

NYHEDSORIENTERING DECEMBER 2016: Helga Zepp-LaRouche i København: Donald Trump og Det Nye Internationale Paradigme

Den 12. december 2016 var Helga Zepp-LaRouche – Lyndon LaRouches hustru, Schiller Instituttets grundlægger og en international nøgleperson i kampen for et nyt globalt udviklingsparadigme – særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar på Frederiksberg med titlen: »Donald Trump og det Nye Internationale Paradigme«. Blandt deltagerne var diplomater, aktivister og repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet blev indledt med fremførelsen af en kendt traditionel kinesisk sang, Kāngdìng Qínggē (Kangding Kærlighedssang), af Feride Istogu Gillesberg (sopran) og Michelle Rasmussen (klaver). Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som på smukkeste og mest optimistiske vis førte publikken igennem en tour-de-force af den nuværende politiske situation med såvel befolkningens afvisning af det nuværende paradigme gennem Brexit, Hillary Clintons valgnederlag til Donald Trump og det italienske "Nej", som et forsøg på at skabe kaos (og krig) inden Donald Trumps indsættelse den 20. januar. Dertil kom en fremstilling af det nye globale paradigme, som allerede er ved at overtage verden, illustreret ved Kinas politik for Den Nye Silkevej – som den kommende amerikanske administration skal finde sin plads i – og den videre udvikling, der er nødvendig, hvis menneskeheden skal

finde sin sande identitet. Hele talen og den efterfølgende diskussion kan ses, høres og læses på: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16773.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Tidligere britisk diplomat og efterretningsmand: Hensigten med CIA's påstande er regimeskift i Moskva

18. dec., 2016 – I en lang artikel i *Consortium News* den 16. dec., skrev den tidligere britiske diplomat og efterretningsmand, Alistair Crooke, at hensigten bag CIA's lækkede påstand om, at Rusland forsøgte at hjælpe Donald Trump til at vinde præsidentvalget, er at vælte Vladimir Putin og samtidig forhindre Trumps mindre høgeagtige udenrigspolitik endnu inden han indtager embedet. Crooke gav sin artikel titlen, »Politiseret efterretningstjeneste skyder Trump en kugle i knæet«.

For at styrke sit argument, citerer Crooke tidligere præsidentielle medarbejder, klummeskribent og tidl. præsidentkandidat (1969-74), Pat Buchanan: »Bag forsøget på at bagvaske [den udpegede udenrigsminister Rex] Tillerson og aflegitimisere Trump ligger et større motiv. Trump har modstandere i begge partier, der er alarmerede over hans triumf, fordi den er en fare for den udenrigspolitik, som er

deres *raison d'être*, grunden til, at de 'er til'.«

»Disse mennesker ønsker ikke at ophæve sanktionerne mod Moskva. De ønsker ikke at afslutte konfrontationen med Rusland. Som det ses derved, at de har bragt det lillebitte Montenegro ind i NATO, så ønsker de at udvide NATO til også at omfatte Sverige, Finland, Ukraine, Georgien og Moldova.

Deres plan er en permanent inddæmning af Rusland ... Deres mål er at vælte Putin og frembringe 'regimeskifte' i Moskva.«

Crooke konkluderer, at krigen i Syrien har haft en »enormt ætsende effekt på tjenester som CIA og MI6 ... ved, at de er blevet ekkorum for påstande, om de så er nok så usandsynlige eller falske, der fremføres af diverse bevæbnede bevægelser og deres sponsorer – med den hensigt at fremtvinge en militær intervention fra Vestens side. Kort sagt, så ophører disse tjenester med at være observatører; de bliver investorer. De farer vild i en labyrint af forvrængede kendsgerninger, falsk propaganda og tilegnet arrogance. Ligesom Prometheus pønser de på i hemmelighed at stjæle fra Zeus, krigens gud: de aspirerer til at diktere krig og fred.

Hr. Trump er brudt ind i denne dominerende verden af 'strategisk kommunikations-krigsførelse' og har ødelagt deres spilleindsats, Syrien – og lovet *afspænding* med Rusland. Det må virkelig føles utåleligt.«

Foto: Alistair Crooke.

Trumps vælgere har brug for mere end vrede nu: De har brug for kreativitet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. december, 2016 – Alt imens et ekstraordinært drama udspiller sig i USA, hvor man bruger efterretningstjenester til at forsøge at vælte et præsidentvalg, der er afgjort, har den nyvalgte præsident talt ved en række enorme stævner i hele nationen.

Trumps vælgere har i titusindvis ventet i kulden for atter at lade deres vrede høre, imod de forhadte anslag imod deres liv, som er »globaliseringen« og dens tilhængere. Men, de har presserende brug for noget mere og bedre end vrede.

I verden uden for USA findes der et nyt, økonomisk paradigme, der især kommer fra de asiatiske magter, og som kunne vende amerikanernes held. Men som borgere må de forstå, hvordan de skal koble deres land til dette nye paradigme. Der er nye, fremskudte grænser inden for videnskab, inklusive inden for rumfart og fusionskraft, der kan betyde en højere, menneskelig tilværelse for deres børn. De må forstå, at disse fremskudte grænser i det forgangne blev glemt i Amerika, og de må forstå, hvem de skal samarbejde med for at genoprette dem.

De må se den politiske kamp, der nu forestår, ikke som de ser en Super Bowl, hvor man hylder »dræberslag« og sårede modspillere, men derimod som man ser et Shakespeare-skuespil, der afføder *ideer*. Ikke som en heavy metal-rockkoncert, men som en opførelse af Beethovens *Ode til glæde* som Europa holdt, da det kastede Sovjetunionens kommunisme af sig.

Støtterne bag Obama og Hillary kan ikke omstøde valget. Deres mål er at bringe en anden præsident, Ruslands Putin, til fald.

De er ubøjelige i deres forfølgelse af evindelig krigsførelse, krige for »regimeskifte«, hvis målskive sluttelig er Rusland og Kina. De har til hensigt at bekæmpe disse nationer, om nødvendigt gennem krig, før de rent økonomisk overgår Obamas økonomisk forfaldne USA.

De amerikanske vælgere, nu borgere, er selv med i dramaet. De må agere for at sikre, at den nye præsident ikke forsøger at fortsætte denne krigspolitik; og at han ikke forsætter Obamas – eller det Republikanske lederskabs – økonomiske og videnskabelige politik.

✘ De kan i stedet igangsætte en mobilisering for at redde økonomien og nationen: for en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall; skabelse af en nationalbank i Hamiltons tradition, til produktiv kredit; byggeri af ny infrastruktur på teknologiens fremskudte grænser – såsom højhastighedsjernbaner og magnetiske svæve-jernbaner – i hele landet; genindførelse af NASA's missioner til Månen og Mars og det dybe rum, og forfølgelse af gennembrud i fusionsteknologier.

Denne form for kreativitet, hos tusinder eller endda millioner af mennesker, er det, LaRouchePAC og *EIR* eksisterer for. Amerikanere bruger ikke denne kreativitet, før de indser, at det amerikanske valgchok var en del af et globalt fænomen, der kan føre til et nyt paradigme for menneskets rettigheder og evner.

Foto: Et nyt vindue, der for nylig blev installeret i målkammeret i National Ignition Facility (NIF), gør det muligt for NIF-teamet og besøgende gæster at kigge ind i kammeret, mens dette er vakuumforseglet til eksperimenter. Marts 2011. (Foto kredit: LLNL)

Terroristangreb fremtvinger suspendering af evakueringer fra Aleppo

16. dec., 2016 – Selv om evakueringen af militante kæmpere og deres familier fra det østlige Aleppo er skredet planmæssigt frem i de seneste dage, blev de syriske myndigheder i dag tvunget til at suspendere processen pga. terroristangreb mod evakueringen af de militante kæmpere, og mod ambulancerne.

Ifølge det Syrisk-arabiske Nyhedsagentur (SANA) affyrede jihadistiske snigskytter kugler og granater mod busser med de evakuerede. SANA's korrespondent, der citerede unavngivne kilder, rapporterede, at suspenderingen ville blive opretholdt, indtil man kunne få garantier for, at terroristerne blev tvunget til at overholde den våbenstilstand, som blev forhandlet igennem af Rusland og Tyrkiet.

Forud for suspenderingen rapporterede det Russiske Forsoningscenter, at evakueringen af de militante kæmper og deres familier fra det østlige Aleppo var næsten fuldført, med 9.500 mennesker, der har forladt byen siden i går. De fremkom med anklager om, at »radikale og uforsonlige« bevåbnede bander havde beskudt syriske tropper i nogle kvarterer.

Tydeligvis ude af stand til at takle situationens kendsgerninger, skældte udenrigsminister John Kerry, under en pressebriefing i Udenrigsministeriet i går, ud på det, han kaldte en »samvittighedsløs« situation i Aleppo og insisterede på, at »[Assad-]regimet eller dets allierede« havde beskudt konvojerne ud af Aleppo med de sårede. Dette er »foragteligt«, buldrede han løs, »intet mindre end en massakre« og »tilfældig og rå brutalitet« imod befolkningen i Aleppo. Han krævede omgående standsning af fjendtlighederne.

En langt nyttigere intervention kom fra Vitaly Churkin, Ruslands FN-ambassadør, der sagde, at den første opgave i Syrien efter Aleppos befrielse bliver en total suspendering af kamphandlinger og en genoptagelse af Syrien-Syrien-dialogen, rapporterede SANA. Churkin sagde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, at Rusland altid har sagt, at der må komme en politisk løsning på krisen i Syrien, en løsning, der respekterer landets suverænitet og territoriale integritet. Churkin understregede, at, gennem at intervenere i Syrien, da det gjorde, var Rusland med til at forhindre terrorister i at overtage kontrollen over Damaskus og bidrage til at befri store områder i landet. Han bekræftede ligeledes, at Rusland har været med til at etablere en dialog mellem Assad-regeringen og »oppositionen« i og uden for Syrien.

