

Udenrigsministrene Lavrov og Tillerson, generalerne Dunford og Gerasimov, drøfter samarbejde i Syrien

6. maj, 2017 – Et *de facto* samarbejde mellem Rusland og Trump-administrationen om Syrien går åbenlyst frem. Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov har endda karakteriseret de deeskaleringszoner, som man har indgået aftale om under weekendens konference i Astana, som værende baseret på ideer, som den amerikanske udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson foreslog tidligere på året. Desuden talte Lavrov den 5. maj i telefon med Tillerson for at diskutere Syrien, og formand for generalstabscheferne, general Joseph Dunford, og den russiske chef for generalstabten, general Valery Gerasimov, talte også sammen over telefon i dag.

»Der var fokus på spørgsmålet om en afgørelse af krisen i Syrien«, lød en erklæring fra det Russiske Udenrigsministerium om diskussionen mellem Lavrov og Tillerson. »I lyset af resultaterne af det internationale møde om Syrien i Astana den 3.-4. maj diskuterede de to topdiplomater opgaverne med at deeskalere situationen i dette land, og at sikre våbenhvilens holdbarhed, opbygge anti-terrorindsatser og animere ekstern støtte til den interne, syriske forhandlingsproces. De to sider diskuterede også flere andre regionale problemer, samt spørgsmål på den bilaterale dagsorden. De to topdiplomater aftalte at fortsætte de russisk-amerikanske kontakter.«

Til MIR TV sagde Lavrov om deeskaleringszonerne: »USA foreslog ved årets begyndelse, med udsigt til at skabe betingelser til at sikre den civile befolknings sikkerhed, at stoppe volden i

de regioner, hvor voldsomme kampe var i gang mellem regeringsstyrker og bevæbnede oprørsstyrker. Det er ikke tilfældigt, at USA hilste resultaterne af Astana-mødet velkommen, især en aftale om at oprette deeskaleringszoner«, citeres han af Irans FARS nyhedstjeneste.

I mellemtiden vil Rusland, Tyrkiet og Iran danne en fælles arbejdsgruppe om »deeskaleringszoner« i Syrien om to uger, med det formål at aftegne linjerne for deeskaleringsområderne og sikkerhedszonerne, så vel som for at løse andre operationelle og tekniske spørgsmål. Dette omfatter at udarbejde kort over sikkerhedszoner og deeskaleringsområder inden for en måned, frem til 4. juni, iflg. dokumentet, som avisen *Hürriyet* har set.

De fire zoner trådte i kraft i dag efter midnat. »Skabelse af deeskaleringsområderne og sikkerhedszonerne er en midlertidig forholdsregel, som indledningsvist vil vare seks måneder og automatisk bliver forlænget på basis af garantlandenes konsensus«, lød dokumentet.

Ifølge RT bekræftede Forsvarsministeriets rapport om samtalen mellem Dunford og Gerasimov arrangementet med dekonfliktion, der var blevet midlertidigt annulleret efter det amerikanske luftangreb på den syriske flyvebase den 6. april, men aftalte også »yderligere forholdsregler for at forebygge konfliktsituationer under fælles operationer mod ISIS og al-Nusra«.

Denne slående erklæring blev ikke uddybet, men bekræfter, at Rusland og USA bevæger sig mod mere direkte samarbejde i krigen mod terror.

Talsmand for de amerikanske generalstabschefer, kaptajn Greg Hicks, bekræftede i en erklæring, at Dunford og Gerasimov »talte om den nylige Astana-aftale og bekræftede deres forpligtelse til dekonfliktion-operationer i Syrien. De aftalte desuden at opretholde regelmæssig kontakt«.

Lad vore sejre fra fortiden gennemtrænge vores fælles succes i fremtiden

6. maj, 2017 – Følgende erklæring distribueres i hele verden af medlemmer af LaRouche PAC, der deltager i de af Rusland initierede marcher til ære for dem, der bekæmpede fascisme i Anden Verdenskrig – som i Rusland går under navnet »Den Store Patriotiske Krig«. Øverst på flyvebladet er et billede af løjtnant William Robertson fra den amerikanske hær og løjtnant Alexander Sylvashko fra den Røde Hær, som omfavner hinanden foran et skilt, der lyder, »Øst møder Vest«, og som symboliserer det historiske møde mellem den sovjetiske og amerikanske hær i nærheden af Torgau, ved floden Elben, Tyskland, den 25. april, 1945.

De sovjetiske tab under Anden Verdenskrig er ufattelige for de fleste amerikanere, med et svimlende tabstal på 30 millioner menneskeliv, for ikke at tale om ødelæggelsen af familier, industri, land, kultur og infrastruktur. Kun kineserne, der mistede henved 20 millioner mennesker under kampene med Japan, kan muligvis fatte, hvor stort et offer, det sovjetiske folk led, såsom under belejringen af Leningrad (Skt. Petersborg), før sejren var hjemme. En sådan styrke, en sådan udholdenhed og et sådant mod udgør et vidnesbyrd om den kraft, menneskeheden besidder imod en ondskabens kraft, der er helliget ikke alene ødelæggelsen af menneskeliv, men også af menneskehedens ubegrænsede fremtid.

Hvilken vej fremad følger vi?

Samarbejdet mellem de tre stormagter: USA, Sovjetunionen og

Kina, var altafgørende for de allieredes sejr i Anden Verdenskrig og er fortsat hjørnестenen i et nyt verdenssystem i dag.

Præsident Franklin Roosevelt, der anerkendte Sovjetunionens rolle under Josef Stalin, så vel som også indsatsen fra både de nationalistiske og kommunistiske kineseres side imod Japan, afviste personligt ethvert forsøg på at opretholde Det britiske Imperiums politik for kolonisation eller konflikt, og satsede på en verden med samarbejde mellem de fremvoksende, uafhængige nationer i verden, som især inkluderede det sovjetiske Rusland, Kina og Indien.

Hans vision for efterkrigstiden var radikalt anderledes end den vision, som blev implementeret af Storbritanniens Winston Churchill og, efter Roosevelts død, præsident Harry Truman. I stedet blev der, i kølvandet på krigen i Stillehavet, skabt en kunstig opdeling af britiske imperieinteresser og Wall Street-interesser, der specifikt havde til formål at opsplitte disse tre store nationer til at blive koldkrigsfjender.

Tiden er nu inde til, at arven fra den Kolde Krig slutter. Som den amerikanske udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson sagde til medlemmer af det Amerikanske Udenrigsministeriums stab den 3. maj, 2017:

»Vi har frembragt resultater på en måde, der i mangt og meget var formet af, og var en rest fra, den Kolde Krigs æra. Og i mange henseender har vi endnu ikke selv foretaget overgangen til denne nye virkelighed; man kan, når vi har vore samtaler med NATO – endnu et eksempel – se, at der er mange institutioner i hele verden, som blev skabt under en anden tid.

Så, efterhånden, som vi arbejder os ind på denne mulighed for at se på, hvordan vi skal udføre vores arbejde, er en af tingene at tænke på verden, som den ser ud i dag, og lade tilbage – altså, vi gør tingene på denne måde, fordi vi har

gjort det på denne måde i de sidste 30 eller 40 år, eller 50 år – for alt dét blev skabt under andre omstændigheder.

Man kan vel sige, at jeg indbyder jer alle til at gå til denne indsats, som vi vil påtage os, uden begrænsninger af jeres tankegang – overhovedet.«

Det britiske Imperium er fjendens sande ansigt; dette er en kamp, vi skal vinde.

**LaRouche PAC Internationale
Webcast,
5. maj, 2017; Leder**

I en tale for Udenrigsministeriets personale for to dage siden, forklarer han virkelig, på en meget rolig, omfattende og klarhjernet måde, udenrigsminister Tillersons synspunkt og – må man antage – også præsident Trumps, om, hvordan udenrigspolitik vil blive ført af Trump-administrationen, med udsigten til samarbejde mellem USA, Kina og Rusland. I Tillersons tale foretog han en slags spadseretur rundt til hele verden; og han forklarede, hvad Trump-administrationens politik ville være i disse forskellige områder. ...

Det, udenrigsminister Tillerson sagde, er, at vi ikke længere vil bruge såkaldte »vestlige værdier« som påskud for vores udenrigspolitik. At vi selvfølgelig støtter

menneskerettigheder og alle de vigtige værdier, som den Amerikanske Revolution blev udkæmpet for, og som findes indbygget i Uafhængighedserklæringen og USA's Forfatning. Men, vi vil føre vores udenrigspolitik med den idé for øje, at vi har betydningsfulde partnerskaber, og at det ikke er vores opgave at diktere, hvilke værdier, de skal have i deres indenrigspolitik. Men derimod, at vi har meget reelle interesser, og at de også har meget reelle interesser.

Matthew Ogden: Det er 5. maj, 2017, og jeg er Matthew Ogden. Med mig i studiet i dag har vi Jason Ross, der i dag har gennemført et meget vigtigt interview, som vi vil vise nogle klip fra under aftenens udsendelse, med hr. William Binney, en meget betydningsfuld person. Jason Ross vil introducere ham senere i udsendelsen.

Men før vi kommer til det, så befinder vi os stadig i en nedtælling til konferencen om Kinas Bælt & Vej-initiativ, der starter ni dage fra i dag – 14. og 15. maj – i Beijing, Kina. Foreløbig har 28 statsoverhoveder meddelt, at de deltager i forummet, som Kinas præsident Xi Jinping vil være vært for. Vi ved, at Ruslands præsident Putin vil deltage som æresgæst. Og USA's præsident Trump kan stadig nå at meddele, at, ikke alene vil han deltage i dette forum, men han vil også tage imod den invitation, Xi Jinping flere gange har overrakt ham, om, at USA tilslutter sig denne nye udvikling med Bælt & Vej-initiativet, eller den Nye Silkevej.

Lad mig gå direkte til sagen og fortælle jer, at der er en meget signifikant artikel, der blev udgivet i *China Daily* for blot et par timer siden. Det er en af de førende, kinesiske, engelsksprogede aviser i USA. Denne artikel har titlen, »Trump opfordret til at deltage i Bælt & Vej Forum«. Jeg viser artiklen på skærmen for jer; og I kan se, at dette er et interview med fr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. Hendes billede ses her i nederste hjørne, og artiklen indledes med det følgende:

»USA's præsident Donald Trump bør deltage i det forestående

Bælt & Vej Forum for internationalt samarbejde i Beijing, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, en politisk og økonomisk tænketank.« Artiklen fortsætter med at citere Helga LaRouche:

»'Det bedste ville være, hvis præsident Trump personligt ville deltage i Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing', sagde Zepp-LaRouche i et interview til China Daily.

'Det næstbedste ville være endnu et personligt topmøde mellem ham og præsident Xi Jinping umiddelbart efter, i Kina', sagde hun. [Det første var i Mar-a-Lago for et par uger siden.]

Zepp-LaRouche foreslog, at den økonomiske samarbejds mekanisme, en af de fire søjler, der blev etableret under det første møde mellem de to ledere i Mar-a-Lago i Florida, kunne arbejde på konkrete forslag til gensidige investeringer, både bilateralt og i tredjelande, i sammenhæng med Bælt & Vej-initiativet ...

Zepp-LaRouche sagde, USA må tilslutte sig initiativet, der har udviklet 'en gigantisk dynamik' og er 'historiens største' infrastrukturprogram.

'Kun, hvis USA går med i dette initiativ, vil der være en måde, hvorpå geopolitik, der har forårsaget to verdenskrige i det 20. århundrede, kan overvindes', forklarede hun. 'Når de institutionelle kræfter i USA først indser, at det er mere i amerikansk industri, jobs' og samfundets interesse generelt, end det er at stå uden for initiativet, kan en potentiel Thukydid-fælde, eller en krig over brændpunkter, undgås.'«

Artiklen fortsætter dernæst med at sige, »'Kinesisk samarbejde i opbygning af USA's infrastrukturbehov ville være med til at forynge den amerikanske økonomi', sagde hun.

'For de kinesiske og amerikanske nationaløkonomier er gensidigt komplementære', og Zepp-LaRouche sagde, de gensidige investeringer på dramatisk vis kunne stige med samarbejdet inden for initiativet.

Et sådant win-win-samarbejde ville ikke være begrænset til bilaterale investeringer, men kunne helt naturligt føre til joint ventures stort set i hele verden, i betragtning af opsvinget for økonomiske forventninger, forårsaget af initiativet, tilføjede hun.«

Så dette er altså en signifikant artikel, der blev udgivet i dag i *China Daily*, og det sker i sammenhæng med denne nedtælling til Bælt & Vej-topmødet. Men det er vigtigt, at Helga Zepp-LaRouches ord samtidigt nu også bliver læst af de engelsktalende læsere i USA – læserne af *China Daily*, der er en meget læst publikation; og der har også været en meget signifikant udvikling fra udenrigsminister Rex Tillersons side. I en tale for Udenrigsministeriets personale for to dage siden, forklarer han virkelig, på en meget rolig, omfattende og klarhjernet måde, udenrigsminister Tillersons synspunkt og – må man antage – også præsident Trumps, om, hvordan udenrigspolitik vil blive ført af Trump-administrationen, med udsigten til samarbejde mellem USA, Kina og Rusland. I Tillersons tale foretog han en slags spadseretur rundt til hele verden; og han forklarede, hvad Trump-administrationens politik ville være i disse forskellige områder. Men han startede med at gøre noget meget signifikant, og han har virkelig fået en masse kritik fra nogle af den transatlantiske, atlanticist-presse, kunne man kalde det. *The Atlantic* havde faktisk en lang artikel, der angreb udenrigsminister Tillersons verdenssyn. Men det, han gjorde, var, at han, i meget klare vendinger, afviste den 'humanitære interventionisme', der er blevet en del af amerikansk politik under både Bush' og Obamas administration. Man kunne kalde dette for »Tony Blair-doktrinen«; Tony Blair forklarede, i en særdeles berygtet tale i slutningen af 1990'erne, verden efter tiden for den 'Westfalske Freds principper'. Dette blev Bush- og Obama-administrationens doktrin; at gennemtvinge såkaldte »amerikanske demokratiske værdier« over resten af verden, som

et påskud for at gennemføre regimeskifte og 'farvede revolutioner'. Det blev til det, som Susan Rice og Samantha Powers gennemførte i FN, og det var i realiteten påskuddet for, eller ideologien bag, utallige operationer for regimeskifte og hemmeligt finansierede farvede revolutioner, der er blevet ført i hele verden i løbet af de seneste 10-15 år.

Det, udenrigsminister Tillerson sagde, er, at vi ikke længere vil bruge såkaldte »vestlige værdier« som påskud for vores udenrigspolitik. At vi selvfølgelig støtter menneskerettigheder og alle de vigtige værdier, som den Amerikanske Revolution blev udkæmpet for, og som findes indbygget i Uafhængighedserklæringen og USA's Forfatning. Men, vi vil føre vores udenrigspolitik med den idé for øje, at vi har betydningsfulde partnerskaber, og at det ikke er vores opgave at diktere, hvilke værdier, de skal have i deres indenrigspolitik. Men derimod, at vi har meget reelle interesser, og at de også har meget reelle interesser.

(Udskriftet fortsætter på engelsk:)

So, I'm going to play for you this short clip from the beginning of Secretary Tillerson's speech; and you'll see that it

sets up a very important context in which, in a second clip which

I'll introduce to you, he discusses the future and the hopeful potential future of our relationship with China. But first, here's the first clip from Secretary Tillerson's speech:

[begin video]

SECRETARY REX TILLERSON: Guiding all of our foreign policy actions are our fundamental values. Our values around freedom,

human dignity, the way people are treated. Those are our values;

those are not our policies, they're values. The reason it's

important I think to keep that well understood, is policies can change; they do change, they should change. Policies change to adapt to the circumstances. Our values never change; they're constant throughout all of this.

