hvis de to største økonomier i verden ville samarbejde på denne måde, vil der ikke være noget problem på planeten, der ikke kunne løses.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Lyndon LaRouche: Stop FBI's bedrageri; Stop kuppet mod præsidenten – Hvad de løgnagtige medier ikke fortæller**

*Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 8. juni, 2017* – Lyndon LaRouche lancerede en appel til det amerikanske folk om at stoppe det igangværende kup imod præsident Trump, som torsdag fik yderligere næring gennem den fyrede FBI-direktør, James Comeys løgnagtige vidneforklaring for Senatets Efterretnings-Udvalgskomite. LaRouche sagde, at kuppet er en FBI-operation, der forsøger at ødelægge USA, og hvis det ikke standses, vil verden stå over for generel krig.

Den 7. juni afslørede tidligere direktør for Nationalt Efterretningsvæsen, James Clapper, den faktiske motivation for kuppet imod Trump, med bemærkninger i Australien. Han sagde, at Trumps åbenhed over for fred med Rusland – det valprogram, som Trump blev valgt på af det amerikanske folk – i sig selv var totalt imod USA's sikkerhedsinteresser og i realiteten at sidestille med forræderi. Det var allerede før valget almindeligt kendt i det officielle Washington, at præsident Obama, i aftalt spil med briterne, kandidat Clinton, DNI-chef Clapper, CIA-chef Brennan og FBI-chef Comey, havde styret USA på en kurs for krig med Rusland og Kina, som efter planen skulle aktiveres fuldt ud med valget af Hillary Clinton. I stedet blev Trump valgt, hvilket udløste kuppet, der fulgte. Præsident Trump har holdt sit løfte og etableret bedre relationer med både Rusland og Kina, der begge søger samarbejde med USA omkring udvikling af verden, baseret på store infrastrukturprojekter. Det er det virkelige, og eneste, spørgsmål her. Comey bakkede op om dette torsdag i en lang

tirade imod Rusland som værende en dødsfjende, som svar på et spørgsmål fra senator Joe Manchin.

Her er de generelle linjer for, hvordan den reelle sammensværgelse virkede. Ifølge Comeys egne ord og disse faktiske implikationer, så udpeges, den 6. januar, FBI-direktør Comey af Obamas efterretningschefer til at gennemføre en »J. Edgar Hoover« mod Trump og briefe ham om slibrigt afpresningsmateriale, fabrikeret af britisk efterretning og agent for Clinton-kampagnen, Christopher Steele. Det er en ren Hoover-afpresningsoperation. Comey giver Trump et signal om at »opgiv din fantasi om at samarbejde med Rusland, og vi udgiver ikke dette«. Trump rokker sig ikke en tøddel. Dagen efter lækkes hele Steele-dossieret til alle de internationale medier, med anklager mod den nyvalgte præsident om perverse seksuelle handlinger med russiske prostituerede. Dette indrømmede Comey i sin vidneforklaring torsdag og sagde, at han var klar over, at denne briefing kunne fortolkes som et »J. Edgar Hoover moment«, som svar på et spørgsmål fra senator Susan Collins fra Maine. Under det pgl. møde forsikrede Comey Trump om, at præsidenten ikke blev efterforsket af FBI. Så går Comey ud og skriver et hemmeligt memo om briefing og præsidentens svar. Blev dette memo videregivet til briterne? Hvem andre blev det givet til?

Comey hævder, han skrev dette op, fordi han troede, præsidenten ville lyve. Dette er pladder. Comey var allerede blevet udvalgt til at bringe præsidenten til fald, til at få ham i en fælde, hvis Trump ikke trak næsen til sig mht. at søge bedre relationer med Rusland og Kina. At James Comeys plan var at opsætte en fælde for præsidenten er den eneste, logiske konklusion, man kan drage af Comeys vidnesbyrd som svar på spørgsmål fra diverse Republikanske senatorer.

Først, senator Risch: Jeg husker, du talte kort med os kort efter 14. februar, hvor *New York Times* skrev en artikel, der indikerede, at Trumps valgkampagne var aftalt spil med russerne ... denne rapport fra *NYT* var ikke sand. Er det fair at

sige sådan?