Under sin pressekonference i går i Japan, sammen med sin japanske modpart, Shinzo Abe, rapporterede Putin, »[V]i opretholder en aktiv dialog med den bevæbnede opposition, med hjælp fra Tyrkiet«.

**De, der spreder antirussisk
hysteri,
er ligesom personer i en
gyserfilm,
siger Ruslands
viceudenrigsminister**

16. dec., 2016 – I et interview, publiceret af TASS i dag, sammenlignede Ruslands viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov

dem, der i Washington rabler løs imod Ruslands angivelige »hacking«, med karaktererne i en gyserfilm, »vampyrer, der er bange for sollyset og bliver til støv, når solstrålerne rammer dem. Det ville være morsomt, hvis det ikke var så sørgeligt«.

Ryabkov bemærkede ligefremt, at forbedringer i de amerikansk-russiske relationer bliver en lang og vanskelig opgave, men tilføjede, at Rusland er rede til at arbejde med USA og være en konstruktiv partner »uden tøven, pauser eller kunstige forhalinger«. Med hensyn til de aktuelle, hysteriske angreb mod Rusland, sagde han, at han håbede, at »den naturlige pragmatisme hos mange af de nominerede til Trumps team, der endnu skal godkendes af Senatet«, vil være med til at undgå »den absolut uforståelige usikkerhed, der grænser til forfølgelsesvanvid«.

Han tilføjede, at han kender den udpegede udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson, så vel som mange andre kandidater, der måske har været udpeget til posten.

»Dette er absolut normalt, men hvad der forbløffer mig i nutidens Amerika, er den fantastiske reaktion, hvor man krymper sig, blot nogen nævner, at en person nogensinde har haft kontakt med russere.«

Den russiske regeringsperson sagde, at han forventer, at »pilen« i den amerikanske politik vil ændre retning under Trump-administrationen, og at »der ikke kommer de samme, udtrykkelige bestræbelser på at spille det anti-russiske kort«. Det er uheldigt, sagde han, at Obama-administrationen, som man kunne forvente, ville tage afstand fra den aktuelle anti-russiske kampagne, i betragtning af dens ansvar som regering og »arten af dens aktivitet«, i stedet »er blevet involveret i dette snavsede og upassende spil«.

Lyndon LaRouche: Obamas ord er en trussel om at dræbe

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. december, 2016 – Fredag erklærede præsident Barack Obama i et truende tonefald i et interview på NPR Morning Edition, der blev landsdækkende transmitteret, angiveligt som respons på beskyldninger om, at russerne skulle have hacket Demokraternes Nationalkomite,

»Jeg mener, at der ikke kan være nogen tvivl om, at, når en fremmed regering forsøger at få indflydelse på integriteten af vore valg, så må vi gribe til handling, og det vil vi gøre på et tidspunkt og et sted, som vi vælger. Men, hr. Putin er udmærket bekendt med mine følelser om dette, for jeg talte direkte med ham om det.«

Lyndon LaRouche sagde:

»Disse ord er en trussel om at myrde betydningsfulde mennesker. Det er, hvad han lærte af sin [sted-]fader.«

LaRouche opfordrede borgerne til at *»holde øje med denne fyr, så han ikke dræber«*. Obama truer offentligt verden. *»Planetens nationer trues nu af Obamas plan om massedrab af mennesker ... «*

Dernæst gentog Obama, under sin pressekonference i Det hvide Hus her til eftermiddag, sin trussel mod *»russisk hacking«*. Han sagde, at han havde sagt til Rusland, at

»de skal ophøre med det og indikerede, at der vil blive konsekvenser, når de gør det ... Vores mål er fortsat at sende Rusland et klart budskab.«

Desuden erklærede Obama sig enig opsummeringen fra CNN-reporteren i Det Hvide Hus om, at *»præsidenten mener, Vladimir Putin autoriserede hackingen«*.

Anklagen om russiske indgreb i selve valget lugter langt væk, i betragtning af, at der nu i månedsvis ikke er blevet fremlagt noget bevis, der viser Ruslands skyld, men kun uophørligt gentagede påstande. I dag sagde talsmand for den russiske præsident, Dmitry Peskov, at USA bør ophøre med ubegrundede beskyldninger om russisk indgriben.

»De bør enten holde op med at tale om dette, eller også i det mindste fremlægge nogle beviser.«

Torsdag nægtede efterretningsfolk fra Obama-administrationen direkte at gå til Kongressen, da de blev bedt om at gøre det af Repræsentanternes Hus' Efterretningskomite, for at levere beviser under et møde bag lukkede døre. Der har været mange indikationer på, at andre efterretningstjenester ikke er enige med CIA-direktør John Brennans konklusion om russisk hacking.

Faren kommer fra Obamas forkærlighed for mord – samt den kendsgerning, at han snart vil forlade embedet og derfor hverken vil have eksekutive magtbeføjelser, eller beskyttelse mod eventuel retsforfølgelse for sine forbrydelser.

Lad os kigge på Obamas kendte meriter. Der er hans tirsdagsmøder, hvor han udarbejder mållister over de ofre, der skal dræbes ved hjælp af droner. Der er de forsatte deployeringer af amerikanske mænd og kvinder, som udsættes for skade og død, i amerikansk militærtjeneste i de 16 år, hvor Obama/Bush/briterne har ført krige for regimeskifte (Irak, Afghanistan, Libyen, Syrien). I selve USA er der et massivt antal borgere, der lider og dør pga. Obamas katastrofale økonomiske politik, som han selv kalder en succesfuld, økonomisk genrejsning. Der er en voldsom stigning i tilfælde af overdosis af narkotika og dødsraten generelt.

Lad os se på Obamas historie. Hans trang til at dræbe stammer fra hans egen opvækst, har LaRouche mange gange understreget. Hans stedfar, Lolo Soetero i Indonesien, var en drabsagent i den undergravende virksomhed og nedslagtning (1965-66), der

skulle vælte præsident Sukarnos regering. I sin selvbiografi skriver han, hvordan han i denne periode lærte, at drab på de svage er, hvad de stærke gør. (*Dreams from My Father*)

LaRouche bemærkede, at

»internationalt har vi netop nu folk, der leder et globalt program for udvikling og fred [den eurasiske Nye Silkevej, med præsidenterne Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin, og andre], men Obama vil ikke bare lade tingene forløbe på en fredelig måde«.

De vil dræbe; så har vi problemet, og det hele er blodig uorden. LaRouche understregede, at *»Alle signalerne er til stede. Obama har gjort det ganske klart«.*

LaRouche krævede, at man tog skridt til at advare folk. *»Obama har gentagne gange vist, at han er parat til drab i stor skala i USA og andre nationer.«* Det, der må gøres, er, at *»Obama må lukkes ned«* for at forhindre det, han har til hensigt at gøre.

Foto: Præsident Obama kæmper for TPP under et møde i House Democratic Caucus på Capitol Hill, juni, 2015. (Foto: Whitehouse.gov)

**Samarbejd med Rusland for
at mestre atomkernen,
og rejs ud i rummet!
LaRouchePAC Internationale**

Webcast, 16. december, 2016

Medierne svirrer med historier om, at den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin hackede de amerikanske valg. Vi får kommentarer fra Lyndon LaRouche om hele denne larm, og vi hører fra et medlem af Efterretnings-veteraner for Sund Fornuft (VIPS), tidligere senator fra Alaska, Mike Gravel, om disse beskyldninger, samt om, hvad vore relationer med Rusland og Kina bør være. Dernæst bevæger vi os ud i rummet, med overvejelser over behovet for fælles, internationalt samarbejde om forsvar af Jorden mod sådanne kosmiske trusler som vildfarne asteroider og kometer, samt diskuterer den moralske forpligtelse over for fremskridt og videnskabelig opdagelse, der i sig har potentialet til at forene nationer på basis af et nyt grundlag for internationale relationer mod fælles, menneskelige mål!

Engelsk udskrift:

We Need To Develop a Platform of Economic Activity that Makes Mankind an Active Force in the Solar System!

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, December 16, 2016

JASON ROSS: Hi there! It's December 16, 2016, and you're joining us for our Friday LaRouche PAC webcast. We're recording today at 3:30 in the afternoon. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host today. I'm joined in the studio by Ben Deniston and via Google Hang-outs by Kesha Rogers, member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

So, the world has presently undergone a tumultuous sea-change in its orientation; away from the trans-Atlantic world

of wars, of economic stagnation. We've seen this recently in such votes as the Brexit vote in England, which was a repudiation of that orientation; we've seen it in the election of Donald Trump in the United States, which certainly a repudiation of what Obama had represented and what Hillary was seen as being sure to continue. Instead, we're seeing something much better come about in potential, which is the war avoidance strategy from Russia and the economic cooperation being put forward by China through the Belt and Road initiative; which is the Chinese policy initiative which has come as a result of decades of organizing by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche and their associates for a policy which they had called the Eurasian Land-Bridge and which has now become the New Silk Road, and as China calls it, the Belt and Road initiative for cooperation on economic projects internationally.

This isn't something that the trans-Atlantic financial and military power is taking lying down. Instead, the use of war, of murder, of destabilization to prevent such cooperation has been put into place; as we've seen with the disastrous military policy of Obama, for example, and of George Bush before him. Over the past few weeks, this has taken a turn with an increasing drumbeat of stories about Russia hacking the US election; of stories

coming out, not backed by hard evidence, but by hearsay and by appealing to the words of authorities that we can presumably trust, that Vladimir Putin threw the election to Donald Trump by hacking the DNC and the emails of John Podesta, and I suppose controlling the thoughts of everybody who voted for Donald Trump.