So, I think the real challenge many of us have is, [as] we think about constructing our policies and carrying out our policies, is how do we represent our values? And in some circumstances, if you condition our national security efforts on somewhat adopting our values, we probably can't achieve our national security goals or our national security interests.

If we condition too heavily that others must adopt this value that we've come to over a long history of our own, it really creates obstacles to our ability to advance our national security interests and our economic interests. It doesn't mean that we leave those values on the sidelines. It doesn't mean that we don't advocate for and aspire to freedom, human dignity, and the treatment of people the world over; we do. We will always have that on our shoulder everywhere we go.

But I think it's really important that all of us understand the difference between policy and values. In some circumstances, we should and do condition our policy engagements on people adopting certain actions as to how they treat people; they should. We should demand that. But that doesn't mean that's the case in every situation. So, we really have to understand in each country, or each region of the world that we're dealing with, what are our national security interests? What are our economic prosperity interests? Then, as we can advocate and

advance our values, we should; but the policies can do this. The values never change. So, I would ask you to just, to the extent you could think about that a little bit, I think it's useful. Because I know for me, this is one of the most difficult areas as I've thought about how to formulate policy. To advance all of these things simultaneously is a real challenge. I hear from government leaders all over the world, "You just can't demand that of us. We can't move that quickly, we can't adapt that quickly." So, it's how do we advance our national security and economic interests; and on this hand, our values are constant over here. So, I give you that as kind of an overarching view of how I think about the President's approach of America First. [end video]

OGDEN: So, with that, Secretary Tillerson brought an end to the Blair-Bush-Obama doctrine of color revolution, regime change, and so-called "humanitarian interventionism." This is the beginning of a new doctrine which is still being defined, but coming out of the Trump administration foreign policy. Now Secretary Tillerson did make very significant trip a few weeks ago to China; where he met with Xi Jinping and other very high-level officials. And this was in the weeks preceding Xi Jinping's visit to the United States, where he had his bilateral summit with President Trump at Mar-a-Lago. It's very significant, as we count down the days between now and this forum for the Belt and Road Initiative in Beijing, that there is a

new

policy doctrine being formed in the Trump White House, in terms

of the relationship that the United States will have towards China. Obviously, none of this is yet determined, but there are

definite changes in process.

I'm going to play for you now another clip from Rex

Tillerson's speech; where he begins by talking about the North Korea situation, but as you'll hear, he immediately brings up the

role that China and also Russia are playing in terms of collaborating with the United States to resolve that situation and also other situations around the world. Then, you'll hear him get a little bit more into detail about what the potential for a relationship between China and the United States over the

coming half century, as he discusses it, can become.

[begin video]

SECRETARY TILLERSON: So, as all of you clearly understand, when we came into the State Department, the administration came

in, was sworn in, and was immediately confronted with a serious

situation in North Korea. In evaluating that, what was important

to us and to me to understand was, first, where are our allies.

So engaging with our allies and ensuring that we and our allies

see the situation the same. Our allies in South Korea, our allies in Japan. Secondly, it was to engage with the other regional powers as to how do they see it. So, it was useful and

helpful to have the Chinese – and now the Russians – articulate

clearly that their policy is unchanged. Their policy is a denuclearized Korean peninsula. Of course we did our part years

ago; we took all the nuclear weapons out of South Korea. So now

we have a shared objective; and that's very useful, from which you then build out your policy approaches and your strategies. So many people are saying, "Gee, this is just the same thing we've tried over and over. We're going to put pressure on the regime in Pyongyang; they're not going to do anything, and then

in the end, we'll all cave."

Well the difference, I think, in our approach this time, is we're going to test this assumption. When folks came in to review the situation with me, the assumption was that China has

limited influence on the regime in Pyongyang, or they have a limited willingness to assert their influence. So, I told the President, we've got to test that; and we're going to test it by

leaning hard into them, and this is a good place to start our engagement with China. So, that's what we've been doing, is leaning hard into

China to test their willingness to use their influence, their engagement with the regime of North Korea. So, that's North Korea.

Then if I pivoted over to China, because it really took us directly to our China foreign policy, we really had to assess China's situation – as I said – from the Nixon era up to where we find things today. We saw a bit of an inflection point with

the Beijing Olympics; those were enormously successful for China.

They kind of put China on the map, and China really began to feel

its oats about that time; and rightfully. They have achieved a

lot. They moved 500 million Chinese people out of poverty into middle class status. They've still a billion more that need to move. So, China has its own challenges, and we want to work with them and be mindful of what they're dealing with in the context of our relationship. Our relationship has to be one of understanding that we have security interests throughout Northeast Asia and security interests throughout the Pacific, and we need to work with them on how those are addressed. So, that gets to the island building in the South China Sea, the militarization of those islands, and obviously we have huge trading issues to talk with them about. So, we are using the entre of the visit in Mar-a-Lago, which was heavy on some issues with North Korea, but also heavy on a broader range of issues. What we've asked the Chinese to do is, we want to take a fresh look of where is this relationship going to be 50 years from now? Because I think we have an opportunity to define that. So, I know that there have been a lot of dialogue areas that have been underway for the last several years with China; we have asked China to narrow the dialogue areas and elevate the participants to the decision-making level. So, we outlined four major dialogue areas with China; and we've asked them to bring people who report directly to the decision maker, which is President Xi. So for the first time, we are seeking — and it so far appears we will get — people at the Politburo

level and at much higher levels of the government in China to participate in these dialogues, so we can reframe what we want the relationship to be and begin to deal with some of the problems and issues that have just been sort of sitting out there

stuck in neutral for a while. It's a much narrower – as we make

progress, those things will result in working groups where we can

get after solving these things.

We're going to have the first meeting of the diplomatic and security dialogue, which is chaired by myself and Secretary Mattis with our counterparts here in Washington in June.

We've

put it up as kind of top priority. The second one is economics

and trade, which is chaired by Treasury Secretary Mnuchin and Commerce Secretary Ross, and it's well underway also.

So, that's kind of the new approach we're taking with China, is elevate; let's kind of revisit this relationship and what is

it going to be over the next half century. I think it's a tremendous opportunity we have to define that. And there seems

to be a great interest on the part of the Chinese leadership to

do that as well. They feel we're at a point of inflection also.

So, that's China.

[end video]

OGDEN: Let me just reiterate a couple of the points that you heard Secretary Tillerson just make. He said it's time for

us to take a fresh look at where this relationship is going over

the next 50 years. What will that relationship be 50 years

from

now? We have the opportunity to reframe what that relationship

will be, to revisit that relationship, and to examine what it's

going to be over the next half century. We have a tremendous opportunity to do that, he said, and there's great interest on the part of the Chinese leadership to do that as well. They feel

that we're at a point of inflection.

Now, just because this is a significant point to always include the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played in creating the vision, in laying out the vision which is really creating the pathway forward for what is the future, in 2005, Lyndon LaRouche published a book which was titled {Earth's Next

Fifty Years}. Not coincidentally, Mr. LaRouche's point in this

book, which he presents in a very profound and philosophically developed way, was that we've really reached the point where we

need to view the potential for a great powers relationship.

Between whom? The United States, China, and Russia; and also India, but most importantly this three-power relationship between

the United States, China, and Russia as a potential collaboration

to begin to envision a system of inter-relationship between nations based on mutual benefit between those countries. And the

development of the planet through – and he lays this out in detail in this book – the Eurasian Land-Bridge, or the New Silk

Road as he calls it, has the potential to bring mankind into a new mode of history. A new chapter of history where wars are something of the past; great wars are no longer fought between countries over narrow national interests. In fact, the mutual

benefit of these great projects, which are represented by what China is now doing, is the potential for peaceful coexistence between all cultures; a dialogue between civilizations, and as the opportunity to pave the road towards a new chapter of human history.

So again, this was {Earth's Next Fifty Years}; this was published in 2005 by Lyndon LaRouche. So, it's the ability to envision what the future must become which creates the opportunity for competent and clear-minded leadership. I think

you saw in a very real way the influence of that on what you're

now seeing at least in an exploratory way from the U.S. State Department and Secretary Tillerson. What he also brought up which is very important, is that China has succeeded in lifting

500 million people out of poverty in just a very short amount of

time; through great projects and investment into their own population. That's half a billion people.

What Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say earlier, when we were speaking to her and Mr. LaRouche, is that we have to continue to

beat the drum in terms of President Trump reciprocating what has

been offered by President Xi Jinping in terms of the United States participating in this New Silk Road dynamic. This is the

logical and obvious answer to President Trump's question: How are we going to spend \$1 trillion in the United States on developing the infrastructure and putting people back to work with real skilled, productive, high-paying manufacturing jobs? Well it must be done in collaboration with China. There's no way

that can be done without reciprocating Xi Jinping's offer to join

this New Silk Road dynamic.

So, I'm going to remind people that about a month or two ago, the LaRouche Political Action Committee issued a pamphlet.

I'm going to display that on the screen for you right now. It was titled "America's Future on the New Silk Road." So, you can

see the cover of that pamphlet right here. The subtitle is "LaRouche's Four Laws: the Physical Economic Principles for the

Recovery of the United States." You can see in the Table of Contents what this pamphlet includes. So, there's an introduction, which is called "A New Era for Mankind"; then you

have Lyndon LaRouche's document, the "Four New Laws to Save the

United States Now." Then you have four chapters which elaborate

each of those four points. One is, restore Glass-Steagall; this

is a fight we're really in the midst of right now, and it's coming to a head. Two, a new Hamiltonian national bank.

Three,

credit for increased productivity; and four, a crash program for

fusion and space.

That pamphlet has several full-spread maps included in it;

and I'm going to just show you a few of those. [pages 4-5]

First

you have "China's New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative: First Steps towards the World Land-Bridge" And this sort of shows

what the elements of the Belt and Road Initiative as it exists right now are across Eurasia. It includes the

China-Mongolia-Russia corridor, the China-Pakistan corridor, the

New Eurasian Land-Bridge, the China-Indochina corridor, the

Bangladesh-China-India-Myanmar (BCIM) corridor, the Maritime Silk Road, including ports and shipping lanes and so forth; and then also China-Central and West Asia.

So those are the projects, as Helga LaRouche called it, the biggest infrastructure project in human history, that's what is now on the table. And those are the heads of state and government that are going to be attending this summit in Beijing next weekend. This affects the entirety of the populations of this area of the world. So that's what exists now.

If the United States wished to join this, there are several very concrete projects which could be included: This map [pages 8-9] is titled "U.S.A. Joins the New Silk Road: An International Recovery, Working with China To Build America." Very significantly, high-speed rail and magnetic levitation – look at what China has done with high-speed rail development in China, and compare that with the pathetic state of rail in the United States. It also includes reviving our industrial corridors, the so-called "rust belt" development corridors, which include not only transportation but also energy development and so forth. Along those development corridors, you could have new cities. It's called "New Renaissance Cities," because the cities have to be centers of culture and education and art, and science and research. And then very importantly, the Bering Strait connection. So as we develop the high-speed rail in North America, it can connect to what's being built in Eurasia. And then finally, the third full-spread map in that pamphlet [pages 20-21], is called, "The Full World Land-Bridge: Expanding

China's New Silk Road, A Global Infrastructure Economic Platform." And these are some other projects which are sort of third-party projects, which the United States and China could be working together on for the benefit of other areas of the world:

Very importantly, a new Marshall Plan for the Middle East, this is how we should resolve the crisis in Syria and Libya and Iraq.

In South America, a new inter-oceanic canal: This is on the books through Nicaragua. Also a South American transcontinental railroad. The canal through the Isthmus of Kra, in Thailand, we

had a special presentation on that just a few weeks ago; this is really moving forward, the Kra Canal. Refilling Lake Chad with

the Transaqua Project. This is one of the most important projects for the future of Africa; and then also in Africa, a Europe-Strait of Gibraltar tunnel.

So that's the pamphlet, "America's Future on the New Silk Road" and it's available on the LaRouche PAC website, and this is something which we should be coming back to right now. It's very important.

But as Helga LaRouche said, in our discussion, we have not yet reached the point of safety: We are still in the danger zone. There are so many hotspots which could blow up around the world, and there continues to be a very real attempt, from the British Empire and from their allies inside the United States to undermine and to destabilize the Trump administration for the

very reason that you saw Secretary Tillerson state – we are no longer going to be the country which is the “dumb giant” implementing British Empire, divide-and-conquer policies in the world. No longer East against West, but we are going to seek dialogue and we are going to seek cooperation with these countries.

So I think with that said, it sets up, I think, what we’re going to discuss with Jason and I’d like to just let Jason pick it up from there.

Jason ROSS: These projects you’ve discussed, this is something that can transformed mankind, like going to the Moon.

This is that kind of scale of change, in relations among people.

Ever since Trump was elected, there has been an ongoing attack against him of people whom you’d think had lost their minds, or

you were having a bad dream, except that it’s really happening;

people who are repeatedly saying, they’re not attacking trumps policies per se, – that happens too, of course, but what I’m talking about is the drumbeat about “Russia, Russia! {Russia, Russia! Russia!}” People saying that “Russia elected Donald Trump.” That “Russia hacked the Democratic Party,” “Russia hacked

John Podesta, Russia hired internet trolls; Russia has compromising blackmail material on Donald Trump – Russia, Russia, Russia!” “Russia caused Democratic candidates to shy away from the TPP.” It’s just complete nonsense!

Now, this is being done for two reasons. One as an attempt to delegitimize and throw Trump’s administration out entirely, or, failing that, attempt to box him into an anti-Russia provocative type of policy, to show that he’s not a shill or a stooge for the “man who’s directing the entire world, Vladimir

Putin," if you would listen to some people on MSNBC or other places.

So today I had the wonderful chance to speak with William Binney about this. Bill Binney was a covert, three-decade employee at the NSA. He resigned in 2001 as a top-level executive there; he resigned over the fact that safeguards against spying on American citizens were being overlooked, and that a setup was being made to allow a totalitarian, and as he put it, "an Orwellian state."

So, let's just go ahead and jump right in to hear what Bill Binney has to say about whether Vladimir Putin runs the whole world.

[begin video]

JASON ROSS: Let me ask you, Mr. Binney: What do you think about these claims. Did Russian hackers elect Donald Trump?

WILLIAM BINNEY: I wrote an article that was published in {Consortiumnews} on Dec. 12th of last year, that said this was all a big fabrication, simply because they weren't saying exactly

where the hack came from, and where the data out of the hack went

to! I mean, that's the whole point of what NSA has set up, in terms of copying and collecting everything in a fiber network inside the United States, and virtually everything in the world

on those fibers.

So that means – and they've got trace route programs by the hundreds, scattered all over the world. That means that they can

follow the [data] packets as they move through the network.

Now,

if somebody hacks into the DNC or Hillary or Podesta's email or

something, and they want to find out who it is, all they have to

do is use the IP address with XKeyscore as Edward Snowden said,
and they've got all the data to find out where the packets went!

But they haven't done that, you see. And even NSA who's the only

one that can do this – the rest of them are meaningless – if NSA says they've got data on it, then it's meaningful. If the rest say that we have high confidence, that's just pure speculation. And it's something that's just pure garbage, that doesn't mean anything. Produce the evidence, they haven't produced any at all, so that's what I called it back in December of last year.

[end video]

ROSS: Well, that's a pretty straightforward response on that, isn't it? Let's take up now the topic of the control over the domestic political apparatus that's exerted by an uncontrolled intelligence apparatus that collects material on everybody.