Comey: Det var i hovedsagen ikke sandt.

Med hensyn til samtalen om Michael Flynn:

Risch: Du citerede ordret, hvad præsidenten sagde, »Jeg håber, I kan finde en vej til at lade dette passere, til at lade Flynn i fred. Han er en god mand. Jeg håber, I vil slippe det.« ... Han gav dig ikke besked på at lade det passere?

Comey: Ikke med hans ord, nej.

Risch: Han gav dig ikke ordre til at slippe sagen?

Comey: Igen, hans ord var ikke en ordre.

Risch: Du har ikke kendskab til nogen, der anklages for at håbe på noget?

Comey: Nej, ikke som jeg sidder her.

I ethvert sandfærdigt scenarie burde dette have afsluttet sagen her.

Diverse Republikanske senatorer spurgte gentagne gange Comey, hvorfor, hvis præsidenten havde bedt om hans loyalitet, havde bedt ham droppe efterforskningen af Flynn (som var en efterforskning på baggrund af falske erklæringer, som præsidenten efter al sandsynlighed ikke engang vidste noget om), hvorfor aflagde du ikke rapport til justitsministeren? Alternativt, hvorfor truede han så ikke med at indgive sin afsked, som han tidligere havde gjort under en konfrontation med præsident George W. Bush? Hvorfor blive ved med at mødes med præsidenten og fortælle ham, at han ikke blev efterforsket samtidig med, at han nægtede at fortælle offentligheden det samme og vendte tilbage for at lægge strategi med FBI-agenter om, hvad der blev sagt, og hvad de næste skridt ville være. Comey indrømmede under sin vidneforklaring, at der var logiske ting, han ikke gjorde, inklusive at sige til præsidenten, at

han skulle stoppe al upassende opførelse, fordi FBI havde besluttet, at disse samtaler var af »interesse for en efterforskning«, dvs., at Comey, der agerede som en hemmelig informant, endnu ikke helt havde haft held til at lægge en fælde for præsident Trump.

Comey inkluderer FBI-vicechef McCabe i kredsen af personer, som han briefede om alle sine udvekslinger med præsidenten. Uheldigvis for Comey og hele dette scenarie med at »lægge hindringer i vejen for rettens udøvelse«, så forklarede McCabe under ed for Kongressen i kølvandet på alle disse tildragelser, at der ikke havde været noget forsøg fra Trumps eller nogen andens side på at blande sig i eller forhindre FBI's efterforskning. Faktisk forklarede Comey selv for Senatet torsdag, at der, forud for hans fyring, ikke havde været nogen efterforskning af præsident Trump, hverken for at hindre rettens gang eller for aftalt spil med russerne.

I en erklæring i kølvandet på Comeys indstuderede optræden, benægtede præsident Trumps advokat, Marc Kasowitz, at præsidenten nogen sinde skulle have bedt Comey om at droppe sagen mod Michael Flynn, nogen sinde skulle have lagt pres på Comey eller blot udbedt sig Comeys »loyalitet«. Kasowitz understregede korrekt disse dele af Comeys vidneforklaring:

- Den angivelige russiske hacking flyttede ingen stemmer.
- Præsidenten sagde til Comey, at, hvis nogen af hans satellit-medarbejdere gjorde noget forkert, ville det være godt at finde ud af det.
- James Comey indrømmede, at han lakkede alle sine memoer om sine samtaler med præsident Trump til *New York Times*, med det formål at fremprovokere udnævnelsen af en særlig anklager. Mindst ét af disse memoer var hemmeligt.

Denne kamp vil ikke blive bragt for retten. Om den skal fortsætte eller ej er det amerikanske folks og deres repræsentanters afgørelse. Som LaRouche sagde, så er tiden

kommet til, at folk taler ud og afslutter dette forstyrrende og særdeles farlige kupforsøg. Tiden er ligeledes kommet til at efterforske kupmagerne, inklusive de forræderiske nyhedsmedier.

*Foto: Comey aflægger forklaring for Senatet, 8. juni, 2017.*