This has been going on since the summer; this is when the DNC first announced that its email system had been compromised. At that time, in discussions around this, the Secretary General of NATO, Jens Stoltenberg, said "A severe cyber-attack may be classified as a case for the alliance – NATO. Then NATO can and must react. How? That will depend on the severity of the attack." So, putting it on the table that cyber-attacks can be met with military responses by NATO. In October, the famous James Clapper, who said that the US was not wittingly collecting material on millions of Americans when asked by Senator Wyden, Clapper – along with the head of Homeland Security – said in October that "we believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities."

Over the past weeks, we've seen front-page articles in the {New York Times}, the {Washington Post}; for example, last Friday the {Washington Post} without naming any sources or pointing to any specific facts, wrote that "The CIA has concluded, in a secret assessment, that Russia intervened in the 2016 election to help Donald Trump win the Presidency, according to officials

briefed on the matter." So, no named sources. On Monday, plans were announced to have the Electors of the Electoral College briefed by the intelligence agencies on foreign interference in our elections; basically trying to call into question the election itself and the laws governing Electors. Just yesterday, on NPR's "Morning Edition", President Obama said, "I think there is no doubt that when any foreign government tries to impact the integrity of our elections, that we need to take some action. And we will; at a time and place of our choosing. Some of it may be explicit and publicized; some of it may not be. But Mr. Putin is well aware of my feelings on this, because I spoke to him directly about it." That's what Obama had to say yesterday; he spoke about it more at his final press conference at the White House today.

So, we reached Lyndon LaRouche for comment about this, this morning; and I'd like to play for you his response:

LYNDON LAROUCHE [recording]: Those words in his mouth are, as far as they're there, that's a threat to murder people; to murder people of importance. Because this is the way Obama's stepfather taught him, and the way that Obama operated in killing people on Tuesdays during that episode period. So, the point is, the threat is murder; and the best thing to do is say, publicly, that the nations of the planet are now threatened by Obama's

plan

for mass killing of people. And that has to be said; because that's what that guy has always done, since his stepfather trained him. Obama is a killer; and therefore, he's not going to

let things get by peacefully. Obama will kill, unless somebody

stops him. That's the reality here. All the details and so forth, and things of your back and forth, really don't amount to

much right now. Many of the people who are leading the effort of developing the world program don't need to be stirred up. It's only Obama's crowd that are dangerous; and they will kill.

Therefore, it's important for those who are waiting for their opportunity but are not going to ask for it; that's where the problem comes in. Once Obama, with his crowd, starts killing people, that's going to be a bloody mess; and that's going to be

the kind of thing that threatens the people of the United States

and others right now. He's made it clear; the signals are all there. Obama is still going for a kill against the people of the

United States and others.

ROSS: So, there you have LaRouche's views on the expected

response for Obama to take his usual course of killing to get his way on things.

Now, on Monday, the VIPS group – the Veteran Intelligence

Professionals for Sanity – released a memo called "Allegations of Hacking the Election Are Baseless", in which they gave their

reasons for coming to that assessment. We interviewed a

leading

member of the VIPS group, former Senator Mike Gravel – former Senator from Alaska – to get his take on this; and we can play that for you now.

Mike Gravel is one of the signers of a letter that was released by the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity a

couple of days ago in response to the {New York Times} and the general media tumult around Russia hacking the elections, Russia

denying Hillary Clinton the Presidency; that she deserved as a gift from God. So, I'd like to ask Senator Gravel, who is a former adjutant top-secret control officer for the Communications

Intelligence Service, and a special agent of the Counterintelligence Corps; and in addition being a former Senator

from Alaska. Senator Gravel, could you tell our viewers what you

think of this notion that Russia hacked the election and determined the outcome of our Presidential election here in the US?

SEN. MIKE GRAVEL: First off, it's ridiculous! It's far-fetched ridiculous! We know – and here we can be grateful to

Edward Snowden – that the United States' capability, along with

their partners in Britain, have the capability of vacuuming up {every single communication in the world}. That means that the NSA has {all} of Hillary's emails; has {all} of the communications between the US and Russia. And so for the government to come out and say via the intelligence community, that this is all instigated by Russia, is just part of the demonization that we've seen taking place about Putin and Russia,

as part of a plan in the United States to have regime change in Russia. Believe it. We're seeing what's happened in Syria with regime change, which is hundreds of thousands of people displaced and killed. And now we know that it was the US that financed the coup in Kiev, that unseated Ukraine's duly-elected President, who was favorable to Russia; which, of course, is normal, since they are neighbors and were essentially one country at one point. And so we destabilized that, and that was admitted to by the Under Secretary, Victoria Nuland, who's still there; was there under Clinton. She admitted that the United States had spent \$5 billion over a 10-year period, to destabilize the government of Ukraine. We succeeded.

Then, of course, as a reaction to that, when Russia had to continue its fresh-water port, which is Sevastopol, which became under threat, they protected it by annexing – {re}-annexing, let's put it that way – because it was part of Russia before. It was given away by Nikita Khrushchev several years ago.

So, in point of fact, we have all the knowledge in the NSA. Maybe the NSA doesn't talk to the FBI, or doesn't talk to the CIA. I don't know. We've had this problem in 9/11, with nobody connecting the dots; and may have that same problem right now. But there's no question that the United States government does more activity in the cyber world than {anybody else}. Russia is

probably a distant second. China is a distant second. But there's nobody that holds a candle to what we're capable of doing.

So, for our government to turn around – or {elements} within our government let's put it that way – to turn around and say that the Democratic Party was hacked and these hacks were given to WikiLeaks who then released them; well, it seems odd that the American government would have to be partners of WikiLeaks to let this stuff out. What seems more likely, is that somebody within the government, whether rogue or intent, saw this as an ability to try and embarrass Russia; embarrass Putin, and to save face for Hillary, who was promptly losing the election with her skullduggery.

As a result of this, we now see the {New York Times} – and this should not surprise us – the {New York Times} and the {Washington Post}, the two major national newspapers of note, have done a lot of disinformation over the years, and I think this is just one more instance of that disinformation coming out of the {New York Times}. Keep in mind it's the {New York Times} that ginned up the war to invade Iraq. You can take your credits from there, as to what they're capable of doing when they put their mind to it.

So, that's essentially what I think is the case. Here too, we have enough people with skills and knowledge, particularly with our group, the former intelligence officers in the government, very senior intelligence officers – because none of us are spring chickens – to be able to question what has been

put out, and say that this doesn't seem accurate, and doesn't make sense.

ROSS: So, that interview took place on Wednesday; the same day the {New York Times} ran a front-page story – "Hacking the Democrats: How Russia Honed Its Cyber-power and Trained It on an American Election". So, it's half the front page; four full pages inside. That same day, Sam Biddle at the {Intercept} put out what had been amassed as all the public evidence that the Russian government was behind the hack; pointing out that it's not enough evidence. Comparing it to earlier invasions, such as when people working with the Chinese PLA hacked American industrial firms, the Department of Justice put out a 56-page report detailing all the specifics of how it happened; or when North Korea hacked Sony, the evidence was put forward. This time, though, it's just the say-so of intelligence officials.

All of this might look like it's a bunch of flailing around to explain the electoral defeat by blaming anybody except for the terrible candidate that the Democrats had, but it's much more than this. You have to remember, this isn't just domestic theatrics; the case is being made for – as Obama put it – a revenge attack or some kind of answer being made to Russia in some way or another. That is, threatening a nuclear-armed nation over allegations that have not been backed up with any specific evidence and frankly, of accusing Russia of things that the US admits to doing all the time. So, we asked Senator Gravel, what was the intent; why the anti-Russian hysteria? Is this just about the election? What's the push for this? This is what

he
had to say:

SEN. GRAVEL: The intent is to sabotage the potential
new
relationship [with Russia]. That's what the intent is. But
here
too, I think Trump has his own areas of expertise in this
regard.
And the new Secretary of State designate, Rex Tillerson, he
also
has a great deal of experience with the Russian leadership.
And
so, as a result of that, they're going to dictate their own
policy.

What we see right now, is the last regurgitation of a
failed
policy, one that was very dangerous. In demonizing Putin the
way
we've done in American media, Western media, and then turning
around and levelling the charge at them that they are trying
to
destabilize Western and Eastern Europe, is ridiculous. I know
of
no instance – and I would question anybody to quote an
instance
– where Russia has threatened anybody in the last decade in
Eastern Europe and Europe proper. He sells them oil and gas;
why
would he want to destabilize his customers? It makes no sense
at
all. But to the neo-cons, who are intent on trying to protect
the
hegemonic position of the United States in the world, {this
makes
a lot of good sense for them}. They need to demonize Russia
and

Putin, they need to demonize Xi and China, and assert our military prowess in the world. We have a significant economic position in the world, and these militarists feel they've got to shore that position up, with militaristic policies that make no sense at all.

What they should be doing, is joining with China in the Silk Road (One Belt, One Road) to raise the economic level of the world to a higher level, and that would be the biggest contribution we could make to the well-being of people around the world, and to the issue of having world peace. That's what we should be doing. But that's not what's happening. What's happening is what we learned from the study of the Thucydides Trap, where the power which is the global power – which is the United States – is now facing the problem of an ascending power like China moving in and surpassing us. Well, our egos may not be able to take that, but certainly the people of the world could take it; because it would mean greater economic activity, on the part of China.

So, it's all mixed up with this insanity that exists within the American government, by a group of people called neo-cons. They start with Cheney. They go from Cheney/Rumsfeld, that crowd, into the present group of neo-cons. Here you have a person like John Bolton, who's being considered for the Number Two man at the State Department. I can't think of a person who's more idiotic, as a neo-con, than John Bolton. I think Bush is just wantonly

picking people, hither and yon, to satisfy the conservatives.