[begin video]

ROSS: More recently about a little over a month ago you co-authored an article with Ray McGovern in which you wrote about

Trump's response to this, that "his choice may decide whether there is a future for this constitutional republic. Either Trump

can acquiesce to or fight against a deep state of intelligence officials who have a myriad of ways to spy on politicians and other citizens. And thus amass derogatory materials that can be easily transformed into blackmail."

[<https://consortiumnews.com/2017/03/28/the-surveillance-state-behind-russia-gate/>]

That's a strong claim. Tell us, how do you see the Trump response to this attack on elected government? And what should ordinary people do, to prevent such a policy coup?

BINNEY: Well, first of all, I think President Trump realizes what's been going on. A recent statement he made about, "there's an awful lot of spying going on on U.S. citizens and we really don't know the extent of it, and we really have to find out what the heck" – he used the word "hell" – "what the hell is going on." Well, that means they're even keeping him in the dark.

Now, as the President of the United States, he's supposed to know all the sources of information that the intelligence community is using to produce intelligence for him, and he obviously doesn't know about this. But I've made it perfectly clear that the "Fairview program, Stormbrew programs, and Blarney programs* for the tapping of fiber networks inside the United States are the sources of information on everybody in the United States, including representatives in the House and Senate; you know, even judges on the Supreme Court, Generals on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all Federal judges, all senior lawyer firms all around, and all the journalists and everything; all that stuff is being captured and stored.

And what they're not talking about is, I've seen some arguments where they said, "well, as long as we're only using it for intelligence and law enforcement isn't involved, you know, it's OK for us to do that." That was the argument I think that Judge Napolitano put forward, that they were using with the

FISA

Court to dupe them into doing what they want.

And that's really what's happened: They've been duped, and so have the Congress, most of Congress. I mean the Intelligence

Committees I think were more aware of what was going on than the

rest of Congress. But they duped the rest of Congress! They made them all just play along like a bunch of sheep, "here's bell, follow the bell," you know? So our democracy basically doesn't really exist the way it was originally intended. And the

law enforcement, FBI, DEA, and others in the law enforcement community had direct access into the NSA data – they've had it all along! Director Mueller at the FBI said he'd been using the

Stellar Wind, which is the domestic spying data, since 2001, he'd

been using that, so; and that's direct access through their technology data center in Quantico, Virginia into the NSA data bases where they could look all the content and metadata of everybody in the country! And they could retroactively research

them any time they want.

And they're using it to arrest people for common crime inside the United States. so, I mean, this is simply a destruction of the entire judicial process in our country and it's a fundamental violation of the constitutional rights.

And

they've scrapped the Constitution, fundamentally.

I mean, that's why I said, when the Iraqis were struggling to put together a Constitution, I said, "well, why don't we give

'em ours, we're not using it." [laughter]

[end video]

ROSS: The discussion continued; we covered a lot of topics.

The interview will be available tonight for you who are subscribing to our audio podcast, it'll be up this weekend on the website.

The other aspect to take from it, is, as he said in that article that he co-wrote with Ray McGovern, this is not something that will go away. Unless this apparatus is taken on and removed, cleaned out, this ongoing cloud of blackmail potential and political coercion that exists above the level of elected government will continue putting pressure to oppose the kinds of developments that we saw with what Tillerson put out, and with the pamphlet that Matt just went through. So it's not a fight that will go away. This isn't something that will simmer down and go cold on its own. It's a fight that's got to be won.

OGDEN: Absolutely. It's heating up right now. It's definitely not going away. Just earlier this afternoon, Sen. Rand Paul sent out a tweet, where he said, "I have formally requested from the White House and the Intelligence Committees, info on whether I was surveilled by the Obama administration or the intelligence community." So, to the extent that people are trying to write off the claim from the Trump White House that, in fact, Trump was wire-tapped or surveilled by the Obama administration, now Sen. Rand Paul is asking the same question. He went on to say, "Did the Obama administration go after Presidential candidates, members of Congress, journalists, clergy, lawyers, federal judges? Did the Obama administration use warrantless 'wiretapping'" – in quotes – "on other candidates besides Donald Trump?"

So, this is a real question. This makes Watergate seem pale in comparison.

ROSS: And some of the other specifics that have come out about this. There's the report that Susan Rice was the person, Obama's National Security Advisor, who outed Michael Flynn, or who made an "unmasking" request to get from the recorded calls with the Russian diplomat that, oh, that the person he was speaking with was Gen. Michael Flynn.

So you don't get much higher level in the political and intelligence world than Mike Flynn, and if even his conversations

are being listened to and unmasked in this way, you know, who isn't? Are the members of the intelligence community, are they

being blackmailed in this way? This is the sort of thing that you say, what would Hoover have been doing if he all of these tools at his disposal?

And the numbers back it up: A report just was released that there were almost 2,000 incidents of unmasking of American citizens, whose identities and communications were collected in a

foreign or other intelligence collection process, that the Obama

administration made that there were almost 2,000 requests to unmask and find out who were the Americans involved in these conversations.

OGDEN: And this continues to go back to the question of the role that British intelligence is playing, and obviously now it's

been publicly admitted that, in fact it was GCHQ that was conducting the surveillance and channeling all of this intelligence into the U.S. because it's illegal under U.S. law to

spy on your own citizens – so just ask the British to do it! And vice versa.

So, this continues to be the persisting question. And the point that has to be asked, and this is the question: Will Donald Trump recognize that this the true face of the enemy, and that the British Empire have been attempting to stonewall and bulldoze the United States into becoming their "dumb giant," in their attempts to set the world against itself and to continue to manipulate the international politics through this geopolitical model which they've been using since the end of World War II; or, will we say this is the end of that so-called British-U.S. "special relationship" and now is the time that we are going to initiate a New Paradigm of international relations.

So I think that question gains more relevance as we look at this speech that we played earlier today from Secretary Tillerson, where he really did bring an end to this Blair doctrine of using so-called "Western values" as the pretext for regime change and color revolutions, and we see a potential for a new relationship between the United States and China, new relationship between the United States and Russia, and a new attitude in terms of what our goals are in terms of our relationships with the rest of the world?

So it's a war which continues, and this interview that you conducted today, Jason, with William Binney is an important tool for people to use. So I think people can watch the website for that to come out, and as you said, it will be available to podcast subscribers tonight in audio form.

So let's wrap up today's broadcast by saying that we are nine days away from the opening of this Beijing conference.

This

begins one week from Sunday: The heads of state and government will be arriving a week from today, a week from tomorrow in Beijing. I guarantee you that the accommodations can be made for

President Trump to attend that summit if he so makes the decision

in the next few days. And as Helga LaRouche said, even if that

doesn't occur, the next best option would be for another bilateral summit between President Trump and President Xi in the

days and weeks following the Belt and Road Initiative summit.

So we have that to look forward to, and over the coming days, we ask you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com, and continue

to do what you can do, to educate the U.S. population about the

possibility of what would be our opportunities, were we to join

this Belt and Road Initiative. That pamphlet that I gave you a guided tour of is available on the LaRouche PAC website.

We'll

make that available as a link

[<https://larouchepac.com/20170225/four-laws-pamphlet>] in the description of this video here today. And also you can watch the

full speech from Secretary Tillerson that's available on YouTube

and we'll make that link available as well.

[<https://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2017/05/270620.htm>]

So thank you very much for joining us, and please stay tuned to the LaRouche PAC website and the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel

for the full interview with William Binney, you can find the interview that Helga Zepp-LaRouche conducted with {China Daily}

on their website
[http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2017-05/05/content_29219579.htm]

– chinadaily.cn and that link is also provided in the description of this video.

So thank you very much. Thank you Jason for joining me here today, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Så fik visionære personer alligevel ret

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 4. maj, 2017 – I dag, præcis ti dage, før åbningen af Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing finder sted, er vidtrækkende forandringer til det bedre i menneskets vilkår blevet til en umiddelbart opnåelig mulighed. Den nye vision for menneskeheden, der har været Lyndon LaRouches og Helga Zepp-LaRouches hele livsværk, kan virkeliggøres, hvis deres ideer effektivt promoveres i løbet af de forestående dage og uger.

Hvor mange indså sandheden i Kinas officielle avis, *Global Times'* lederartikel fra 2. maj? Den sagde, at ængstelsen over Bælt & Vej-initiativet »blotlægger den stereotype, amerikanske nulsums-tankegang ... [Men] den offentlige mening i USA er diskret ved at ændre sig, fra at være imod det, og til at tillægge en undersøgelse af det, større betydning«.

Sandheden i denne iagttagelse er nu blevet understreget på en overraskende måde, gennem den amerikanske udenrigsminister Rex Tillersons lange, improviserede tale for hele

Udenrigsministeriet i går. Anglofile nyhedskilder har citeret en del af Tillersons bemærkninger med det formål at bagvaske dem: hans åbningsudtalelser, hvor han klart tager afstand fra Bush- og Obama-administrationernes morderiske politikker med »farvet revolution« og regimeskifte. Her sagde Tillerson, at Amerikas »værdier« ikke nødvendigvis er det samme som dets udenrigspolitik – hvilket, som han forklarede, vil sige, at forsøg på at påtvinge andre nationer amerikanske »værdier« ofte ville vise sig kontraproduktivt.

Men det, der ikke blev rapporteret, var Tillersons detaljerede og udtrykkelige beskrivelse af den nye administrations nye aftaler om dialog med Kina. Han sagde, at den nye dialog ville blive med kinesiske regeringsfolk, der rapporterer direkte til præsident Xi Jinping – og således implicit, at amerikanerne ville være regeringsfolk, der rapporterer direkte til præsident Donald Trump. Planen fra begge sider er her, at man vil opnå konkrete aftaler snarere end blot få en talk-shop, som den foregående »dialog«.

Men hvad er det overordnede formål med dialogen? Tillerson understregede, og understregede igen, at dens formål bliver at definere den amerikansk-kinesiske relation »for det næste halve århundrede!«

Var det ikke Lyndon LaRouche, der skrev bogen med titlen, »Jordens kommende halvtreds år«? (Hele Rex Tillersons tale for Udenrigsministeriets ansatte kan læses her: <https://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2017/05/270620.htm>)

En implikation er, at det stadig er muligt for præsident Trump at deltage i denne Bælt & Vej-konference den 14.-15. maj, og vi bør kæmpe for, at det sker.

I mellemtiden – på den anden side af globen i Kasakhstans hovedstad Astana – underskrev de russiske, iranske og tyrkiske repræsentanter i dag en aftale om at etablere demilitariserede »sikre zoner«, eller »deeskaleringszoner«, i Syrien, med

støtte fra den syriske regering. USA var, selv om de ikke deltog i aftalen eller deltog direkte i forhandlingerne, repræsenteret i Astana af fungerende viceudenrigsminister Stuart Jones. Præsident Putin sagde, at præsident Trump i deres telefonsamtale den 2. maj havde støttet sådanne sikre zoner – ja, det havde faktisk været en del af Donald Trumps præsidentkampagne, selv om det ondskabsfuldt var blevet miskarakteriseret som en *casus belli* for Rusland. Den russiske regering siger, at oprettelsen af disse zoner endelig vil begynde at adskille terroristerne fra den bevæbnede, syriske opposition – noget, som [tidl. udenrigsminister] John Kerry i et år havde lovet at gøre, men som Barack Obama aldrig ville give sin tilladelse til.

Samtidig har nogle amerikanske kongresmedlemmer ikke holdt trit med verdensbegivenhederne således, at der ikke blev indgivet et Glass/Steagall-tillæg, før Husets Komite for Finansielle Ydelser havde en direkte afstemning om et finansielt reguleringslovforslag i dag, langs partilinjerne. Vi vil mobilisere mere aggressivt og hårdere om dette, men ikke længere specifikt med denne komite som mål.

Det er det store billede, som hver og én af os til enhver tid må repræsentere: menneskehedens fremtid i de næste halvtreds til hundrede og halvtreds år.

Foto: Helga og Lyndon LaRouche taler ved en Schiller Institut-konference i Tyskland, juni 2016.

POLITISK ORIENTERING 4. maj

2017:

Nu må Danmark tilslutte sig Kinas Bælt & Vej-initiativ

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

»Det er 4. maj; ti dage, inden det går løs i Beijing med det store Bælt & Vej Forum, som bliver et afgørende punkt i den fortsatte udvikling her på planeten Jorden; det tror jeg allerede nu ligger klart. Det er jo så spændende, at den danske statsminister Lars Løkke Rasmussen ikke kunne vente. Han havde så travlt, at han sagde, 'jamen, jeg vil ikke vente til 14. maj; jeg tager derover allerede 2. maj til Kina og besøger pandaer, men også den kinesiske præsident og statsminister, og det er selvfølgelig en god impuls, at det er det første – ikke statsbesøg – men det første besøg fra dansk side med statsministeren, officielt besøg, siden 2008, da Danmark og Kina indgik et strategisk partnerskab, hvor Danmark ligesom blev det første land i Norden til at indgå et sådant særligt strategisk partnerskab med Kina. Så det er en god impuls at tage derover. Det, der så bare er vigtigt, er, at der er andet på dagsordenen end de pandaer ...

Fordi, dét, Danmark SKAL med på, det er det nye paradigme, som Kina er drivkraften i, men hvor det ikke bare drejer sig om Kina, næh, det drejer sig om størstedelen af verden; det er det nye paradigme, som Kina samarbejder tæt om sammen med Rusland, sammen med stadig større dele af Asien, efterhånden det meste af Asien, men hvor Sydamerika, Afrika og andre lande også står i kø for at være med. Til dette Bælt & Vej Forum er der 30 stats- eller regeringschefer, der indtil nu har annonceret deres deltagelse, men der vil være delegationer fra over 100 lande, mange på meget højt niveau, fordi det her er stort; fordi Kina er blevet drivkraften i global udvikling. Den tankegang, man har haft i Kina, er simpelthen, at man har

sagt, 'Vi har været i stand til at løfte 6 til 700.000 millioner mennesker, fattige kinesere, ud af fattigdom til et langt bedre liv; man har så en ambition om, at, i 2020 skal der ikke længere findes fattige i Kina; der skal ikke findes folk, der har problemer med, at de ikke får mad, osv. Fattigdommen skal afskaffes; men hvorfor skal det kun gælde Kina? Man har fundet ud af, at, hvis man investerer i infrastruktur, hvis man bruger penge på at investere i infrastruktur, i moderne teknologi, i modernisering af forskellige ting, jamen, så kan man løfte hele samfundet op; og det er ikke en speciel ting, der gælder for kinesere; det gælder for alle mennesker ...«

Lyd:

FDR: "Winston, når denne krig er forbi, vil der ikke være noget

Britisk Imperium!"

EIR-kortvideo, 3. maj 2017

Kina: Løsning for Korea mulig

med amerikansk-kinesisk samarbejde

2. maj, 2017 – En lederartikel i *Global Times* i dag fremkommer med den mening mht. Koreakrisen, at, »Hvis Washington arbejder i samme retning som Beijing, er der udsigt til et betydningsfuldt gennembrud i spørgsmålet.«

Lederen, der repræsenterer regeringens partipolitik, beklager behersket, at Trump-administrationen har udtrykt en holdning om, at »Pyongyangs opgivelse af sine atomambitioner afhænger af, om Beijing lægger tilstrækkeligt pres på dem«, hvilket, siger lederens forfattere, ikke er korrekt. »Washington må, samtidig med, at de ikke placerer for mange forventninger på Kina, også fortsætte med at udøve deres egne bestræbelser i spørgsmålet. Trump bør ikke få alle sine råd fra et par såkaldte strateger og blive vildledt omkring situationen.«

De bemærker, at problemet grundlæggende set er mellem Washington og Pyongyang, eftersom »Nordkoreas hensynsløse forfølgelse af atomare og langtrækkende missilteknologier drives frem af usikkerhed omkring dets regime. Det forsøger ikke at blive det næste mål for afsættelse, efter Irak og Libyen. USA må adressere Pyongyangs strategiske foruroligelse.« Dette er nøjagtig, hvad Rex Tillerson sagde i sidste uge.