I think what they're going to find is when these conservatives attempt to assert policy positions that are at variance from Donald Trump, they're going to find they're short-lived. He'll fire them. He's done that on TV and he's used

to that. "Give me the wrong advice, you're fired." That's what you're going to see from a President who's going to be tweeting.

He's going to be tweeting his policies to the American people and

the world, all by himself, in his room, with his little computer.

ROSS: You know, if you have time for one more question, I'd

like to ask you about China, which you brought up. One of Trump's recent appointments was the former governor of Iowa, which is a state that President Xi Jinping of China has close ties to, having lived there for years, studying agriculture when

he was a lower-level figure in the government. You brought up the One Belt, One Road as a potential for the US to be involved

in. It's currently something that, under the Obama administration, the US has been opposing. The US did not join the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; the US urged other nations not to join it as well. What would you see as the proper

or the best – what should the US role in the world be? What should US relations with China in particular be with regard to this program?

SEN. GRAVEL: Well, the U.S. role should, first and foremost, rests upon economic activity – raising the quality of

life for the people in the United States and for the people in

the world. That's the goal that China has set with respect to its One Belt, One Road.

We oppose that because we are refusing to accept the fact that China is the ascendant power, and that within a couple decades, will be the Number One economic power in the world; but not the military power. If you just look at the amount of money they're spending, they spend about 10% of what we do on our defense posture. As a result of that, it demonstrates they have no interest in becoming the military predominant power in the world. They're ceding that to the United States.

But that, of course, is not all that attractive, as you saw in the Pivot to Asia. Thank God that we have a new President, Duterte, in the Philippines, who is now creating a rapprochement to China, which is the most enlightened thing they could do. Their future is not with the United States; their future is as a player in the economy of South Asia. That's what a rapprochement with China portends – that both the Philippines will be the recipient of extensive One Belt, One Road financing to raise the standard of living in the Philippines, which used to be superior to many of the other countries in Asia, and is now in the lower brackets.

My recommendation is the United States and the new administration would be Trump negotiating his "deal." And the deal he can negotiate is that, yes, the United States will join with China, and will

raise
the economic threshold of the world.

ROSS: That sounds like an excellent direction for the
US.

I was wondering, do you have any other final thoughts you'd
like
to leave for our viewers?

SEN. GRAVEL: No, not at all, except to thank the
LaRouche
organization for doing good work in advancing the cause of
peace,
and in advancing the cause of economic growth. The only way we
going to bring about world peace is when we raise the standard
of
living of the people throughout the world. Again, thank you
for
the good work in that regard.

ROSS: Senator Mike Gravel, thank you very much.

SEN. GRAVEL: You're welcome.

ROSS: While keeping up front that assessment from
LaRouche
that Obama the murderer is not going to take this transition,
take this shift lying down, and the use of the Russian hacking
business as an opportunity from their perspective to create
conflict, let's switch gears and discuss more about what that
better future ought to be; what our positive policy is. I'd
like
to turn it over now to Ben Deniston.

BEN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. This should serve as a
useful
counterpoint, I think, to everything we were just discussing
here. In the recent weeks, we've had some discussions with
Lyndon LaRouche about the prospect of bringing the principle

of

the SDI – Strategic Defense Initiative, or in its modern form, the Strategic Defense of Earth; bringing that principle back onto

the table in this potential new strategic environment where, assuming Obama doesn't get his way and doesn't start thermonuclear war before the next President even has a chance to

take power, we could see a new alliance emerging between the United States, Russia, and China. And setting aside this insane

geopolitical framework of viewing these nations as our adversaries and doing everything we can to undermine their growth

and development and rise to world prominence. Mr. LaRouche was

very supportive of this being a time in which the Strategic Defense of Earth policy can come back as a real pillar of a new

security architecture for the planet; which was also a focus that

Helga Zepp-LaRouche had when we were discussing it with her earlier in the week as well. This can be a critical pillar for

how the security, the defense, the military institutions of nations in this new era, coming together and cooperating on the

new challenges, the common threats and issues that face all nations. The reason why I say this is a principle, is because we're in a new – I would really say for the past couple of generations – a new historical phase for mankind in this thermonuclear age. We've reached the point where if we continue

a geopolitical, imperial policy where a leading power tries to maintain control at all costs, you're at the point where if that

goes to full-scale war as it has in past periods, past

centuries,
you're talking about the annihilation of mankind. You're
talking
about a new phase of mankind, where full-blown warfare now has
the ability to wipe out civilization as we know it. That's
been
an historically new environment that mankind has been dealing
with in the past generations. Now, we're seeing the potential
for a build-up around that kind of war to be put off the
table;
put on the back burner around a new administration. But what
we're talking about with this Strategic Defense of Earth and
in
the context of the broader exploration of space, the joint
development of space which Kesha will have some comments on in
a
little bit. This needs to become a central positive issue
that
we rally nations around; it can't just become "Let's not have
war
or conflict because it's bad"; but "Let's have a positive,
truthful conception – a real principle – of what are the
issues
that face all nations together, that we should be rallying
around
in cooperation."

That was LaRouche's SDI originally; {LaRouche's SDI},
not
necessarily the program that got implemented to some degree.
But
LaRouche's idea of the SDI, which was a joint open cooperative
program with the Soviet Union; sharing technologies and
capabilities, and jointly developing new capabilities to – as
Reagan said – "render the threat of thermonuclear weapons
impotent and obsolete." We'd actually be working with the
Soviets to do this; and Mr. LaRouche recruited Dr. Edward
Teller,

President Reagan around this idea. These were not hippie, flower-wielding peaceniks; these are not people that just ran around saying "No war. War is bad." These are pretty serious, staunch conservative Cold Warriors to a certain degree; but they recognized the truthful validity of what LaRouche was developing around his idea of the SDI. Mankind had reached a point where we needed positive, collaborative, joint development of these kinds of capabilities for the common aims of nations. Mr. LaRouche came incredibly close, in collaboration with Reagan, Teller, and others, to really overturning the strategic framework back in the '80s with that program.

But that hasn't really gone away. We've discussed this on shows in the past, but it's worth just reminding people that in the '90s, right in the aftermath of the attempt to get the full SDI program, there was kind of a re-emergence of the same idea around the defense of Earth. The recognition at that time – in the early '90s – that the Earth is actually incredibly vulnerable to asteroid strikes, comet strikes; and we should actually be looking at what the heck we can do on this planet to defend the planet from these kinds of potential disasters. That was something that Dr. Edward Teller, in direct collaboration with other veterans of the SDI and their direct counterparts in Russia, took up as a major focus in the '90s. You had a whole

series of conferences and investigations, and proposals really, for the same type of joint open cooperation between the defense institutions and related institutions in the United States and Russia for cooperation around this common threat of the defense of Earth from not only missiles, but missiles coming from the Solar System; these asteroids. Unfortunately, it didn't fully go through at the time. We had the continuation of this geopolitical framework, which has obviously continued through Bush and now Obama. But this issue has come back up again. It was in 2012 that the Russians refloated the offer, and it was named the Strategic Defense of Earth in some of the news coverage. Direct, explicit opposition to the US and NATO advancing their missile defense systems towards Russia's borders into Eastern Europe. They said, why don't we have a joint cooperative program for a Strategic Defense of Earth against the threats of asteroids and related issues? Now, today, again with the prospect of a real shift in the United States, assuming we can contain Obama and he doesn't return to his murderous streak and orientation as Mr. LaRouche has warned, we could actually see this principle emerge and become a central pillar of a new historical era today.

So, we thought it would be appropriate today, kind of as a counterpoint, to start to put some of this issue back on the table. I wanted to start just by illustrating some of what these threats are; what we're facing in terms of the threats to the

Earth from these objects in our Solar System. If we go to the slideshow, we have a first graphic [Fig. 1] illustrating just the reality that these impacts happen; and they happen quite frankly a lot more frequently than people probably tend to realize. In the animation, you can see the famous, very well-documented, surprise Chelyabinsk impact over Russia. Which we had no warning about; we did not know was coming. This frankly very small asteroid came in and impacted with such a high speed – which is characteristic of all of these collisions in the Solar System. A lot of the energy release is due to the fact that these speeds are incredibly fast. When you get an impact of two orbiting bodies in the Solar System, you tend to get massive energy releases, explosions. Here you had a very small object intersecting the Earth; slamming into the atmosphere and releasing the energy of a small nuclear explosion as it hit. This, I think, awakened a lot of the world to the reality that these kinds of things do happen, and we have no defense. One, we didn't even see this one coming; and two, if we had seen it coming, we have no demonstrated, developed capability to defend the Earth from these kinds of challenges. I'd like to point people to on this graphic additionally, from some data that's been released in the relatively recent period, we can see in this map of the world, an illustration of many smaller meteor impacts into the atmosphere that have occurred just between 1994 and 2013. The Chelyabinsk impact was the largest in this time range; these all were smaller than the Chelyabinsk impact, but these

were still large explosions in the upper atmosphere. You can see that they've painted the entire Earth over the course of this time period; just to illustrate the fact that these impacts are constantly occurring.

Just to give another sense of defending the Earth from these asteroids, here is a schematic of the inner Solar System [Fig. 2]. You can see Jupiter's orbit as the farthest orbit out there; obviously then comes Mars, and Earth's orbit is a little bit darker than the other orbits. All of these blue lines – assuming you have high resolution to see the details of this visual – this blue haze you might see is actually composed of over 1400 orbits of asteroids that are specifically classified as particularly hazardous asteroids. That is, asteroids whose orbits cross the Earth's orbit at some point and create the potential for there to be an intersection where the asteroid is at the intersection at the same time as the Earth, and you have an impact, a collision. You can see here how crowded the inner Solar System is.

Fortunately, among these that we know of, none of these are expected to hit in the next century or any foreseeable timeframe as far as we know. This alone looks pretty dense, pretty packed in the inner Solar System here. What people should really get their mind around is, this is a tiny fraction of what we expect to be out there.