Lederartiklen bemærker også, »Det følsomme tidspunkt i april er forbi. Nordkorea udførte ikke en sjette atomtest, og frekvensen og skalaen af dets missilaffyringer er ikke så signifikante, hvilket kan tilskrives samarbejde mellem Kina og USA.«

Forfatterne konkluderer: »Vi har bemærket, at Washington på det seneste har udvist en vis fleksibilitet i sine erklæringer.«

Trump og Putin diskuterer Syrien og Nordkorea; muligt møde

2. maj, 2017 – USA's præsident Donald Trump og Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin havde en »forretningsmæssig« telefonsamtale, i dag, hvor de diskuterede, hvordan de skulle promovere diplomatisk fremskridt i både Syrien og Nordkorea.

»Vladimir Putin har opfordret til beherskelse og reduktion af spændingsniveauet« omkring Koreahalvøen, sagde erklæringen fra Kreml, iflg. RT's rapport. »Det aftaltes i fællesskab at arbejde på en diplomatisk løsning, der vil afgøre krisen.«

Med hensyn til Syrien har de to præsidenter besluttet at »aktivere dialogen mellem de to landes udenrigsministeriers chefer [Tillerson og Lavrov], der vil søge forskellige muligheder for at sikre våbenhvileprogrammet, stabilisere og kontrollere det«, lyder erklæringen. »Målet er at skabe baggrunden for, at der kan lanceres en reel fredsproces i Syrien. Dette betyder, at Ruslands og USA's udenrigsministre ville informere deres ledere om fremskridt i denne henseende.«

Erklæringen fra Det Hvide Hus sagde, at de to ledere aftale, at »alle parter må gøre alt, de kan, for at afslutte volden« i Syrien, og at Trump og Putin også diskuterede samarbejde omkring nedkæmpelse af islamiske kæmpere i hele Mellemøsten. »Det var en meget god samtale og inkluderede diskussionen om sikre zoner, eller deeskaleringszoner, for at opnå vedvarende fred af humanitære og mange andre grunde«, lød det.

Trump og Putin var også for at arrangere et personligt møde omkring tidspunktet for G20-topmødet i Hamborg i juli, iflg.

erklæringen fra Kreml.

Denne telefonsamtale, den første, siden man fik Trump til at angribe en syrisk flyvebase på basis af falske efterretninger fra briterne, burde gøre det muligt for Trump at vende tilbage til sin oprindelige plan om at arbejde tæt sammen med Rusland om krigen mod terrorisme.

Trump sætter ind for fred i Asien; New York Times råber på krig

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 2. maj, 2017 – Det bliver i stigende grad klart, at præsident Trump, sammen med Kinas præsident Xi Jinping og Ruslands præsident Vladimir Putin, tager skridt til at afslutte krisepunkterne i Eurasien, der havde bragt verden til randen af krig under præsident Obama, og som briterne og deres aktiver desperat har forsøgt at bruge igen i dag for at bryde Trumps samarbejde med Rusland og Kina.

Som en sydkoreansk analytiker sagde i sidste uge, så har Trump en politik for Nordkorea, der er meget tæt på den politik, der føres af de førende kandidater til præsidentskabet i Sydkorea i det forestående valg den 9. maj: hav en større pind, men tilbyd en større gulerod.

Alt imens Trump-administrationen har aktiveret THAAD-missilsystemet i Sydkorea og gennemfører øvelser i området med et hangarskib, B-1 bombefly og atomubåde, erklærer Trump samtidig højlydt for verden, at han samarbejder tæt med præsident Xi, og at han ønsker at forsikre Nordkorea om, at USA ikke truer med »regimeskifte« imod Kim Jong-un-regeringen.

Hans udtalelser mandag om, at han ville være villig til at møde Kim Jong-un personligt under passende omstændigheder, er blevet mødt med hysteri i den vestlige presse, og deres respons til Trumps opringning til den filippinske præsident Rodrigo Duterte, hvor han inviterede ham til at besøge Det Hvide Hus, sendte *New York Times* og andre ud i hysteriske krampetrækninger.

Men hvad repræsenterer disse skridt? Koreakrisen blev skabt af Bush- og Obama-administrationerne, der saboterede hver eneste aftale, der blev opnået med Nordkorea, og førte til Obamas vanvittige »strategiske tålmodighed« – altså, en afvisning af at forhandle med Nordkorea, med mindre de gjorde præcis, som de fik besked på, samtidig med, at han opbyggede en massiv militærstyrke og forøgede sanktionerne. Målet var Kina, ikke Nordkorea. Bush og Obama var henrykte over at have et atombevæbnet Nordkorea, som gav en undskyldning for at opbygge en massiv militær ring rundt om Kina og Rusland.

Nu arbejder Trump sammen med Kina. Der er ikke længere grund til at drive Nordkorea til fjendtlige reaktioner med atomvåben. Som udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson sagde i sidste uge, så må vi overbevise Pyongyang om, at vi ikke tilsigter regimeskifte, men blot en fredelig atomafrustning af Koreahalvøen.

Det samme gælder for Filippinerne. Den tidligere filippinske regerings unødvendige provokation af Kina, hvor de sendte spørgsmålet om suverænitæt over øerne i det Sydkinesiske Hav til en forudindtaget vestlig domstol, uden kinesisk deltagelse, retfærdiggjorde Obamas deployering af en stærk militærstyrke til området. Med valget af Duterte endte denne krise, og Filippinerne arbejder nu tæt sammen med Kina, og ligeledes med USA. Både Filippinerne og USA befinder sig nu under et fornuftigt lederskab, der afviser galskaben med verdenskrig mellem atommagter.

I dag havde Trump en lang telefonsamtale med præsident Putin,

hvor de aftalte at arbejde tæt sammen om udarbejdelse af en fredelig, politisk løsning på brændpunkterne i Nordkorea og Syrien. Dette forfærder briterne, der troede, de med held havde forgiftet Trumps plan om at blive venner med Putin, gennem deres løgne om, at Assad havde brugt kemiske våben, og som fik Trump til at bombe en syrisk flyvebase.

Naturligvis beskriver *New York Times*, Det britiske Imperiums stemme i USA, Xi Jinping og Putin som diktatorer og hævder, at Trump er en tyran, fordi han vil være venner med dem, eller med andre »autoritære diktatorer«, såsom Duterte, Egyptens el-Sisi eller andre, der trodser den britiske imperieopdeling af verden i fjendtlige lejre, og som kun er interesseret i at bekæmpe terrorisme, og ikke andre nationalstater. Dette er i realiteten landene i den Nye Silkevej, der ønsker at arbejde sammen som venner i opbygningen af en verden, der er menneskeheden værdig.

Trump har hidtil endnu ikke meddelt, om han vil deltage i det Internationale Bælt & Vej Forum, der finder sted i Beijing den 14. – 15. maj, og hvor ledere fra 100 nationer vil mødes for at diskutere menneskehedens fremtid, baseret på gensidig udvikling, lindring af alvorlig fattigdom (som Kina næsten har opnået), og en verden, der er fri for krig og terrorisme. Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde den 13. april, hvis Trump går frem med at bringe USA ind i den Nye Silkevej, vil han blive husket som en af de største amerikanske præsidenter. Selve begrebet om Imperium, om en verden, der består af tilhængere af Darwins teorier (den stærkeste overlever) og nationer, der fungerer på samme måde som i dyreverden, hvor man kæmper om fordele på den andens bekostning, kan én gang for alle deponeres i den historiske skraldespand. Menneskeheden kan dernæst gå fremad mod sin sande bestemmelse med at opbygge en retfærdig og fremgangsrig verden, og med fremme af menneskehedens opdagelser i rummet, samt skabe en videnskabelig og kulturel renæssance blandt alle folkeslag.

Trump er måske ved at bryde fri af den britiske krigsfælde: Hvad hans næste skridt må være

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 1. maj, 2017 – Præsident Donald Trumps erklæring i dag om, at han er villig til at forhandle fred direkte med Nordkoreas Kim Jong Un – hvilket vil forskaffe de største, løgnagtige medier i London, New York og Washington et nervøst sammenbrud – er begyndelsen til, at præsidenten muligvis vil bryde ud af en britisk krigsfælde. »Under de rette omstændigheder«, sagde han, og disse omstændigheder kunne meget vel være præcis de *multilaterale*, direkte forhandlinger, som præsidenterne Xi og Putin arbejder så hårdt på.

Kina og Rusland – de nationer, som den britiske elite har forsøgt at drive Trump til krig med. Den britiske regerings Boris Johnson og Michael Fallon har gentagne gange meddelt, at de med sikkerhed vidste, at Trump stod for at gå i krig mod Nordkorea, ligesom de, kortvarigt, havde puffet ham ind i en krigsfælde i Syrien.

Det er af presserende betydning, at alle Trump-tilhængere forstår dette og lægger yderligere pres på ham for at undfly briternes dødbringende »geopolitik«.

Hans destination bør være Beijing, 14.-15. maj, sammen med 30 andre statsoverhoveder og 101 nationale delegationer i Bælt & Vej Forum. Det er samarbejde med Kina om *økonomisk* udvikling

på verdensplan, inklusive en ny økonomisk infrastruktur i USA.

Præsidenten overrumplede Wall Street i samme interview i det ovale kontor ved at sige, at han ønskede at bryde Wall Street-bankerne op med det »21. århundredes Glass-Steagall«. Ingen tvivl om, at de vil tilbyde Barack Obama endnu mere – en halv million pr. tale – for at angribe Trump. Fra og med G20-mødet i februar 2009 i London fulgte Obama den britiske, politiske ledelse: Bankredning (bailout) til alle storbankerne, og vedtagelse af hvad som helst, blot IKKE Glass-Steagall. Dét ville sætte en stopper for Londons rolle og verdens imperie-finanscentrum.

Hvad der er vigtigere, så ville dette smide Wall Street-bankernes spekulative derivater og »kasino«-operationer ud af støtte fra skatteborgerne og statslig garanti og overlade dem til at gå fallit, hvis de vil gå fallit. Med en enorm gældsboble i foretagender og selskaber på \$14 billion, der er begyndt at gå i betalingsstandsning og nu truer med at gå fallit, er dette det afgørende, første skridt til at vende tilbage til en økonomisk genrejsning. Som stiftende chefredaktør for *EIR*, Lyndon LaRouche, i dag sagde om Trumps interview: »Dette finanssystem har været komplet degenereret, et svindelnummer, siden et godt stykke tid før krakket, som jeg forudsagde i begyndelsen af 2007. Man må simpelt hen skaffe sig af med det.«

Præsidenten tager skridt til at undfly den dødbringende, britiske fælde med geopolitik og krig, som – siden FDR – kun JFK og Ronald Reagan er brudt fri af, i det mindste delvist. Den ene blev myrdet, den anden næsten myrdet. Det er et spørgsmål om liv og død for nationen, at præsident Trumps tilhængere forstår, hvad han er oppe imod, og hvad hans næste skridt må være.

RADIO SCHILLER 1. maj, 2017: Nordkorea: Det vigtigste er, at Trump og Kinas præsident Xi er begyndt at tale sammen

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/nordkorea-det-vigtigste-er-at-trump-og-kinas-praesident-xi-er-begyndt-at-tale-sammen

Kinas Global Times skriver meget skrap lederartikel om Nordkorea

28. april, 2017 – Kinas partiavis, *Global Times*, udgav sent i går en lederartikel, der advarer om, at, hvis Nordkorea fortsætter med sine atomvåben- og missiltests, »er Kina nødsaget til at støtte mere barske resolutioner mod dette land«. Lederartiklen, der følger i kølvandet på mere intense diskussioner mellem USA og Kina, bemærker, at relationerne mellem Beijing og Pyongyang allerede har lidt skade pga. atomvåbenkrisen. »De nuværende bilaterale relationer bør først være normale, land-til-land, og baseret på dette kan de forme et nært venskab«, lyder lederartiklen. »Men forudsætningen er, at Kinas nationale interesser ikke krænkes, og at Beijing ikke

skal betale prisen for Pyongyangs ekstreme politikker.« Alt imens Nordkoreas konflikt er med USA, »så gennemfører Pyongyang atomvåbentests blot 100 km fra den kinesiske grænse, og dette truer sikkerheden i det nordøstlige Kina«.

»Nordkoreas udvikling af atom- og missilteknologier har også intensiveret situationen i Nordøstasien og givet Washington en undskyldning for at forstærke sin militære deployering i dette område. Dette betyder, at Kina ikke kan være en passiv tilskuer«, fortsætter *GT*. »Kina bør stå fast på sin opposition mod Nordkoreas atomprogrammer. Selv om Beijing og Washington har forskellige strategiske beregninger, så har de fælles interesser mht. opposition mod Pyongyangs udvikling af atom- og missilteknologier. Beijing lægger pres på Pyongyang for at sikre sine egne nationale interesser snarere, end at det arbejder for Washington.« Men, hvis Pyongyang opgiver sit atomprogram, »kan de bilaterale relationer let igen blive normale«.

Kinas mål er at suspendere både Nordkoreas atomtests og de amerikansk-sydkoreanske militærøvelser. »Beijing håber at maksimere alle de berørte parters interesser«, slutter lederartiklen. »Men, skulle det sluttelig slå fejl, har Kina stadig evnen til at udføre gengældelse over for enhver side, der måtte overskride den røde linje.«

Foto: Flyveoperationer om bord på USA's hangarskib Carl Vinson i sidste uge. Hangarskibet og andre krigsskibe er på vej mod Koreahalvøen i et forsøg på at afskrække Nordkorea fra at teste atomvåben eller affyre missiler. (CreditMattBrown/U.S. Navy, via Associated Press)

USA's udenrigsminister Tillerson kræver ny fremgangsmåde over for Nordkorea

28. april, 2017 – USA's udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson kom i dag, i en tale for FN's Sikkerhedsråd, med et krav om en ny fremgangsmåde over for Nordkorea, en fremgangsmåde, der øger det diplomatiske og økonomiske pres på Pyongyang, men som stadig tilbyder muligheden for en forbedring af omstændighederne i Nordkorea.

»Det internationale samfund har for længe været reaktivt med hensyn til Nordkorea. Den tid må nu være forbi«, sagde Tillerson. »At undlade at handle nu med hensyn til det mest presserende sikkerhedsspørgsmål i verden, kunne medføre katastrofale konsekvenser.« Han fremførte, at, pga. Nordkoreas fremskridt med sit atomvåbenprogram, er der ingen tid tilbage til at handle i, og yderligere pres må derfor lægges på dem nu.

»Vores mål er ikke regimeskifte. Det er heller ikke vores ønske at true det nordkoreanske folk eller destabilisere det asiatiske Stillehavsområde«, fortsatte Tillerson. Han bemærkede, at USA i årenes løb har trukket sine egne atomvåben ud af Koreahalvøen, og »Siden 1995 har USA ydet Nordkorea bistand for \$1,3 mia., og vi ser frem til at genoptage vore bidrag, når Den Demokratiske Folkerepublik Korea først begynder at nedtage sine atomvåben- og missilteknologi-programmer. ... Nordkorea må tage konkrete skridt til at reducere den trussel, som dets ulovlige våbenprogram udgør for USA og vore allierede, før vi kan begynde at overveje forhandlinger.«

Tillerson krævede, at FN-medlemsstaterne udfører tre handlinger, med start i dag. For det første, at FN's resolutioner vedr. Nordkoreas atomvåbenprogram fuldt ud implementeres. For det andet, så kræver USA, at andre lande nedgraderer eller suspenderer deres diplomatiske relationer med Pyongyang, som en måde til at begrænse de resurser, som regeringen kan få til sit atomvåbenprogram. For det tredje, så må Nordkoreas finansielle isolation øges gennem yderligere sanktioner, der er rettet mod organisationer og personer, der støtter Nordkoreas atomvåbenprogram og andre våbenprogrammer. Her er Kina særlig vigtig pga. den »enestående« økonomiske indflydelse, Kina har over Nordkorea, sagde Tillerson.