We can see here, if we take a little bit more

complicated

graphic [Fig. 3] and break it down, there are literally hundreds

of thousands to millions of asteroids of the size of the Chelyabinsk meteor or bigger that we have not discovered.

Based

on our understanding of the distribution of asteroids of different sizes, we know that they're out there; we just don't know where they are. We don't know which ones might impact, which ones might not. We don't know when the impacts would be.

Here is a depiction [Fig. 4], you can see the relationship

between, on the horizontal axis in a logarithmic scale, different

sizes of near-Earth asteroids. On the far right, you can see the

very large ones in the range of kilometers across in diameter, all the way down to sizes of meters. On the vertical axis, you

can see the expected estimates of the distribution, the number,

of near-Earth asteroids of those sizes. You can see for the very

large ones, we believe there are not very many; but as you start

to get to smaller sizes, you get a geometric growth in the number

of near-Earth asteroids of these different sizes. You can also

see depicted the scale of the damage that would be inflicted on

the Earth if it were to hit over an unlucky location. The Chelyabinsk impact being pretty much the smallest size that would

not – kind of representing a lower limit on what doesn't do huge

amounts of damage. But if it were just a little bigger, that

could have caused really catastrophic effects for Chelyabinsk, Russia – that region. In this range, what people sometimes call a "city-killer" range; the size of object that would release the energy of a large thermonuclear explosion, we've discovered maybe 1% of the near-Earth asteroids in this size range.

While NASA has done a good job of finding and discovering a number of the larger objects which can do damage over a large fraction of the Earth if not effect the entirety of the Earth; we've found a good number of those for the asteroids in particular. But as you start to go to these smaller sizes, we've barely scratched the surface. As dense as you think this previous graphic is in terms of the number of bodies out there, there are orders of magnitude more that could do serious damage that we just don't know about. Again, the first step is knowing where they are and when they might hit; the second step is actually having a defense capability. We've not really done anything besides general studies and theoretical investigations on that front. So, this is still an open, unanswered challenge. But this is kind of just the first step in a real defense of the planet Earth from these types of cosmic challenges. As people are probably aware, you also have the issue of comets. This really grabbed people's attention in the mid '90s when mankind sat on the planet Earth, looked to Jupiter, and watched a massive comet that had broken apart into a series of fragments as you can

see in the upper graphic [Fig. 5] there, collide with Jupiter. In the moving animation, you see the explosion of one of these fragments as it impacted Jupiter's surface. The other bright object is one of Jupiter's moons; but this is an image in the infrared where you can see the effects of these energetic types of activities more clearly. In the purple image, you can clearly see the effects of the impact on the surface of Jupiter after the impact had occurred. These impacts let marks the size of the planet Earth on Jupiter's surface.

So, this was a big wake-up call in the mid '90s. This was comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 was one of the designations for it. Before this period, it wasn't widely accepting that we had to think about these types of impacts. When this occurred and they found this stream of comet fragments about a year before it actually hit; they looked at its orbit and said, "Wow! This is going hit Jupiter." So, everyone was sitting there watching, as this thing went up. We had the Hubble telescope, all these telescopes pointing; we saw this thing as well as we could from all over the world. This really was a major wake-up call to the fact that these impacts really do occur. They can come from asteroids, which you saw in the illustration of the inner Solar System, but they can also come from comets; which represents a qualitatively different challenge, as we'll see in the next animation. [Fig. 6]

This should give you a sense of this greater, more difficult challenge posed by comets. This is a particular case of a

comet

name C1996B2; and this was discovered in January 31, 1996.

That's when we first knew this comet even existed. As you can see in the animation which is based directly off of the orbital

data from NASA, we discovered this comet at the beginning of this

animation when it was just out past the orbit of Mars. Within two months, it made a close pass by the Earth. We had no idea it

was out there until two months before it makes of close pass by

the Earth. Whereas the object that hit over Russia – the Chelyabinsk impact – was measured at about 20 meters in diameter; this object is estimated to be about 5 kilometers in diameter. That's about half the diameter of the comet that's believed to have taken out the dinosaurs. As we let the animation play out, we see something very interesting that's characteristic of this distinct nature of the challenge of comets. Look at its orbit. The circular orbits you see here are

the outer planets; that's Neptune's orbit. So, this has an extremely elliptical orbit that takes it far out into the depths

of the Solar System. When these comets are out there in the far

reaches of the Solar System, they're incredibly difficult to see.

So, we only see them when they're starting to come into the inner

Solar System. Again, as this case demonstrated, we saw this one

two months before it made a close pass. If that had been on an

impact trajectory, there would have been nothing we could have done. When we're talking about that size of an object with these

comets, we're talking about something that can wipe out civilization. That is a global catastrophic impact, an object of that size. We're not talking about the local scale damage of the asteroids we were talking about a second ago; we're talking about catastrophic effects across the whole planet.

So, this is another depiction [Fig. 7] of where we think these bodies are. Based on the orbits of these comets – sometimes technically referred to as long period comets; it's believed that many of these comets reside in the farthest outreaches of the Solar System. Far, far beyond the outer planets. This is a logarithmic scale, so you can see that this distribution of comets – sometimes referred to as the Oort Cloud – begins over tens of times past where Voyager has currently reached, and extends tens times farther than that. We're talking about the very outskirts of the gravitational hold of the Sun. It's believed, again, we haven't seen this region – but based on the orbits of comets we see coming in just in the short time period mankind has been able to make these observations – it's believed that this is a very large population of bodies out in this outer region of the Solar System. Because the gravitational effect of the Sun is so weak out there, it doesn't take much to perturb their orbits and potentially send some into the inner Solar System. Again, with our current capabilities, we're creating scenarios when we only see them months, maybe if we're lucky a few years, before an impact. Certainly not enough time

to do anything about it with our current capabilities.

Now, I just want to end on kind of an interesting note, that there are some studies – although the data is limited – indicating there might be certain cyclical natures to these large comet impacts. Some people even believe it could relate to how the Solar System moves through the galaxy; which raises some very interesting questions about how this outer region of comets could get perturbed on a periodic basis and send in what they call "showers" – cometary showers of many comets coming into the inner Solar System, creating a scenario where it's much more likely that Earth or the other planets might get hit with an impact as Jupiter got hit in the '90s.

I think it's just worth noting that one of the leading astronomers in this whole field, Eugene Shoemaker, who unfortunately passed away in the late '90s, had pioneered much of the work in this field. And for whom this comet that impact Jupiter is named; him and his wife, who discovered it together. He himself believed that it is likely that we are currently in the period of a comet shower; that was something that he published in the late '90s. Based upon the types of crater records and other evidence, he said it's not certain, but it could be the case that we're currently in the middle of what on a human time scale is a long period in which there's an increased frequency of cometary entries into the inner Solar System and an increased likelihood of impacts occurring. Whether this directly accounts for his hypothesis or not, it was only last year that

we found out that a relatively dim star had actually passed through the Oort Cloud about 70,000 years ago; which is one of the kinds of scenarios that can perturb many of these bodies. Again, since these things are so far away, it can take 70,000 years for these things to reach the inner Solar System. The point is, this is still incredibly preliminary knowledge of this region – of the Oort Cloud; of the region between the Oort Cloud and the inner Solar System. There could be a long period comet that's only ten years out, that's been travelling for 50,000 years from the Oort Cloud, or even longer; and it's now only ten years away and it's on a direct impact course with the Earth, and we wouldn't even know. It could be just in the outskirts of the outer planets region of the Solar System; not even in this far, far depths region. Again, we're talking about things that can devastate civilization completely, globally as we know it.

This discovery of this dim star passing through the Oort Cloud, we just found that out a year ago. How many other bodies are out there that might have had close passes in the geologically recent past that could be doing similar effects? The point is, our knowledge is incredibly miniscule for something that threatens the entire planet; and our defense capability doesn't exist. This typifies just one of the issues; and I think there's a lot more we're going to get into in coming shows. But this typifies one of the issues that is front and center for

this

principle of the SDI, the SDE to re-emerge and center around. These are threats that don't recognize national borders; they don't recognize cultural boundaries. They challenge the entire

planet and they're outside of our current capabilities. If we're

going to have a sane and principled relationship for leading nations in the planet, then it has to return to these kinds of challenges. Addressing these common aims and threats as Dr. Edward Teller had spoken of, as Mr. LaRouche put on the table with this whole SDI proposal.

The point that I think we should really end on, and maybe

discuss a little bit in conclusion, is that – and this is something that we've been discussing with Mr. LaRouche over the

recent weeks – this isn't a separate, isolated issue. This is part of mankind becoming a Solar System species. This is part of

mankind expanding to a new level, developing a platform of economic activity that makes mankind a presence, an active force

in the Solar System. We can come up with specific scenarios where you can deflect one asteroid or maybe a particular telescope that can help us see some of these things; and we should be discussing and looking at those things. But the fundamental issue is, how do we expand mankind into the Solar System as a much more active and capable presence where we can handle these kinds of challenges? How do we engage other nations

in cooperation and collaboration, instead of hiding our technology and hiding our capabilities because we want to have a

leg up over China or Russia? How do we jointly develop the fundamental science and technologies mankind needs to defend the

planet Earth in an open, cooperative way?

If we're going to seriously, actually get into that, Mr.

LaRouche has been emphatic; that takes us right to the work of Krafft Ehrlicke, his collaboration with Krafft Ehrlicke, and these

early space pioneers who really worked out the fundamental principles of mankind's development of the Solar System. I think

that is fully integrated with this Strategic Defense of Earth perspective. I think Kesha might have more to say, but that's going to be a critical part of this new space paradigm that we've

been discussing in recent weeks.

KESHA ROGERS: Very good. I wanted to go back and really

take up this conception of what it really means to advance the cause for peace. Because first of all, we have to end the perpetuation and acceptance of a big lie, a murderous lie that human beings cannot have access to that which is truthful.