»USA og Kina har haft meget produktive udvekslinger om dette spørgsmål, og vi ser frem til yderligere handlinger, der bygger på, hvad Kina allerede har gjort«, sagde Tillerson.

Forud for sin tale for FN's Sikkerhedsråd afviste Tillerson, i et interview med NPR, regimeskifte som en mulighed og åbnede en dør til nye veje i relationerne med Nordkorea. USA's mål på halvøen, sagde han, er en fuld og hel atomafrustning, og de er USA's eneste mål.

»Vi har ingen røde linjer«, sagde han. I øjeblikket drejer det sig om målet, sagde han. »Hvis man lytter til nordkoreanerne og regimet i Pyongyang, så er deres begrundelse for at have atomvåben, at de mener, det er deres eneste vej til at sikre deres regimes fortsatte eksistens. Det, vi håber at overbevise dem om, er: I behøver ikke disse våben for at sikre jeres regimes eksistens.« USA's mål er meget klare, men det samme er det, der ikke er USA's mål. »Vi søger ikke regimeskifte; vi søger ikke regimets kollaps; vi søger ikke en accelereret genforening af halvøen«, sagde han. »Vi søger en atomvåbenfri Koreahalvø – og igen, dette er ligeledes helt i overensstemmelse med de mål, andre i området har.«

<https://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2017/04/270544.htm>

Foto: USA's udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson taler for FN's Sikkerhedsråd, 28. april, 2017.

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl.

»Hvorhen, USA:

Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«

LaRouche PAC Internationale

Webcast,

28. april, 2017

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl, for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Vi ser denne kamp blive mere intens over spørgsmålet, »Hvorhen, USA?«, med den titel, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav den nylige Schiller Institut-konference i New York City – »Hvorhen, USA: Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«. Der er i løbet af den seneste måned, siden det meget ukloge angreb, som Trump-administrationen beordrede mod Syrien, sket det, at det er kommet offentligt frem, at der rent faktisk finder et britisk-anset kup sted i USA imod Trump-administrationen. Indholdet er de løgne, de fabrikerede efterretninger, der er kommet fra britisk efterretning og er blevet bulldozet hen over præsident Trump; meget på samme måde, som Tony Blair brugte løgnene om maseødelæggelsesvåben i 2003 for at bringe USA ind i Irakkrigen.

Vi må bruge det bedste fra alle kulturer og skabe en virkelig universel renæssance!

Vært Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er 28. april, 2017; jeg er Matthew Ogden; velkommen til vores LPAC webcast fredag aften, her på larouchepac.com. Med os i studiet i dag har vi en særlig gæst, Mike Billington fra *Executive Intelligence Review (EIR)*, som vi har inviteret i dag pga. af den aktuelle, strategiske situations ekstraordinære natur.

Vi står naturligvis blot to uger fra det meget betydningsfulde Bælt & Vej-topmøde, der finder sted i Beijing, Kina, den 14. og 15. maj; og det er altså præcis to uger fra i morgen. Flere dusin statsoverhoveder fra lande i hele verden har bekræftet deres deltagelse. Som vi har rapporteret, så er den russiske præsident Putin inviteret som æresgæst til at deltage i Bælt & Vej-topmødet. Vi fortsætter vores kampagne for at opfordre præsident Donald Trump til at deltage i dette topmøde, som særlig gæst; og for at bruge det som hans mulighed for at gengælde præsident Xi Jinpings tilbud om, at USA kan gå med i det nye paradigme for udvikling og fred, som repræsenteres af Bælt & Vej, eller den Nye Silkevej.

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl, for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Vi ser denne kamp blive mere intens over spørgsmålet, »Hvorhen, USA?«, med den titel, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav den nylige Schiller Institut-konference i New York City – »Hvorhen, USA: Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«. Der er i løbet af den seneste måned, siden det meget ukloge angreb, som Trump-administrationen beordrede mod Syrien, sket det, at det er kommet offentligt frem, at der rent faktisk finder et britisk-angført kup sted i USA imod Trump-administrationen. Indholdet er de løgne, de fabrikerede efterretninger, der er kommet fra britisk efterretning og er blevet bulldozet hen over præsident Trump; meget på samme måde, som Tony Blair brugte løgnene om maseødelæggelsesvåben i

2003 for at bringe USA ind i Irakkrigen.

Men dette var ikke et enestående tilfælde for Irak i 2003, eller for Syrien i 2017. Dette er den måde, hvorpå briterne har spillet deres imperiespil i det ene årti efter det andet; de har brugt USA som deres dumme kæmpe, med det formål, fortsat at holde verden opdelt. Denne del-og-hersk-strategi har været en britisk imperiestrategi i århundreder, og tiden er inde til, at USA bliver intelligent og siger, »Det er slut! Vi vil ikke lade os bruge på denne måde; og vi vil tage imod det Nye Paradigme med 'win-win'-samarbejde«. Briterne og deres rejsekammerater i USA har sandelig været meget ligefremme i deres forsøg på at destabilisere og vælte Trump-administrationen, fordi de var meget bange for, at han ville gennemføre, hvad han har sagt. Ikke flere regimeskift; ikke flere imperialistiske krige, og vi vil samarbejde med Rusland og med Kina. Det sidste var lidt mere komplekst, men det om Rusland var meget klart. Men som vi ved, så har præsident Trump og præsident Xi Jinping fra Kina, siden topmødet med præsident Xi, haft meget tætte, personlige relationer og har regelmæssigt haft samtaler. Denne kommunikationskanal er afgørende, især med det brændpunkt, som nu er vokset frem direkte på Kinas grænse, i tilfældet Nordkorea.

Vi vil bruge tilfældet Nordkorea som en case study, men i sammenhæng med denne meget bredere opfattelse af opgøret over, hvilket system, der i fremtiden vil styre verden: det imperialistiske del-og-hersk, eller et nyt 'win-win'-paradigme for fred og udvikling. I denne sammenhæng har vores gæst her i dag, Mike Billington, netop udgivet en ny artikel, som er en meget vigtig artikel, I bør læse . Den er meget klar. Den har den provokerende titel og stiller spørgsmålet, »Hvorfor er Korea ikke allerede genforenet?«.

(Artiklen findes i EIR's seneste nummer, men er kun tilgængelig for abonnenter. Andre artikler kan læses gratis – se knappen EIR på vores hjemmeside. Du kan henvende dig til vores kontor mht. at tegne abonnement på EIR, tlf. 35 43 00 33

– red.)

Hermed giver jeg ordet til Mike og lader ham gennemgå lidt af indholdet, de aktuelle udviklinger, og så spørgsmålet, som han fremlægger i sin artikel:

(engelsk):

MICHAEL BILLINGTON: Thank you, Matt. In fact, the purpose of this article was to show that the answer to that question is that there is {no} legitimate reason that Korea is not peaceful and at least on the way to reunification already. I'll review some of that material here. But let me start. There were some extraordinary developments today; so let me give a short update on the crisis. It has to be noted that this is a very serious crisis, in the sense that were something like what happened with Syria, where Trump was – as Matthew said – lied to coerced into carrying out an attack against Syria for absolutely no reason; on totally false intelligence. Were that to happen in Korea, this would not be like an attack on an airbase in Syria. This would lead to a total disaster throughout all of East Asia and perhaps even global nuclear war. Whether or not they could take out North Korea's nuclear capacities, North Korea – as I'm sure people know, because it's all over the press – they have massive conventional capacity. Their armaments lie a total of 30 miles from the capital [of South Korea] Seoul, this beautiful,

developed, advanced city; which could be just absolutely wiped out if there were a war. And they could possibly attack even Japan, let alone US bases within South Korea; so this would be a move of insanity. The Japanese and the South Koreans know this very well. I should point out that our friends in South Korea note that there is no panic in South Korea; because they've been through these kinds of things before, and they simply assume that nobody is crazy enough to launch a preemptive attack on North Korea.

But, because of what happened in Syria, a lot of people – including all of us – were very concerned that the British might pull off another stunt and get Trump to go with this. What happened today is extremely important. Trump himself did an interview with Reuters, in which he said on North Korea, “We’d love to solve things diplomatically, but it’s very difficult. But Xi Jinping is playing a crucial role in this. I believe he’s trying very hard. I know he would like to be able to do something. Perhaps it’s possible that he can’t, but I think he’d like to be able to do something.” Then, most extraordinarily, he said about Kim Jung-Un, the leader in North Korea and grandson of the founder of North Korea, Kim Il-Sung, he said, “He’s 27 years old. His father dies; he took over a regime. So, say what you want, that’s not easy; especially at that age. Now I’m not giving him credit, or not giving him credit. I’m just saying it’s a very hard thing to do. As to whether or not he’s rational, I have no opinion, but I hope he’s rational.” So,

this
is useful. He then returned again to the fact that he has
very
good personal relations with Xi Jinping: "I feel that he's
doing
everything in his power to help us with a big situation. I
wouldn't want to be causing difficulty right now for him; and
I
certainly would want to speak to him first before taking any
action." Very useful.

Then Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, who chaired a meeting
at the UN Security Council this morning of ministers, taking
the
place of that wacky lady we have in there right now speaking
for
the US too often. But Tillerson was not wacky; not at all.
He
was very clear in his presentation to the UN Security Council.
He said, "For too long, the international community has been
reactive in addressing North Korea. Those days must come to
an
end. Failing to act now on the most pressing security issue
in
the world may bring catastrophic consequences." Now, what
does
he mean to act now? The press headlines all over the world
are
"Trump and Tillerson Are Threatening War on North Korea; They
Want To Act Now. It's the End of Strategic Patience", which
was
the policy of Obama. But keep in mind, "strategic patience"
was
not being patient; it was saying "We will not talk to North
Korea. We refuse to talk to North Korea; we simply sit back
and
constantly increase the sanctions, increase the military
build-up

around their border until they do what we say.” Which, of course, they won’t do as long as they’re being threatened. So, the question is, what does it mean to act now? Does it not mean, let’s get back to talks, let’s negotiate. What the President said about Kim Jung-Un is a very serious comment. Here’s somebody who’s in a difficult position. Then, Tillerson said the following: “Our goal is not regime change. Nor do we desire to threaten the North Korean people, or destabilize the Asia-Pacific region. Since 1995, the US has provided \$1.3 billion in aid to North Korea; and we look forward to resuming our contributions once the country dismantles its weapons program.” Now that 1995 is a reference to something called the Agreed Framework, which I’m going to mention when I go through some of the history on this. Even more powerful, Tillerson – in an interview with NPR before he went into the UN Security Council – said the following: “You know, if you listen to the North Koreans, their reason for having nuclear weapons is that they believe it is their only pathway to secure the ongoing existence of their regime. We hope to convince them that you do not these weapons to secure the existence of your regime. We do not seek a collapse of the regime. We do seek an accelerated reunification of the peninsula; we seek a de-nuclearized peninsula, and China shares this goal with us.” Now these are very positive steps; and they refute the British headlines and the {Washington Post} and {New York Times} headlines that say “Get ready. We’re going to have a war in Korea.” So, this I think is extremely important. Let me go through a bit, some of the history of this; because even in my

reviewing to write this article, I was a bit astonished at how close we were, twice before, to having a peaceful relationship in

the Korean peninsula and potentially even being reunified or being on the course to reunification.

The key point, I think, is that the British assets in the White House over the last 16 years – Bush and Cheney, and then Obama, who served the British purpose of keeping the world divided East and West, as Matthew was pointing out. The key to

doing that was making sure the US did not have good relations with Russia, and making sure the US did not have good relations

with China. They used the South China Sea, they used Ukraine, they used Syria; all of these really had nothing to do with the

South China Sea or Ukraine or Syria. They had to do with preventing any potential for the US and Russia to work together,

and the US and China to work together. This is empire; that's the way empire works to keep the world divided, especially the East-West divide.

Let's go back to what Tillerson was referring to in 1995.

What happened was that the North Koreans were part of the UN Non-Proliferation Treaty and non-nuclear development agreements;

that they wouldn't develop nuclear weapons. Then in the early '90s, the IAEA – the International Atomic Energy Agency – believed that they were using small test reactor at Yongbyon.

It

was a graphite-moderated reactor which produces plutonium as a side-product of producing energy. So, they believed that they were hiding the plutonium being produced at the Yongbyon plant and using it produce weapons. This led to a very serious crisis.

The Clinton administration and their Defense Secretary at the time, William Perry – and I'll mention Perry a couple of times

here – were very seriously considering a strategic take-out of the Yongbyon plant. Would that have been as serious as now?

I don't think so, but it would have been very serious. What happened is quite interesting. Former President Jimmy Carter went to North Korea – supposedly on his own; I'm sure this was very carefully worked out with President Clinton. But he went on

his own; he met with Kim Il-Sung who was still alive at that time, the original head of North Korea. Out of that meeting, [they] came to an agreement that they would, through negotiations, come up with an agreement to solve the crisis; which they did. It was called the Agreed Framework of 1994. This was quite extraordinary. The North Koreans agreed to dismantle the Yongbyon nuclear plant and to stop construction on

two other plants that also were graphite and could produce plutonium. In exchange, the US built a nuclear plant for North

Korea. The US and the South Koreans were, and they began – they didn't get very far – to build a large 1000-megawatt nuclear plant; but it was going to be a light water reactor that didn't

produce fuel for nuclear weapons. It was a safer form of a nuclear plant. In the meantime, they did provide oil, until they got the nuclear plant going, for heating.

They agreed to start negotiations toward a peace agreement. The US and North Korea are officially still at war. After the Korean War, there was not a peace agreement, but just an armistice to stop the fighting. Officially, there is no peace agreement; we do not have normal relations with North Korea.

We're actually in a state of war with North Korea. Clearly, the North Koreans want to have a normal relationship with the US, not

to be constantly threatened. It was agreed that that would happen. This was moving forward quite well; it was slow, there were problems. The US didn't live up to all its agreements; but it was moving forward.

Then, extremely importantly, in 1998, Kim Dae-jung was elected President of South Korea. Kim Dae-jung was a very interesting character; he had been a very strong opponent of the military regimes in South Korea. He had been thrown in jail several times, and there was a point where he was about to be executed; the US intervened and saved his life at that time.

By 1998 things had changed; there was more of a move towards getting away from military regimes. They weren't exactly dictatorships; they were elected, but they were military regimes. Kim Dae-jung was elected. He immediately began to not only democratize domestic policies, but he set up something called the Sunshine Policy, which was we will work with North Korea on development; on opening up economic collaboration as the basis over the long term to establish peace between us and long-term reunification.

So, Kim Dae-jung was in power. William Perry, the Defense Secretary – he had left being Defense Secretary by that time – but in a recent article on his history in all of this, said that towards the end of the Clinton administration, they were working to take that agreement even further. To have the North basically swear that they were giving up all weapons programs, in

exchange

for having a peace agreement and setting up normal relations between the two countries. It was so close that they had actually planned a Presidential visit to North Korea; that Clinton would visit North Korea.

Unfortunately, as William Perry points out, the Clinton administration ran out; and Bush and Cheney came in. You may remember that the Defense Secretary under Bush and Cheney was Colin Powell, a general; a fairly wise gentleman. He, in his first press conference, said we intend to engage with North Korea, and pick up where Clinton left off. Very important. The

{next day}, Bush – with Cheney behind him and Paul Wolfowitz around – said “There will be no engagement with North Korea. They’re a dictatorship.” Sounds familiar, right? Dictators. “We will not talk to them. There will be no engagement.” And Colin Powell was basically put in his place, and the whole process began to fall apart; at least in terms of the US working,

collaborating, and playing a key role in collaboration with North

and South Korea, and Russia and China and Japan.

In any case, Kim Dae-jung and the others – Russia, China, Japan, North Korea, South Korea – continued the process. They basically said OK, that’s what Bush and Cheney are saying; but this is the future lives of our country and really of the world.

They moved forward. Kim Dae-jung, by 2002, was successful in setting up an extraordinary process. I should mention here that

Lyndon LaRouche’s ideas through that period – 2000-2002 – were all over South Korea. One of our members, Kathy Wolfe, was going

back and forth; she was meeting with people in the government, around the government, cultural people in South Korea. You may

remember that 1992 was when Lyndon LaRouche first came up with

the idea at the time of the fall of Soviet Union, that we should build a New Silk Road; we should have a Silk Road which would bridge Europe, Russia, China, and bring them together around a development process by building the New Silk Road – what the Chinese called the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

So, Kim Dae-jung, the South Korean President, built a process he called the Iron Silk Road. I can assure you there was an influence there; that term didn't come out of nowhere. LaRouche had always said that the New Silk Road should go from Busan to Rotterdam. Busan is at the southern tip of South Korea.

In other words, it had to go through North Korea, through Russia, and also through China into Europe. So, this idea of the Iron Silk Road was taking shape. It was taking shape so much – put that first map on [Fig. 1]. This is the map. The plan was to reconstruct two rail lines from South Korea into North Korea, which of course had been shut down. There was an armed Demilitarized Zone [DMZ] with fences on either side; and a no man's land in between. The idea was to build rail connections as you can see on the map. One of them going through the West, that would go up through Pyongyang and then into China. One that would head out towards the West and go up towards Russia into Vladivostok and hit the trans-Siberian railway in both directions, actually.

Indeed, they began this process. Kim Dae-jung went to the North and met with Kim Jong-Il, who was the son of Kim Il-Sung; who was in power. Kim Il-Sung literally died the year they signed the Agreed Framework; but his son continued it. They made this process; they built this process up. By 2002, they literally opened up the Demilitarized Zone fences in both of

those spots. Both the North-South and the [inaud; 21:43]; they cut the DMZ fences. Soldiers from both the North and South went into the DMZ and began clearing the mines that were all over the place in the DMZ. They reconstructed the rail line between the two countries. In 2002 [Fig. 2] you had the extraordinary event of a railroad going across the DMZ; going from South Korea into North Korea. Symbolic, because there had to be a lot of construction on the rail lines to make them connect all the way through. But as you can see here, they had a big banner in the front; the Reunification of the Koreas. This was an extraordinary event, which we reported in {EIR} at some length; these pictures were in those articles back in 2002. It wasn't just the railroads. At the same time, Kim Dae-jung began an industrial park in North Korea – the Kaesong Industrial Park. This was across the border in North Korea with South Korean companies setting up factories in the North with North Korean labor. This grew to the point where recently there were 123 South Korean companies working in the North. This was obviously in the direction of setting up collaboration between the South Korean industry and the skilled but very poor workforce in the North. So, this was proceeding forward. They also set up six party talks. You've probably heard of the Six Party Talks. This was where Russia, China, Japan, North

and South Korea, and the United States began a series of talks to try to regroup from the failure, the collapse, the shutdown by Bush and Cheney of the Agreed Framework. These meetings began.

I won't go through the details of what happened; it's tedious, because every opportunity that Bush and Cheney had to say that the North Koreans were cheating, the North Koreans are lying; you can't trust these vicious dictators. Every opportunity they had to sabotage forward direction; there were some positive agreements made. If you read the history of it from the US press, it'll say the North Koreans reneged. Well, it wasn't that way. It was sabotage by Bush and Cheney every chance they got.

It went into the Obama administration and Obama continued sabotaging it every chance he got.

So eventually, these fell apart under Obama. Obama then began this so-called "strategic patience"; which meant no talks, build up your military, impose sanctions. They might have said that the purpose was that they expected the North Korean regime to collapse; but that wasn't it at all. Bush and Cheney and Obama {wanted} North Korea to build nuclear weapons. Now why would somebody be so insane as to want North Korea to have nuclear weapons? First of all, they knew that they wouldn't use them, or they'd be blown off the face of the map. William Perry, in his recent article, said the North Korean regime is reckless, but they're not crazy; they're not suicidal. If they were to use a nuclear weapon preemptively, they know that the country would be obliterated overnight and their leadership

entirely killed. They're not crazy. But why would the West want them to have nuclear weapons? Because the target is not North Korea; it's China. As long as you have this bugaboo of North Korea threatening the world with their nuclear weapons, you can go ahead and build up a massive force around China, the way they were in Europe where they're building anti-ballistic missiles and moving NATO right up to the Russian border. Sending troops, tanks, planes right up to the Russian border. And in Asia doing the same thing, supposedly to counter North Korea. Most people have read about what's going on with these THAAD missiles. Literally just a couple of days ago, they actually set up the THAAD missiles in South Korea; claiming that these are needed for the defense of South Korea against the North. THAAD – this is Terminal High Altitude missiles. North Korea is 30 miles from Seoul; they don't need to send 8 ICBMs up into space and back down onto Seoul. The THAAD is useless against North Korea; it may be useless in general. But it's a threat to China and to Russia, because with that you have the X-band radar, which sees deep into Chinese territory and Russian Far East territory. Which thereby gives them an advantage in a potential first strike, where they could take out – they fantasize – they could take out the counterstrike capacity of China. The Chinese and Russians are saying this destroys the balance; we're going to have to put something together to counter this. The other thing to point out is the obvious fact that North

Korea sees very clearly what happened to Iraq; what happened to
Libya. Two countries that voluntarily gave up their nuclear weapons program with all kinds of praise and promises from the West, although they lied about Iraq. But as soon as they did, their nation was bombed back to the Stone Age, their leaders killed, and their country turned over to warring terrorist forces.

So, the North Koreans are not crazy! And they're aware that, were they to give up their nuclear weapons program preemptively, they'd probably get the same regime change statement. Which is why it's so important Tillerson is saying we
are not going for regime change; which is what Trump had said throughout the campaign – that they weren't going to have regime
change. They also see that the targetting of China, they're aware of this, is part and parcel of this operation. You should
point out that the Obama administration had this TPP – this Trans-Pacific Partnership – which was also a part of the attempt
to isolate China. It didn't work; largely because the countries
there recognized that this was an attack on China, and they absolutely depend upon and appreciate the infrastructure development coming from China through the New Silk Road the New
Maritime Silk Road.

That's where this stood. And the last thing I'll bring up here is that the last administration in South Korea – Park Geun-hye; I'm sure that everybody has seen that she was recently
impeached and thrown out of office. The impeachment was upheld
by the Constitutional Court, and there's now an election which is

taking place in less than two weeks on May 9; which makes it all the more absurd that the US deployed this THAAD missile system, literally few days before an election in which the candidates are both against the THAAD missile system. They rushed this in, in order to make it – hopefully, they think – make it impossible to be reversed. But we'll see. It was a foolish move by the US to ram this through.

But in any case, Park Geun-hye started her administration – this is the daughter of Park Chung-hee, who was the brilliant leader who brought Korea out from being one of the poorest nations on Earth to being one of the great industrial, nuclear power producing and exporting countries in the world. His daughter, Park Geun-hye, was elected President. But unfortunately, she was elected mostly on her name. However, she

began her administration with what she called the Eurasian Vision. This was, in fact, part of the New Silk Road process. She saw working with Russia, China, and Japan, that Korea belonged to Eurasia; which obviously meant that it had to work through North Korea. Officially, the regime in the South under

her and her predecessor were not allowed to have relations with

North Korea, except for the Kaesong Industrial Park. But, Park

Geun-hye allowed three major South Korean companies – Hyundai Merchant Marine, which is their biggest ship company; KoRail, which is their state rail company; and POSCO, a huge steel company – to have a consortium with Russia and North Korea. Literally, a consortium; a business agreement where the Russians

rebuilt a port in the north of North Korea; rebuilt the

railroad

from Vladivostok down to that port. They were shipping Russian

coal into North Korea, where it was picked up by a South Korean

Hyundai ship; shipped to the South, put on South Korean rail and

shipped to a South Korean steel mills. This was, again like the

Kaesong, it was a model for the kind of collaboration which could

lead towards long-term economic progress and development and trust; and lead towards a reunification.

Then, without going into details, the North Koreans tested I think it was the fourth of their nuclear tests. Everybody knew

it was going to happen for the reasons I said. They're not going

to give this up unless they can get an honest pledge that there's

not going to be a war, a regime change against them. They did;

and unfortunately, Park Geun-hye who was weak, capitulated entirely to Obama. She shut everything down; shut down even the

Kaesong Industrial Plant which had been up for 15 years, which killed their own industries. Shut down the [inaud; 31:25] process of the rail, and basically cut off all ties to the North

all together on behalf of Obama, on behalf of a war against China. Despite the fact that in 2015, she had gone to Beijing on

the 70th anniversary of World War II's victory against the Japanese and the Germans. She'd gone there and stood on the podium with Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin; the three of them standing together, honoring the war victory. Then she comes back

and basically pulls the plug on the whole thing. She wasn't impeached because of that; she was impeached because of a corruption case within South Korea. But I'm certain

to this led to the loss of any trust in her; that she'd undermined her own industries; that she'd capitulated to an American policy, that she was going ahead with this THAAD deployment. She lost the industry, she lost the left factions that were about to win the election, the more liberal side.

So,

this was a real disaster for South Korea, and potentially for the world.

Now, we have Trump; we have Xi Jinping; we have Abe in Japan working very closely with Putin. And we're going to have a new

regime in South Korea. I won't go into exactly who these guys are; but in general, both the leading candidates want to work with Russia and China and want to open up better relations with

the North. So, you have the geometry. If Trump goes with the Silk Road process, you have a geometry which is going to end this

last British outpost of destabilization and instability – this North Korea monster. The monster issue; it's not that North Korea is a monster. But this has served the British imperial purpose of keeping the US at a point of conflict with Russia and

China. If we can solve that, then all of Asia is now unified, except for the North Korea issue. With the election in the Philippines of Duterte, his rejection of the war policy in the South China Sea, it basically united all the Southeast Asian countries; all ten of them are now united around working with China. Not cutting off ties to the US, but working with China.

So, you have tremendous potential; and it's all really coming down to the next very short period. Weeks, months at

most. A lot of this is going to be determined in the very near term. As LaRouche has always insisted, to look at any particular crisis – like the North Korean crisis – you have to look at it in the context of the entire world; and certainly in the context of the Eurasian potential of the New Silk Road. I think there's every reason to be confident that some sort of talks are being discussed privately; not just threats. That this is going to move forward in the context of the Silk Road. As Matthew mentioned, if Trump were to go to this meeting on May 14 and 15, Abe would probably then go from Japan; and there's no question that we would have a peace process that would be almost unstoppable, no matter what the British claim they're going to unleash. So, this is a very great moment in history. A dangerous, but potentially great optimism is in hand.

OGDEN: And you can tell that the British are definitely very anxious of what could be lurking around the corner for the future of their divide and conquer strategy. I know we were talking before the show, Mike, about the very appropriate and incisive statements that were made by the Russian representative at that meeting at the United Nations Security Council. Here's the quote. This is the Russian Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN, Vladimir Safronkov, and he turned to Matthew Rycroft, who is the British Permanent Representative at the United Nations Security Council, and he said the following: "The essence is,

and everyone in the United Nations knows this very well, is that you are afraid. You have been losing sleep over the fact that we might be working together with the United States; cooperating with the United States. That is your fear. You are doing everything to make sure that this kind of cooperation be undermined.”

BILLINGTON: This has had a tremendous impact, because people know that LaRouche has argued all the last 50 years, that the problem is the British Empire. Almost nobody of stature has ever acknowledged that continuing role of the British Empire until this, really. I learned today that Ambassador Rycroft, who was a close ally and advisor to Tony Blair, and was one of the authors of the “dodgy dossier” which started the Iraq War in the first place. I learned today from our friends in England, that Rycroft was meeting today with the head of the White Helmets; the terrorist so-called “humanitarian” group that works with al-Qaeda and al-Nusra, and who provided the fake evidence of Assad carrying out a chemical weapons attack. So, this is confirmation that this open collaboration with a terrorist organization funded by the British, and functioning to try to start a war in Syria for which we can and must prevent that in league with this overall fight to bring about the New Silk Road, not a new war.

OGDEN: Let me end with this, and I’ll let you respond to it. I think as everybody knows, a very significant personality

in Korea and that area of the world, was the great US General Douglas MacArthur. In the aftermath of the original Korean War, Douglas MacArthur came back to the United States, and he reported back to Congress. This is a quote from MacArthur's speech to a Joint Session of Congress in 1951. I think it gets directly at the much broader point that Helga and Lyndon LaRouche have been making at the present time about what is really at stake, and what is necessary if we're going to move civilization into a new paradigm of survival. This is what Douglas MacArthur said: "Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn fail; leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blocks out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem, basically, is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

So Mike, you were one of the speakers at the conference the Schiller Institute sponsored in New York City two weeks ago. The subject of that conference was not only the diplomatic and

strategic cooperation which is necessary between the United States and China right now, the United States joining the New Silk Road and the Belt and Road Initiative. It was also a dialogue of civilizations; a dialogue of the greatest parts of these two great cultures – European culture and Chinese culture.

In a form where Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in a really profound way, stretching across generations, across centuries, across millennia

really put the great German poet, the revolutionary poet and philosopher Friedrich Schiller in dialogue with the poet and philosopher who really is the basis of all of modern Chinese civilization – Confucius. That dialogue she set up between Friedrich Schiller and Confucius, speaking to each other across

the span of millennia and across literally two sides of the world, created the kind of image of mankind, the possibility of a

mankind which could emerge if we were to finally put an end to this imperial system of dividing the East and the West and bringing these two great cultures into a dialogue with each other.

So, you presented at that conference, and maybe just in that context

BILLINGTON: Those are available now. The new {EIR} that came out today has Helga's speech and a speech by Patrick Ho, who

is a very good friend of ours from China, from Hong Kong, who is

campaigning all over the world for the New Silk Road. It's three

conferences now that we've done together. He gave a presentation

then on Confucian thought and Western thought; but in that presentation, he showed a very serious problem which I had addressed over my long years of sabbatical leave in prison,

where

I studied extensively the Chinese culture and the relationship between Confucian culture and the Western Christian Renaissance.

Patrick didn't take up that challenge for this speech; so he gave

a speech which fell prey to exactly what I then spoke about.

That speech is also in the {EIR} this week; or you can watch it

on the Schiller Institute website. It's very important, because

what I learned in studying this, is what the British set about –

as they do in every colony that they took over – in profiling the backward tendencies within that culture and then grasping those backwards tendencies that want to stay primitive, stay backwards; and defining those to be the natural ideology of that country.

In the case of China, they recognized that Confucianism was a very great threat to their ability to control and keep China backwards; because it's a vision like Platonism in the West.

And

as Helga had brilliantly shown, like the Renaissance thinking in

Europe that professed progress. It valued the mind of the individual as that which made him human; it's the creative power

of the human mind. Against that, the British said no, no, Confucianism is keeping you backwards because it's formal and it's structured. You have to go back to the roots of Taoism, which basically tells the peasant that he's a happy peasant; he's

happy not knowing about science and technology. Stay backwards.