This

is what the fight really is. When you're talking about the murderous policy of Obama, it's not a matter of opinion or whether or not you have a belief or non-belief, or like or dislike this President. This President is acting on behalf of the same factions which are indicative of what Bertrand Russell

actually represented. He set back the cause of human progress in

society. To say that if you make enough people believe that snow

is black, or you perpetuate a lie enough; then enough people will

believe it. But now, we're seeing that that's not working

anymore. That the cause that Bertrand Russell and those who were

against the genius of Albert Einstein that mankind can have access to that which is truthful, that system is being destroyed;

it's losing out, and there is a new era, a new system of mankind

emerging that is being represented by what the United States has

the potential to become if we break with the lies that have been

perpetuated and say, "No more! Obama must be thrown in jail now." Anybody who's pushing this policy that we have to be at odds with nations such as Russia and China, are continuing to set

back the progress of mankind. This is not just about waiting for

the next election and saying OK, well we dealt with Obama and hopefully we can survive this next few weeks or so. The question

is, that people who continue to allow for this murderous policy

to dominate the thinking and the direction of our nation, cannot

be tolerated.

I think it's important to really look at what it is that

this President has done in setting back the course of human progress by his dismantling and attacks on the manned space program. What you're really dealing with right now is that we have to look at the advancement of the space program as a new evolutionary leap in the progress of mankind. To look at the advancement of the space program not just as a discretionary budgetary matter for internal US relations, but as Mr. LaRouche

said at the onset of this election when Mr. Trump was elected, you now have a new system of international relations emerging. The United States has to join with that.

But when you're talking about advancing the cause of

peace,
it's expressive of the fight that Mr. LaRouche, his wife Helga,
and this organization have been advancing and leading for a very
long time. Then you talk about Mr. LaRouche's policy of the Strategic Defense Initiative; a lot of people tried to lower that
to a scale of just missile defense and defense of nations acting
against the appearance of nuclear weapons from other nations,
or
just on a small scale. But what you're talking about, is the advancement of an evolutionary leap in the progress of mankind throughout the Solar System, throughout the Universe. And mankind understanding how to come together for a common aim of mankind; to submit to the development of the whole of the Solar
System, which is going to increase our understanding of how to advance mankind both here on Earth and off the planet. This is
what has been missing. The way people think about human economy,
the way people think about relationships to the advancement of mankind in the Universe, is based on these small scale relations;
but it has to be completely changed at this point in time.
What
Krafft Ehrlicke discussed in terms of an extraterrestrial imperative in his third law, was really taking the lid off on human progress; that mankind was an expression of unlimited potential. He says in that third law that by expanding through
the Universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of Reason and the wisdom of moral law within himself.

The problem is that we have lost that sense of moral

law

within mankind to act for the betterment of human beings and human progress. And have lost that power of Reason because we refuse to fight for that which is truthful. That has to end; that has to be stopped now. I think the fight going forward, has to be centered around this basis; that we are going to uplift human society out of the depths of despair, and actually organize around a new commitment to human progress that has been missing for far too long.

I just wanted to say that because I think that we are on the verge of a new era for mankind right now, but people have to get a sense of it. It's not going to happen unless you fight for it; unless you fight to bring it into existence. The starting point of that is that we have to develop a new system of international relations, working with Russia, with China; not as enemies, but working together to end this threat to human progress that has been going on for far too long.

ROSS: Absolutely! I think that ties it also with that other major leap that's needed in humanity of Lyndon LaRouche's fourth law of his "Four Laws to Save the USA Now"; which is the breakthrough to get fusion power. Like this need for adopting a platform that allows us to have a control over space, that let's

us really have this region of the Solar System; something that's within our power, within our reach, within our ability to interact with and intervene on if something is about to kill us all. The essential to make that happen is fusion power. No matter how efficient a windmill you design, or no matter what breakthroughs they make in building solar panels, those aren't ever going to be at all useful for moving into space. You're not going to go to Mars with a windmill. What we are going to do that's going to transform our relationship to nature – I think this idea that we must grow; it's the characteristic of the human species, this moral law that you spoke of, Kesha. This law that we have to answer to is that it's been the nature of the Universe to develop; we've seen it with the creation of the Solar System. We've seen it with the development of life on this planet into increasingly higher forms; not in a purely qualitative way, but also through some specific quantitative measures adopted by Vladimir Vernadsky, for example. Where he looked at the increase of concentration of energy in forms of life; where he looked at the increasing range of chemical elements that were used by life; an increasing power and density of energy flow through the biosphere. That's really up to us at this point. The Universe, in a real way, depends upon us for those next levels of development that are the fruits of our minds. To create things in nature that have never happened before. Just like

multi-cellular life, that was a new thing that hadn't happened before; chlorophyll – life going extraterrestrial to get the power of the Sun to feed on. That was something that hadn't been seen before. Now, it's the kinds of things that we do: electromagnetism; the breakthroughs that we have available to us with nuclear science, with fusion power. This is the calling that we have to respond to; this is something that we can come to in resonance with other nations around the planet and really cooperate on as a real basis for international relations. Not maintaining supremacy, or maintaining the power of a bloc; but having a serious mission that is common to all people to collaborate on and to move forward.

DENISTON: It's maybe a minor point relative to everything, but I couldn't help noticing when Mr. Gravel mentioned that we spent \$5 billion over 10 years to destabilize Ukraine; that's more per year than our fusion budget by a fair amount. That's \$500 million a year; our fusion budget for magnetic confinement has been significantly less than that. Just in terms of a particular reflection of the totality; we're spending more to overthrow Ukraine, to mess with Russia, than we're spending on what could be infinite power for mankind for centuries to come.

ROSS: Priorities, huh?

DENISTON: Yeah.

ROSS: All right. I think that was a good discussion; we hit on a lot of topics today. I think if we keep ourselves focussed on getting these Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche implemented and preventing the hullabaloo now around this

Russian hacking, etc. In these last periods of the current administration, they're attempting to create some sort of possibly irreversible conflict with Russia; that has to be stopped, and the foundation for a new system of cooperation among nations and people has to be put into place. That's something that we're very uniquely situated to do. So, I look forward to your help in making that a possibility and seeing you next time on larouchepac.com. Good bye.

Hvad handler alt hysteriet om?

Lyndon LaRouche: Obama prøver bare at undgå fængsel!

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. december, 2016 – Mangeårig medarbejder Harley Schlanger sendte her til morgen følgende rapport:

»Jeg briefede Lyn [Lyndon LaRouche] her til morgen og gennemgik optrapningen af hele anti-Putin-hysteriet. Efter fem minutter eller så, hvor jeg rapporterede om de utroligt absurde historier på NBC (*'høj grad af overbevisning om Putins direkte involvering' i hacking*); New York Times' (*'Hvordan Moskva sigtede et perfekt våben mod de amerikanske valg'*, og lederartikel, *'Aleppos ødelæggere: Assad, Putin, Iran'*), og andre, samt kravet om enten, at Valgforsamlingen (Electoral College) afviser Trump, eller et nyt valg, sagde Lyndon

LaRouche,

'Dette er tåbeligt sludder, det er et bedrag'.

»Jeg sagde, jeg ved, det er bedrag, men, mener du ikke, at dette tilsigter enten at fjerne Trump, eller begrænse ham? (LaRouche):

'Nej, det vil aldrig virke. Dette er alt sammen fantasi, det er vrøvl. Det kommer fra den politisk døde Obama. Han er færdig, han burde anklages for sine forbrydelser. Dette er et forsøg på at holde ham fri af fængsel.'

Jeg (Schlanger) sagde til ham, at Roger Stone har kaldt dette for et 'blødt kup' og mindede om Watergate. LaRouche sagde,

'Nej, det her er helt anderledes, der foregår noget andet',

hvor han igen henviste til det nye paradigme. Han understregede, efter en briefing om [Janet] Yellens (direktør for Federal Reserve) kommentarer efter gårsdagens møde i Federal Reserve,

'Det er uden betydning; det er alt sammen fantasi. De kan intet gøre.'

Det, der karakteriserer det her, er, at Putin er en

'selvstændig person, der ved, hvad han gør. Det kan ikke stoppes.'

Systemet er færdigt, og det, vi hører, er

'folk, der er skyldige og har et reb om halsen og håber på, at rebet ikke trækker dem ned'.

Han sagde, at vi blot behøver at gennemgå Obamas forbrydelser: han slår amerikanere ihjel med Obamacare (Obamas 'sundhedsreform': Loven om Beskyttelse af Patienter og en Økonomisk Overkommelig Sygesikring) og sin økonomiske politik, og med sine tirsdags-dræbermøder, burde han sættes i fængsel;

han har gentaget begået forbrydelser. Fortæl blot dette til folk – der er ingen substans i det, som efterretningssamfundet, medier osv., siger,

'det er alt sammen sludder'. 'Vi må holde fast ved det, vi laver. Dette er alt sammen hysteri, men intet vil komme ud af det; det vil ikke få nogen effekt'«.

Her sluttede Schlangers rapport.

☒ Hvad dette betyder, er ganske enkelt: Hvem vil yde det amerikanske folk et lederskab for gennemførelse af **LaRouches Fire Love**, og for at bringe USA med ind i Verdenslandbroen? Bortset fra os, er der ingen. Ingen!