Or the so-called "legalist" ideology which was punishment and reward; you treat people like animals. You punish or reward

them

like you do a dog, to make them do what you want them to do. The unfortunate reality is that the British deployed their top guns – especially Bertrand Russell – into China; especially

when Sun Yat-sen came along promoting the American System. They

sent Bertrand Russell in to poison that system; to denounce Confucianism; to promote the happy peasant and the Taoist ideology. Unfortunately, this was deeply ingrained into the Chinese culture, so that even today, Xi Jinping, who is fighting

to bring that country forward, is faced with this kind of thought

in China. And, what they presented to the Chinese as “Western thought” so-called, was not Leibniz and Schiller and Nicholas of

Cusa; the people who gave us the Renaissance, who gave rise to modern science. But rather, they said, “We, the British, defeated you because we have wealth and power. How do we have wealth and power? It’s that we believe in Darwinism, social Darwinism; that the strong must crush the weak. That’s the way

you get strong. So, if you want to be strong, then you should be

like us and believe that Western thought – i.e., British empirical anti-human thought – is what you should aspire to.

I won’t go into more details, but I encourage you to read it; because these are fundamental debates. This question of how

can we create a renaissance, which crosses every great culture;

because every great culture has great moments and bad moments, bad tendencies. Weak tendencies, and strong tendencies which honor the human creative power; the other which tries to keep people enslaved as master and slave. We have to pull out the best of every culture throughout the world. Islam; Judaism;

Christianity; Confucianism; the Muslim tradition of the Baghdad Caliphate. All of these are there – the Indian Gupta period. We can pull these together and have a Renaissance which is not this part of the world as opposed to that part of the world; but is truly universal. Of man with a common aim for mankind as Helga likes to say. This is within our grasp; this could truly be the end of war for all mankind. People say, “Oh, that’s naïve; because human nature is war-like.” Well, {human nature} is not; human nature is creative. It’s the bestial imposition of this backward ideology on peoples which leads to wars. If we had a true, global renaissance based on science and technology, great culture and great music, there’s no reason to think we could not end the scourge of war once and for all; as that beautiful quote from Douglas MacArthur – which I’d never heard – clearly indicates. These are philosophic and theological issues; but they’re in our grasp today. This is what the LaRouche Movement has been about since its inception; and it’s now literally within our grasp.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Mike. This material is available; Mike’s article is going to be published. This is in the {Executive Intelligence Review}, and it will be made available through LaRouche PAC as well. As Mike said, all of the proceedings of that Schiller Institute conference in New York are also available. LaRouche PAC also made a video a couple of years ago on the question of the reunification of Korea and some of

these initiatives from the 1990s and these reunification efforts.

So, we'll make that video also available; it will be linked in the description of this video. But I think that's a wonderful discussion; and it's extraordinarily valuable for people to have

this view, this depth of background. But also this vision of what is possible. Douglas MacArthur's point that in essence this

is a spiritual, this is a theological question. Will mankind come to know himself as a creative species? Will we change the

way that man views himself, which is what is necessary if we are

to survive? The vehicle for doing that is this type of "win-win"

development projects; that's the true name of peace. So, I think

we have a wonderful microcosm in what we just used as a case study in Korea; but this type of thinking is what is so urgently

necessary for the entire world. That's absolutely the value of

what the LaRouche Movement has done over the last several decades, and continues to represent on this planet today.

So thank you, Mike. And thank you all for tuning in, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Lyndon LaRouche:

Vi må indføre økonomisk virkelighed

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 27. april, 2017 – USA og det transatlantiske finanssystem befinder sig nu ved et punkt, hvor det er på vej til en snarlig eksplosion, der overgår 2007-08. Foretagendernes gældsboble i dag, som er på \$14 billion, er større end ejendomsmarkedets boblens \$11 billion i 2007-08, og raten med 20 % betalingsstandsninger, som forudses for denne gæld i dag, er langt større end det, vi faktisk oplevede med ejendomslåne for et årti siden. Vi befinder os allerede i »The Big Short«, hvor Wall Street udlåner flere penge til naive tåber for at hjælpe dem til at opkøbe Wall Streets værdiløse værdipapirer – for derefter at spille imod sine egne kunder.

Hysteriet, der udstilles i Wall Streets daglige, offentlige udgydelser imod Glass-Steagall, reflekterer bankernes bevidsthed om den forestående nedsmeltning.

Intet som den nuværende situation er nogensinde blevet oplevet før, nogetsteds – det, der f.eks. skete i 2007-08, tåler ikke sammenligning med noget som helst i den nuværende verdenssituation.

Gene Kranz, mission controller i NASA, der senere blev chef mission controller for Apollo 13, beskrev i sin bog fra 2009, *Failure is Not an Option* (Fiasko er ikke en mulighed), hvordan hans chef, den legendariske mission controller Chris Kraft, kom hen til hans skrivebord blot to uger efter, at Kranz først startede i NASA i Langley i 1960. Kraft sagde:

»Alle andre er optaget. Jeg har kun dig tilbage. Vi har vores første Redstone-opsendelse foran os. Jeg vil gerne have, at du tager til Cape, går sammen med dem, der udfører testene og skriver en nedtælling. Skriv dernæst nogle regler for

missionen. Når du er færdig, så ring til mig, og vi kommer ned og begynder træningen.»

Kranz fortsatte med at sige, at

»han må have bemærket chokket i mit ansigt, da Kraft fortsatte med at sige, 'jeg giver Paul Johnson besked om at tage imod dig i Mercury Control og give dig en hånd med'.

Min tid som iagttager var forbi, min mulighed for at nå at komme i omdrejninger afsluttet ... Fra mit arbejde, senest ved Holloman Air Force Base i New Mexico, kendte jeg til flyvning, systemer, procedurer og checklister. Jeg kunne godt regne ud, hvad en nedtælling skulle indeholde. Men regler for en mission var noget andet. Der havde aldrig tidligere været en sådan mission i USA's historie – jeg måtte simpelthen kaste mig ud i det. Eftersom der ikke var skrevet nogen bøger om den faktiske metodologi inden for rumfart, måtte vi skrive dem hen ad vejen.»

✘ I dag er situationen den samme. Der findes ingen instruktionshåndbog. Det, vi ved, er, at vi må komme krakket i forkøbet, gennem en dybtgående mobilisering af befolkningen – ligesom en krigsmobilisering, men en dybtgående nationaløkonomisk mobilisering. Tænk på Franklin Roosevelts »100 dages program«. Stiftende redaktør for *EIR*, Lyndon LaRouche, forklarede, hvad dette vil sige i sine »Fire Nye Love« fra juni 2014. Revolutionen, der vælder frem fra hans »Basement« forskningsteam, giver genlyd af dette, sammen med hans »Manhattan Projekt«. Det sås i lederen af Basement-teamet **Benjamin Denistons 15 minutter lange præsentation** ved Schiller Instituttets konference på Manhattan den 13. april, og ligeledes af Basement-teamleder Megan Beets' kursus den 15. april, om **»Fusion; At hæve den menneskelige art.»**

Det findes i hele Manhattanprojektets musikalske arbejde, ledet af Schiller Instituttets musikdirektør, John Sigerson.

»Det, man kan efterprøve, er det, I laver i Basement team, og

det virker», sagde LaRouche i dag.

»Det er funktionelt. Det, vi har gjort i Manhattan-området, har været en præstationsmæssig revolution. Så hvis I vil synke, kan I synke ved at være tåbelige. Hvis I ikke vil synke, så er det, I må gøre, at opføre jer ordentligt.«

LaRouche bemærkede, at USA og andre nationer har en iboende økonomisk kraft, der demonstreres i superhøje vækstrater, som impulser i visse perioder. Men

»så kom tyveknægtene og lukkede det ned og udbredte den myte, at det er sådan her, systemet fungerer. Men det er en myte! Det fungerer ikke sådan.«

Det, vi gør med Manhattan Projektet, hvor vi skaber en kraft for økonomisk kreativitet, må fortsættes. Der må være skabelsen af en udviklingsproces. Vi må indføre økonomisk virkelighed. Hvis det gøres, vil der ikke være noget problem, for døre vil åbne sig – før eller siden.

»Problemet i nationaløkonomier opstår, når nationaløkonomier ødelægges. Hvis man ser på det, som jeg ser på det«, sagde LaRouche,

»så har vi portene til fremgang lige frem for os. Men, vi må fastholde dem – det er forskellen.«

Momentum for Glass-Steagall bag Wall

Streets hysteri samtidig med, at momentum for Bælt & Vej Forum accelererer

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 26. april, 2017 – Wall Street er tydeligvis på fortvivlelsens rand over momentummet for Glass-Steagall, ikke alene i Kongressen og i hele landet, men især i Det Hvide Hus. Tidligere chef for FDIC, William Isaac, og tidligere direktør i Wells Fargo, Richard Kovacevich, er troppet op til en kronik i Wall Street Journal i dag med overskriften, »De brodne argumenter for en Ny Glass-Steagall«, som lægger ud med et voldsomt angreb mod præsident Trumps chefrådgiver, Gary Cohn, for at støtte en Glass-Steagall opdeling af investeringsbanker og kommercielle banker.

»Dette er dybt skuffende«, klynker de, efterfulgt af et højtravende opspind om, hvordan »diversificering« af både kommercielle banker og investeringsbanker (dvs., ved at slå dem sammen), har skabt det nu »stabiliserede« banksystem, som en påberåbelse imod Glass-Steagall.

Sådanne desperate skrig fylder nu i bogstavelig forstand finanspressen hver dag. Det må antages, at de er udmærket klar over, at virksomhedernes og selskabernes gældsboble i USA nu er væsentligt større, end boblen på ejendomsmarkedet var forud for krakket 2008, og som nu nærmer sig \$14 billion, sammenlignet med \$11 billion og lidt småpenge, for huslånsboblen. Tidligere adm. direktør i Goldman Sachs, Nomi Prins, forfatter til *Alle the Presidents Bankers*, sagde til EIR under et interview for nylig, at gældsboblen i foretagenderne nu er langt større end ejendomsboblen, der var gnisten til kollapset i 2008, og nu er vokset med 75 % i løbet af det seneste årti til næsten \$14 billion, og som næsten med

sikkerhed vil eksplodere inden årets udgang. Selv IMF advarede forgangne weekend om, at en væsentlig stigning i rentesatserne kunne fremprovokere et kollaps i 20 % af de amerikanske foretagender. Der er panik i luften, og en løsning såsom Glass-Steagall ville betyde, at spekulanterne på Wall Street endelig langt om længe ville blive nødt til at finde sig en nyttig beskæftigelse, snarere end at få endnu en bailout, betalt af skatteborgerne, og samtidig ville den nyttige, kommercielle banksektor blive bevaret for atter at finansiere realøkonomien.

Men, for at redde USA's økonomi, må præsidenten også tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej, nu, helst ved at deltage i Forum for Ét bælt, en vej (OBOR), som afholdes i Beijing 14.-15. maj. Den kinesiske ambassadør til USA, Cui Tiankai, fornyede den invitation, som præsident Xi Jinping udstedte under sit besøg med Trump, til, at USA's præsident kunne besøge Kina, og til, at USA kunne deltage i Bælt & Vej. China Daily citerede i sin rapport om ambassadør Cuis invitation Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der i sin tale ved Schiller Instituttets Forum den 13.-14. april i New York, med titlen, »Amerikansk-kinesisk samarbejde om Bælt & Vej-initiativet«, sagde, »Samarbejde om Bælt & Vej kunne bruge kinesernes erfaring til at opbygge USA's infrastruktur«, og at Trump kunne blive »en af de største præsidenter i USA's historie«, hvis han går sammen med Kina og andre nationer i Bælt & Vej-initiativet.

EIR opfordrer vore læsere til at se og cirkulere nedenstående, 35 minutter lange opsummeringsvideo, som giver et overblik over denne ekstraordinære Schiller Institut-konference, inklusive præsentationerne fra Kina og Rusland, fra højtplacerede personer inden for diplomatiet.

I hele verden finder der optaktsmøder til Bælt & Vej Forum sted – alene i løbet af de seneste 48 timer i Polen, Ukraine, Etiopien, Kasakhstan og Pakistan. Kansler Merkel har meddelt, at Tyskland vil sende sin økonomiminister, og den kinesiske

udenrigsminister Wang Yi, som deltager i Forum for Oldtidscivilisationer i Athen, Grækenland, har inviteret sin egyptiske modpart og andre til at deltage.

Verden står stadig og vakler alt for tæt på en mulig global krig, som udløses af Det britiske Imperiums dinosaurer, der desperat forsøger at bevare deres opdeling af verden i fjendtlige lejre, Øst og Vest, ved at forhindre præsident Trumps erklærede hensigt om at være venner med både Kina og Rusland som grundlaget for globalt samarbejde og global udvikling. Det er et stærkt og presserende valg – udvikling og globalt samarbejde, eller global krig.

Titelbillede: Bemærk: Denne grafik fra 2015 er en smule forældet, men viser stadig nogle af de væsentligste zoner for økonomisk aktivitet fra Kinas initiativ Ét Bælt, én Vej. Grafik fra merics.org.

USA må gå med i den Nye Silkevej; Få Det britiske Imperium væk af vejen

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 25. april, 2017:

Vi befinder os i en særdeles omskiftelig situation, som mest dramatisk ses af begivenheder mht. Nordkorea; men underliggende har vi den økonomiske sammenbrudskrise og de transatlantiske nationers mislykkede politik. Det, vi har brug for, er, at USA samarbejder med Kina og Rusland, »inden for rammerne af Bælt & Vej-initiativet« – som præsident Xi Jinping

sagde til præsident Trump i Florida, den 7. april – for at sætte en kurs mod sikkerhed og tryghed, bort fra de geopolitiske konfrontationer, som er det 'britiske imperiespil'.

Se på Nordkorea, som i dag fejrer sit 85. jubilæum for oprettelsen af sin hær, med ceremoniel og våbenøvelser, midt i en aggressiv retorik imod USA. Med mindre, der finder en proces sted med forhandlinger og overvejelser blandt de berørte nationer (hvad enten det bliver i regi af 4 eller 6 parter), som kommer med en løsning, så er situationen mere end farlig. Trump-administrationen er aktiveret, men foreløbig kun ud fra et standpunkt om pres og trusler, om end behersket.

'Bak ud', begge to, lød budskabet i dag i den statsejede, kinesiske presse, *China Daily*, hvis lederartikel bærer overskriften, »Fejlvurdering udgør den største risiko for Halvøen«. Man frygter, at »alt kunne ske, hvornår, de skal være, i det spændte opgør, der har udviklet sig mellem Washington og Pyongyang«. Med hensyn til Nordkorea, gør den kinesiske avis det klart, »så har de politiske beslutningstagere i Pyongyang, at dømme ud fra deres seneste udtalelser og handlinger, alvorligt misforstået FN-sanktionerne (de nye), der er rettet mod landets atomvåben- og missilaffyringsprovokationer, og ikke landets system eller dets lederskab ... De må revurdere situationen, så de ikke foretager fejlvurderinger«. Over for USA formaner *China Daily*, »På samme måde bør Washington fortsætte med at udvise beherskelse og forfølge en fredelig løsning af spørgsmålet«.

Præsident Trump tager usædvanlige skridt i Washington, D.C. I går, den 24. april, var han i Det Hvide Hus vært for et frokostmøde med de 15 ambassadører til FN's Sikkerhedsråd, hvor han talte om Nordkorea og Syrien. I morgen eftermiddag, den 26. april, er alle de 100 senatorer i den Amerikanske Kongres inviteret til en briefing om Nordkorea i Det Hvide Hus, ved cheferne for forsvars- og udenrigsdepartementerne, stabschef, general Joseph Dunford, og national

efterretningsdirektør, Dan Coats. Fredag, den 28. april, vil udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson præsidere et møde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd om Nordkorea. (USA har det roterende formandskab for april måned.)

Budskabet i alt dette er foreløbig, som Trump i går udtrykte det over for ambassadørerne, at FN og medlemsnationerne af Sikkerhedsrådet må gøre mere mht. Syrien og Nordkorea. Finansminister Mnuchin annoncerede i går, desværre, amerikanske sanktioner mod 270 syriske videnskabsfolk og forskere med den påstand, at præsident Bashar al-Assad havde gasbombet sit eget folk. Dette på trods af, at der ikke har været nogen ordentlig undersøgelse på stedet. Situationen er således fortsat fyldt med anspændthed, og folk lider og dør.

Se så på, hvem, der ansporer til katastrofe: *New York Times* og *Wall Street Journal* – direkte talerør for Det britiske Imperium. 24. april kræver *NY Times* handling nu over for Nordkorea, fordi »landet er i stand til at producere en atombombe hver seks eller syv uger«. Hvor ved 'The Slimes' det fra? Fra »en voksende mængde af ekspertundersøgelser og klassificerede efterretningsrapporter«, alle unavngivne. For en god ordens skyld går dagens *Wall Street Journal* ind med tilføjesen, at enhver investering i Ét Bælt, én Vej er »dårskab«, spild af tid og penge.

Det er vores opgave er gå ud med sandheden overalt. Den franske statsmand og præsidentkandidat Jacques Cheminade talte på valgaftenen til sin kampagne og sagde, »vi tog vor tids udfordringer op«. Med et blik på fremtiden, »kan vi blive katalysator for et reelt skift og en reel inspiration. Men på én betingelse: at I fortsætter med at kæmpe for det ...«

Foto: Den 24. april var præsident Trump vært for et frokostmøde med de 15 ambassadører til FN's Sikkerhedsråd, hvor han talte om Syrien og Nordkorea.

Rusland genopretter amerikansk-russisk memorandum om flyvesikkerhed over Syrien; den varme linje er slået til

25. april, 2017 – Rusland har genoprettet de-konfliktingsmemorandaet for flyvesikkerhed, på anmodning fra den amerikanske udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson, som han fremlagde dagen efter sit besøg i Moskva den 13. april, siger en kilde fra udenrigsministeriet til *Izvestia*, rapporterer Sputnik International.

»Memorandaet blev underskrevet i oktober 2015, kort tid efter Rusland indledte sin kontraterror-kampagne over Syrien, på anmodning af Damaskus. Den amerikanskledede koalition havde på det tidspunkt tilbragt et år med at angribe terroristmål i Syrien, uden godkendelse fra landets regering.

Memorandaet fastsætter specifikke instruktioner for piloter, som er med til, at hændelser i luften undgås og sikrer flyvesikkerheden midt i de to, parallelle kampagner. En 24-timers kommunikationskanal blev ligeledes åbnet mellem de to landes militærpersonel.«

Præsident Trump, Tag til Beijing for at bygge infrastruktur.

EIR kortvideo 24. april 2017

Det nye britiske kup i USA – Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

EIR kortvideo 20. april, 2017.

Nyt fra Redaktionen – EIR kortvideoer

25. april, 2017 – Som noget nyt vil vi fremover udlægge EIR's nye kortvideoer – 1 til 3 minutter – hver dag, på vores hjemmeside direkte. De bliver ikke oversat til dansk.

Nedenstående de videoer, der hidtil er kommet.

Som det vil være alle vore læsere bekendt, så er der mange, alvorlige brændpunkter i verdenspolitik i øjeblikket. Schiller Instituttet i Danmark kæmper for, at vi også her kommer med –

eller melder os ind i – det Nye Paradigme, så vi ikke ender med en lav levestandard, og som et museums-levn fra en anden tid ... for slet ikke at tale om virkningerne af en krig, også i Europa, hvis konsekvenser, ingen kan overskue.

Men vi har brug for mange, mange flere danskere, der sætter sig grundigt ind i disse ting og tænker over, hvordan I kan hjælpe os, og Danmark, med at opgive den aktuelle, mere eller mindre nytteløse, eller direkte forkerte, politik og kommer i gang med de tiltag, der skal forme Danmarks fremtid – *din* fremtid. Vi skal have bankopdeling – som haster – vi skal have et reelt program for infrastruktur og produktiv beskæftigelse – Danmark skal selvfølgelig være repræsenteret ved Bælt & Vej Forum i Beijing i maj – alle de mange ting, I har fulgt med i gennem vores hjemmeside. Kan I komme i tanke om nogen andre i Danmark, der kan fremlægge et så flot, gennemgribende og fornuftigt program? Men, uden handling er det blot 'svage' ord.

Vi beder jer om, at I distribuerer vores materiale – f. eks. disse kortvideoer – til hele jeres bekendtskabskreds, gennem jeres sociale medier og andre af jeres netværk – og husk at sige til dem, at de igen skal sende det videre ... vi *skal* have mere gang i tingene! Det skal I hjælpe os med! Gør også opmærksom på, at folk kan melde sig til at modtage vores Nyhedsbrev, der sendes 2 gange ugentligt, til jeres e-mails. Tilmelding, se hjemmesiden.

Sæt gang i tingene.

– *Redaktionen.*

The New British Coup in the USA – Helga Zepp-LaRouche

British Press Push War on North Korea

Brits: Aggressive war is LEGAL (when we do it!)

Chinese Diplomat Invites US to Join New Silk Road

President Trump, Go to Beijing to Build Infrastructure

Imod Londons trusler om verdenskrig – Drøftelser mellem Trump og Xi bliver af største betydning

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 24. april, 2017 – Med endnu en telefondiskussion søndag om fred på Koreahalvøen, er dialogen mellem præsident Donald Trump og Kinas præsident Xi Jinping ved at få afgørende betydning som lederskab for verden, hvilket forstås af førende, kinesiske personer, men i det atlantiske område fordunkles af britiske krav om krigskonfrontationer.

Xi har foreslået, og Trump givet tilsagn til, samtaler mellem

de to på fast basis, samt Trumps snarlige besøg til Kina til endnu et topmøde.

Dette er et afgørende samarbejde for den første, amerikanske præsident i hundrede år, der taler om en tilbagevenden til Alexander Hamiltons og Lincolns »Amerikanske Økonomiske System«, som trodsede Det britiske Imperium og gjorde USA til verdens førende industrination.

Kinas »Økonomiske Bælt & Vej-initiativ« er drivkraften i den verdensøkonomiske vækst og er til reel fordel for de øvrige 60 nationer, der deltager, og tilfører deres økonomier infrastruktur og skaber produktiv beskæftigelse. Dette er, hvad Trump ønsker at gøre.

Trump genopliver ånden fra John F. Kennedys Apolloprogram, med videoer om rummet fra præsidenten og hans opkald i dag til rumstationen, hvor tusinder af amerikanske elever så med, og han foreslår at forcere en tilbagevenden til Månen og Mars. Kinas rumprogram fører an i udforskning af Månen, inklusive dennes bagside, hvilket aldrig tidligere er forsøgt, og med udsigt til Mars.

Trump og Xi ønsker begge en fredelig løsning i Korea. Londons ledere og medier forsøger nu, efter at have anført et slag à la McCarthy-epoken imod Trumps samarbejdsrelation med Rusland, ihærdigt at få krisen over Nordkorea til at eksplodere i en verdenskrig. Den britiske forsvarsminister Michael Fallons udtalelse i går om, at »premierminister May er rede til at tage atomvåben i brug i et førsteslagsangreb«, som en britisk overskrift korrekt rapporterede, var krigsvanvid, især i en fabrikeret atomvåbenkrise. Storbritanniens statsanklager har netop erklæret, at aggressionskrig ikke er forbudt under britisk lov!

Briternes handlinger for at sværte og begå 'kup' imod Trump-præsidentskabet må standses.

Hvis det amerikansk-kinesiske og det amerikansk-russiske

samarbejde er godt, er der intet problem i verden, der ikke kan løses.

Som den seneste, 1-minut lange video fra *EIR* erklærer:

»Præsident Donald Trump har ofte talt om sin plan om at bruge \$1 billion til USA's infrastruktur for at styrke produktiviteten og udvide økonomien. Næste måned har han en fantastisk mulighed for at diskutere denne vision med andre verdensledere, inklusive dem i Asien, som bruger 30 gange så meget som USA på infrastruktur, i forhold til deres BNP.

Den 14. og 15. maj afholdes der et enormt topmøde i Beijing, for at udarbejde en detaljeret plan for udførelsen af Bælt & Vej-initiativet. Dette er et internationalt samarbejdsprojekt, initieret af Kina, som involverer: samarbejde mellem flere end 60 lande; byggeriet af det, der vil blive infrastruktur for henved \$20 billioner; det vil berøre mere end 4 mia. mennesker.

Topmødet i maj vil inkludere: 110 nationer, af hvilke 28 bliver repræsenteret af deres statsoverhoveder. Det er en stor mulighed for infrastruktur.

Præsident Trump, gå ikke glip af denne mulighed. Deltag i topmødet i Beijing!«

Foto: *From @realDonaldTrump, April 7, 2017, Mar-a-Lago, Florida: ""@FLOTUS & I are honored to welcome the President of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, & Madame Peng Liyuan to the United States."*

**RADIO SCHILLER den 24. april
2017:**

**Valget i Frankrig: Jacques
Cheminade var fornuftens
stemme**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Verden responderer til
LaRouche, vendt mod Det
britiske Imperium**

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, 23. april, 2017 – I denne uge gjorde den russiske og kinesiske presse det til en sag at dække LaRouche-bevægelsens kampagner for at formå Trump-præsidentskabet til at bringe USA ind i det Nye Silkevejsparadigme med Xi Jinpings Bælt & Vej-initiativ, alt imens de samtidig i stigende grad identificerer briternes rolle i at undergrave Trumps bestræbelser for at bringe USA, Rusland og Kina ind i et samarbejde, til menneskehedens gode. Samtidig foregår der en bevægelse, hvor politiske institutioner i USA går i retning af et samarbejde med LaRouche-organisationer – Schiller Instituttet, *Executive Intelligence Review* og LaRouche Politiske Aktionskomite (LaRouche PAC).

Lørdag gik repræsentanter fra Schiller Instituttet og

medlemmer af en Tea Party-organisation fra New Jersey sammen foran *New York Times* – eller, som præsident Trump korrekt identificerer det, det »mislykkede New York Times«. Plancher ved protesten inkluderede: »New York Times ønsker krig med Rusland, amerikanere ønsker fred«; »New York Times – få alle de falske nyheder på tryk«; og en plakat med et portræt af en rødmende Göbbels, med ordene: »New York Times får Göbbels til at rødme«.

En artikel i TASS samme aften lød: »'Hele verden griner ad New York Times', sagde Daniel Burke, talsmand for Schiller Instituttet, i et interview til TASS' korrespondent. 'De er blevet smålige tjenere for dem, der søger krig og kaos.' Efter hans mening 'spredde denne udgivelse løgne om Syrien, ligesom den løj om tilstedeværelsen af masseødelæggelsesvåben i Irak. Dette er en del af en kynisk og falsk kampagne for at udskifte regimet i Syrien – dette kan let føre til en Tredje Verdenskrig', sagde Burke.« Ruptly, RT's Tv- og videotjeneste, udlagde en video af demonstrationen.

Ligeledes lørdag, udgav *China Daily* en lang artikel, inkl. billeder, som rapporterede om Schiller Instituttets konference i New York City med titlen, »Bælt & Vej-initiativ 'Ny Platform' for kinesisk-amerikansk samarbejde«, som rapporterede om præsentationerne af dr. Patrick Ho, stifter af China Energy Fund Committee, vice-generalkonsul for Folkerepublikken Kina i New York, Zhang Meifang, og vice-chargé d'affaires ved Ruslands permanente mission til FN, Petr Ilichev, som alle talte med Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

EIR har nu indledt en daglig, kort (1-2 minutter) lang video på *EIR* YouTube kanal, der er totalt helliget afsløringen af den direkte britiske rolle i både at undergrave ethvert samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina, og i at bruge enhver tænkelig løgn for at manipulere USA ind i en krig med Rusland og Kina – en krig, som omgående kunne afslutte civilisationen, som vi kender den. Vi opfordrer alle til at abonnere på denne

daglige video.

Præsident Trump accepterede, under sit møde med præsident Xi Jinping den 6.-7. april i Florida, Xis invitation til at besøge Kina, men uden at fastsætte en dato for besøget. Alt imens et sådant besøg er af den yderste vigtighed for menneskehedens fremtid, når som helst, det måtte finde sted, så har Lyndon og Helga LaRouche kraftigt opfordret præsidenten til at deltage i »Bælt & Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde«, som afholdes i Beijing den 14.-14. maj. Hvis han deltager, ville Trump kunne mødes med både Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin, sammen med 26 andre statsoverhoveder og regeringschefer, der har planlagt at deltage i forummet, i omgivelser, der tilsigter at skabe samarbejde for udvikling mellem nationerne på vores fælles planet. Verden må skride til handling nu for at opnå et sådant nyt paradigme for verdens udvikling, som den nødvendige basis for at gøre en ende på det britiske system med geopolitisk, militær konfrontation, én gang for alle, og i stedet skabe en ny renæssance, der er helliget menneskehedens fælles mål.

Foto: Lørdag den 22. april, 2017, holdt medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet og en Tea Party-organisation fra New Jersey en demonstration uden for New York Times. (photo: Daniel Burke/LaRouchePAC)

Lavrov og Tillerson taler i telefon om Syrien og russisk-amerikanske

relationer

22. april, 2017 – Den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov og den amerikanske udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson havde fredag en telefonsamtale, sagde det Russiske Udenrigsministerium i en pressemeddelelse.

»Under diskussionen af internationale problemer udtrykte Lavrov beklagelse over USA's opposition til Ruslands initiativ i Organisationen for Forbud mod Kemiske Våben [OPCW] om at sende inspektører af sted til Syrien for at verificere rapporterne om anvendelsen af sarin-nervegas i byen Khan Sheikhoun den 4. april, og tilstedeværelsen af giftkemikalier på Shairat-flybasen«, sagde ministeriet. »Lavrov og Tillerson aftalte at udstede instruktioner til overvejelse af muligheden for at organisere en uafhængig undersøgelse af hændelsen, i OPCW's regi.«

De drøftede også de bilaterale relationer, hvor Lavrov bragte spørgsmålet om Ruslands krav om »at vende tilbage til Ruslands diplomatiske ejendomme i USA, som Obama-administrationen ulovligt konfiskerede«, op.

»Lavrov og Tillerson aftale også at kickstarte arbejdet i en fælles ekspertgruppe på viceudenrigsministerniveau for at sondere, på hvilke måder, man kunne fjerne generende elementer i de bilaterale relationer«, sagde rapporten.

Fungerende talsperson for Udenrigsministeriet Mark Toner sagde i en erklæring, at telefondiskussionen var en »opfølgende diskussion til de bilaterale spørgsmål, der blev drøftet under [udenrigsminister Tillersons] besøg i Moskva, den 11.-12. april.

De to udenrigsministre diskuterede flere andre spørgsmål, inklusive OPCW-undersøgelsen af Syriens anvendelse af kemiske våben den 4. april. USA's udenrigsminister gentog sin støtte til OPCW's eksisterende undersøgelsesmekanisme«, lød

erklæringen – dvs., ikke nødvendigt at sende nogen til
åstedet, blot acceptere briternes ord.

*Foto: Ruslands og USA's udenrigsministre, hhv. Sergei Lavrov
(venstre) og Rex Tillerson, under sidstnævntes besøg i Moskva
den 11. – 12. april, 2017.*