**»Donald Trump og det Nye,
Internationale Paradigme«
(DANSK) Helga Zepp-LaRouches
hovedtale
ved Schiller
Instituttet/EIR's seminar
i København, 12. dec., 2016.**

Jeg mener, at vi bør være meget glade, for hvis dette alt sammen går den rigtige vej; og det er for en stor del vores personlige forpligtelse at hjælpe, og jeg beder jer alle sammen om ikke at være passive tilskuere, men gå med i Schiller Instituttet for at være med til at implementere disse

visioner og disse ideer, for så vil vi blive meget heldige med, at vi i vores levetid kan leve det nye paradigme. Og det nye paradigme vil blive første gang, menneskets værdighed vil blive virkeliggjort, og jeg mener, at det er en meget, meget vigtig mission, som vi alle bør vedtage.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

(Efterfølgende spørgsmål og svar, engelsk udskrift: [Klik her.](#))

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel

til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på Schiller Institutets og EIR's seminar i København: Donald Trump og det nye internationale paradigme. ENGELSK udskrift af tale samt Spørgsmål og Svar

København, 12. december, 2016 – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i

København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i kampen for det nye paradigme.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale, der varer omkring 1 time og 20 minutter, kan høres ovenover eller her:

https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var

repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).

—

English: Introductory article

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on 'Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm'

COPENHAGEN, Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS) – Today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche was the special guest speaker at a Schiller Institute/{EIR} seminar in Copenhagen entitled, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Eight diplomats from six countries attended, including two ambassadors. There were nations from Western Europe, Southwest Asia, Western and Eastern Asia, and Africa. In addition, there were around 30 Schiller Institute members and contacts, as well as a few representatives of various Danish and international institutions.

The event was opened by the presentation of a Chinese love song performed by Feride Istogu Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Afterwards, Tom Gillesberg, the chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark, introduced Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, describing her historical role in bringing about the New Silk Road policy.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's very inspiring, in-depth speech began with the revolution against globalization represented by the Brexit, the Trump election, and the Italian No vote. She gave

an evaluation of the potential represented by some of the statements and appointments Trump has made so far, and then proceeded with a detailed discussion of the two conflicting paradigms in the world today. Zepp-LaRouche then uplifted the audience with the beautiful ideas of space scientist Krafft Ehricke and Renaissance philosopher Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. She concluded with an appeal to those present not to act as spectators on the stage of history, but engage in the battle for the new paradigm with us.

Her speech, about 80 minutes long, may be heard above, or at: https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

Zepp-LaRouche's speech and discussion had a profound effect on all present.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Discussion:

(There is no video or audio of the discussion period, only this transcript.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

(To facilitate free discussion, the questioners are not identified, and the questions are summarized. The answers are complete.)

Question: Can we be optimistic about Trump's presidency, because he is skeptical about climate change, is for trade war with China and Mexico, opposes the free trade deals, and has

called for tearing up the nuclear deal with Iran.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I said earlier that the potentialities for change are there, but it depends, to a very large extent, upon us – what we do. When Trump got elected, my first response was, this is what I call the ‘dog pull-tail, let-go feeling.’ What I mean by that is that when you pull the tail of a dog, which you should never do, naturally, and you let go, the pain stops. When you pull, there is pain, and when you stop pulling, the pain goes away.

So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWIII, and that was really the primary point, because if Hillary Clinton would have been elected – unfortunately, Hillary Clinton, when she was in the Obama administration, transformed from being a relatively OK person, she was never great, but in 2008, she was relatively decent, compared to what she became, because she capitulated to Obama, and when she made this terrible statement, for example, in Libya, about the murder of Gaddafi, “We came, we saw, and he died.” This is barbarism.

Her behavior in the Ben Ghazi case. There were so many things where she became worse than Obama, almost. So the immediate thing was that that big danger, that she would have continued the policies of Bush and Obama, in the confrontation with Russia and China, that that was stopped is, already, for the survival of civilization, the most important step.

Now, on these other points. Naturally, there is climate change. There is no question about it. But the question is, what is the cause of it? And the Schiller Institute had several conferences where we invited extremely important scientists who presented, beyond a doubt, that if you look at the last 500 million years in the history of the Earth, you have a continuous cycle of ice ages, of warming periods, of small ice ages, and the man-made component of climate change is absolutely negligible. It’s a big fraud, for example, it’s a big business. To sell CO2 omission quotas, is like selling indulgences in the Middle Ages.

Obviously, there are climate changes, and some countries which have low coasts are very much affected, but then you have to adapt to these climate changes with modern technology, and you cannot solve the problem by going to electric cars, or going to decarbonization of the world economy. This is a big fraud, and I am not saying that Trump is saying this for all the right reasons, but the idea to impose measures implied with the "great transformation" Schellnhuber is talking about – I mean these people do not want development.

We have been on this case for the last – as a matter of fact, we, the LaRouche movement, had a conception about the development of the world really starting at the end of the sixties.

I joined Mr. LaRouche because I went to China, Africa, other Asian countries, and I saw the horrible, horrible underdevelopment. So I came back from this trip, and I said, 'I have to become political, because I want to change this.' I could give you a long, long story of the many observations, because I went with a cargo ship, and when you go to these countries with a cargo ship, you get a quite different idea than if you go on a 5-star cruise, and hotels. You see how the poverty affects people in their real lives. And I came back, and I looked at all the political movements, and I saw that LaRouche was the only one who said, 'We have to have Third World development. We have to have technology transfer. We have to alleviate this poverty.'

And we had a positive conception already in the seventies, and therefore, when the Club of Rome appeared, we immediately said, 'This is a fraud.' Because the Club of Rome said, 'There are limits to growth. We have reached equilibrium. Until the year 1972, you could develop, but now, we have reached equilibrium, and we have to have sustainable development. We have to have appropriate technology.' These notions did not exist before, because before, you had the idea of a UN Development Decade, where each decade, you would overcome the underdevelopment by qualitative jumps. And when we recognized this propaganda by the Club of Rome, we immediately said,

'This is a complete fraud,' and the people who wrote the book "Limits to Growth," Meadows and Forrester ...

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

A: I would like to give you written documentation afterwards of the studies that were made by these geologists, which are, without question, the explanation of climate change is not man-made. The anthropogenic aspect of it is so miniscule. Climate change has to do with the position of the solar system in the galaxy, which goes in cycles around a certain axis, and you can see that over 500 million years, the data confirms that you have these wide changes. Greenland is called Greenland, because it was green. There used to be vineyards. You had ice ages which completely covered the Earth, and the reason why I went into this longer history, is to show how the environmentalist movement was created with the attempt to keep development down, and climate change is just another expression of the same effort.

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO2 emission trade, you have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing, because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, "Against the Stream," is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

The question is, 'What is the source of wealth?' Is the source of wealth cheap labor, to buy cheap raw materials, produce cheaply, and sell expensive? Is that the cause of wealth? No.

The only cause of wealth is the increase in the creativity of labor power. And a good government is, therefore, investing the maximum amount into education, into sponsoring the creativity of youth, of labor, and the more people in the labor force, by percentage, are engineers, scientists, the more productive the economy becomes.

And the free trade system, of which NAFTA is just one example, did exactly the opposite. China, which was part of this in the beginning – the reason why China today has so many environmental problems, like smog, like a large amount of groundwater being contaminated, is the result of the fact that China, in the beginning of its industrialization, accepted being a cheap labor production place for the U.S. and for Europe. When I was in China, even in 1971, I visited some factories which were horrible. They were absolutely horrible. The working conditions were terrible, the labor force, which produced electrical devices for radios, it was horrible. They worked for 18 hours. No health system. It was just terrible. And that is how China developed in the first phase.

But then China, with Deng Xiaoping, started to recognize that that is the wrong way. So China is now on a completely different track. They are putting the maximum emphasis on science and technology, the increase of excellence. Last year, they produced 1 million scientists. That's double of what the U.S. produced. Obviously China is a larger country, but still. What will finally be decisive is the number of people who are creative. And that is why China, right now, has the best education system, because they have understood that the source of wealth is not raw materials. Is not trade conditions. It is the creativity of their own people. And that it a good thing. If we go to a system where we have a certain amount of protectionism, to protect the development of the domestic market, it is a good thing.

There is no danger of cutting [countries off from one another], because all of these infrastructure projects are connectivity. The world will be more connected than ever before. But this whole myth of free trade is really a very bad

thing. It has been coined by the people who profit from it. That's why the world is in the condition it is right now, where the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. The middle class is being destroyed all over the world. And I would really like to communicate with you so that we can deepen this dialogue.

On the Iran thing, I don't think he will break it, but that is my hope. I don't know.

So, I'm not saying he's a – as I said, Baron von Knigge would get a heart attack when he hears Trump's speeches, but the world was in such a grip of evil, satanic evil, that it is a good thing that there is a break, and the unfortunate thing, is that Europe is still in this grip.

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

So, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of the Europeans who react this way to the defeat of Hillary, are obeying another power in their head, and that power I call The British Empire, which is still in place, and it dominates Europe, and that is why they feel – I was asking myself, how come all of these politicians are so arrogant towards the new president of the U.S.? Because they were the boot-lickers of Washington until yesterday, and they would immediately do everything Washington would say and do, so I asked myself, 'Where is this sudden self-assertedness coming from?' And the only explanation I came up with, was to say, they must have an idea that there is another power which is more powerful than Trump, otherwise, they wouldn't have this sudden arrogance.

And it is the British, because you will see tomorrow, because tomorrow, there will be a federal press conference in Berlin, where a number of people will present their contribution to

the German chairmanship of the G-20, which will take place in July in Hamburg. This will be Joachim Schellnhuber, the head of the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change), this is the scientific advisory organization advising the German government. He put out this paper about 'the great transformation,' which we wrote about. You can look in the archive. He is the head of the idea of a decarbonization of the world economy.

Now, if you decarbonize the world economy, without having fusion, that would be one thing, to have fusion power in place. Then you can talk about getting rid of fossil fuels, but without having fusion, and being against nuclear energy, fission, it means that you will reduce the world's population to 1 billion or less, because there is a direct correlation between the energy-flux-density, and the number of people you can maintain. Schellnhuber said that the carrying capacity of the Earth is maximum 1 billion people. He didn't say that he wants to do with the 6 billion who are already there. If he would be consequent, he should hop away from this planet.

And they will announce a sinister plan, to try to use the fact that many countries have environmental problems, to sneak in their anti-development programs. People should not be naïve, because not everybody thinks that population growth is a good thing. There are many people who think that each human being is a parasite, destroying nature. That is the image of man which many people have. The greenies, for example.

We look at it in a different way. We think that the more people you have, the greater longevity you can have, division of labor, and a modern scientific society needs many people with a long life span. Because if you are in the Third World, and you die, and you have an average life expectancy of 40 years, or less, you cannot have scientists, because the production of a scientist takes 30-35 years, and if people then die right away, then you can't have a modern society.

So the more creative people you have, the better. Each human being is an incredible addition, because we are creative.

Tom Gillesberg: Schellnhuber, for his services, was appointed

Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE), and for him, he personally has said, that the highpoint of his existence was that the British Queen, personally, gave him the Order of the British Empire, for his efforts to reduce the possibility for mankind's survival, you could say, so it is connected with what you said.

Q: This is the best speech I have ever heard in my life.

Is this a second American Revolution, and will the Federal Reserve, which is privately owned, be closed down, and will money be created for the benefit of all people, and not just the private Fed?

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

It's the same idea that Friedrich Schiller had in Wilhelm Tell. This is a play he wrote, which takes place in Switzerland. There, the Hapsburg oligarch is also trampling on the rights of the Swiss people, then they unite with the Rütli Oath. There is this beautiful formulation which says, 'When the rights of people are trampled upon, they have the right to reach out to the stars, and take from the stars those rights which are eternally embedded in these stars. (I am not saying it as beautifully as Schiller does.)

If you compare these two texts, the Declaration of Independence, and the Rütli Oath from Schiller's play, they are almost identical, and it's very clear that Schiller was inspired by the American Revolution when he wrote that play, because in his plays, there are many ideas which resonate with

the American Revolution, and he actually wanted to immigrate, at one point, to America.

So I think that if Trump turns out to be another fraudster, which we don't know yet, I think that this process of revolt will continue, because I only mentioned some elements.

I could mention that there are many countries now in realignment. For example, the Philippines, Duterte. This was supposed to be the playground for the conflict with China in the South China Sea. Now Duterte sent his Defense Secretary, Lorenzana, to Russia and China, to buy weapon systems from Russia and China, and to establish a friendship with China, and he said, 'The Philippines is no longer the colony of the U.S.'

Then you have Japan, which was the junior partner of the U.S. in the Pacific. Abe went to Sochi, meeting with Putin. In three days from now, Putin will go to Japan to have a state visit. They are talking about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan.

All of these are new alignments. There is a shift in the strategic situation, and I don't think that that shift can be reversed.

Q: About Russia hacking the U.S. election. Why doesn't the U.S. have anti-hacking measures? Can you explain that?

A: I cannot explain that, for the same reason that I cannot explain why the NSA is surveilling everyone, all their phones, their communications, worldwide. They can observe all of these things, but they don't know about terrorism. They don't know about drug trafficking. They don't know about money laundering. Either their system is not so good, or they are looking in the wrong direction. I can't answer your question.

Q: Will the result of the Brexit be positive for Europe, to enable continental Europe to become stronger, and to improve cooperation with the eastern parts of Europe?

A: I think that the EU is not functioning, and I think it is not just the Brexit. The "No" in Italy is a reflection of the same dynamic. Now you have Gentiloni, the new prime minister, and they will probably go for new elections. Right now, in the

polls, you have the 5 Star Party leading. If they win, and form the new government, they have already said that they would leave the EU, and leave the Euro, and, in a certain sense, it is not functioning.

The reason I was against the introduction of the Euro from the beginning, was because we said that it cannot function. You cannot have a European currency union in something which is not an optimal economic space. You cannot put advanced industry together with an agrarian country, with completely different tax laws, pension laws, and you don't want a political union, because Europe is not a people. You don't have a European people. I don't know what the Danes are saying. I don't know what is in the Danish newspapers. The people of Slovenia have no inkling of what is happening in Alsace-Lorraine, and so forth, and so on. You don't have a European people. Esperanto doesn't function. You have 28 nations, 28 histories, 28 cultures.

That doesn't mean that you can't work together. I think that the idea of Charles de Gaulle to work together as an alliance between perfectly sovereign fatherlands, that is a correct idea. And all these fatherlands can adopt a joint mission, like to develop Africa, or other things.

I just think that this European Union is not going to stay forever.

Q: (followup) Will it be easier for Germany and France to promote this development, as the leading countries?

A: Everybody says that Germany is the biggest beneficiary of globalization, the EU, and the Euro, but that's not really true, because, if you look at it more closely, then you can say that since the introduction of the Euro, the domestic market of Germany has completely stagnated. And the number of people who became poorer has increased.

Q: (followup) What about regarding the dialogue with Russia.

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

I do not think that this EU bureaucracy is capable of reform, because by their self-understanding, they are the local pro-consuls of this empire, and I think that it would be much

better if Germany, France, and other countries have individual relations. And I don't think that – this whole idea that you need a European Empire to compete with Russia and China and other emerging countries – The EU, by definition, is an empire. They have said it themselves. Robert Cooper, who has some kind of advisory function [currently serving as EU Special Advisor with regard to Myanmar], he said that the EU is the fastest expanding empire in history. It's a bad idea. And the Russians for – I noticed this since the beginning of the year 2000, that the Russians did not make a difference anymore between the EU and NATO. They said that it's the same thing. And it is the same thing.

Q: You said that the One Belt, One Road was stripped of commercial interests from the Chinese side, as opposed to the IMF, World Bank. On what basis do you say that it is less interest-driven than the Bretton Woods institutions?

A: Well, because, the question is not that I'm saying that China is perfect. I'm not saying that. But when you look at anything, you have to look at the vector of development, is it going upward, or is it going downward? And from that standpoint, I had the advantage that I was in China in 1971, which was in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. This was so different than China today.

The Cultural Revolution was horrible for the people. The Red Guards would take people out of their homes, put them in jail, send them to the countryside, and people were distraught.

And now, people in China are happy. If you talk to students, or to young people, they are optimistic. They say, 'Oh. I will do this in the future. I have these plans.' I talked to a group of students in Lanzhou two years ago, and they said, 'We will go to Africa. We will develop Africa.' I have never heard a German student say this. Yeah, when I was a student, but that's a long time ago.

I think that it is very worthwhile to read the speeches of Xi Jinping. There is a book, "The Governance of China," but that only has about 60 speeches, and there are many, many more. For example, you should read the speeches he gave when he went to

France, to Germany, and to India.

For example, when he went to India, he made a speech which was really incredible, because he said that he loved Indian culture from his early youth, and then he gave so many examples of the high points of Indian culture, the Gupta period, the Upanishads, the Vedic writings, Rabindranath Tagore, many predicates which prove that he really knows what he is talking about. He is not just one of these politicians who have a PR advisor about how to make nice bubbles in your speeches, but you could really see that he means it. And the same for Germany. He came to Germany and he emphasized Schubert and Heine, things which I also appreciate about Germany, and he did the same thing in France.

And I don't think that the Chinese leadership would agree with me when I say this, but I think that they are less communist than Confucians. They probably would not admit that, because they are officially the Communist Party, and that's OK, but, I come from Trier, and Trier is the birthplace of Karl Marx, so I have studied Karl Marx, and I think that they are still socialist, or communist, or whatever, but they always said that they are communist with Chinese characteristics, and these Chinese characteristics are Confucianism.

And the Confucian idea of man is lifelong learning, lifelong perfection, that everyone should be a Jinzi, a wise man, a noble man, and Confucius said, if the government is bad, then the Jinzi, these wise people, should replace the government. Also the idea that you have to have an harmonious development, starting with the family, continuing in the nation, and then, larger, among the nations.

China is the only country that has not made wars of aggression, colonial wars, in its 5,000 years of history. It was invaded many times, the Opium War, and things like that, but China is not an aggressive nation, at all.

And if you look at what they are doing in practice, the IMF and the World Bank have prevented Third World development, and China is going from one country to the next, building science cities, helping with space cooperation, bringing in developing

countries in the most advanced areas of science, in order to not prevent their development. I think this is a completely different approach.

I think that the Chinese have come up with a new model of government, which I have not seen in any place in Europe, the U.S. ever, and it's a model which is overcoming geopolitics, which is, if you say, 'I have a win-win for cooperation. Everybody can join.' Then, if everyone joins, then you have overcome geopolitics.

And geopolitics is the one thing that caused two world wars, and in the age of thermonuclear weapons, we cannot have geopolitics anymore. So I think that these are very important differences.

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey democracy,' and do nothing.

Q: Statement about Chinese infrastructure projects in Morocco. Both are winners, as opposed to projects 20 years ago run by other countries. The Chinese there have learned Arabic. The projects have greatly reduced the travel time. They have a different perspective than the French, and Europeans had.

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

A: I would just say that people should not just believe, or not believe, what I am saying, but take an active attitude to try to find out what the truth is, for themselves. Because the world is not helped by replacing one ideology by another. The only way you can be certain, is that you become a truth-seeking person yourself. Because the whole question about what went wrong, is that people forgot what it is to be an honest truth-seeking person, taking the truth not as something you reach finally, but something you always improve.

Schiller had this beautiful writing about universal history, where he said that the philosophical mind is the first one to

take his own system apart, to put it together more perfectly again.

I think that that quality – and, also, we had two days ago in Berlin, a very important event, which was also about the dialogue of cultures, and every – we had a very important presentation, which you can soon see on our webpage, where we had a double bass player who spoke about the importance of Wilhelm Furtwängler as a conductor, and he gave some musical examples, and he compared the performances of Furtwängler with some modern conductors, and the difference is so unbelievable. The music of Furtwängler is transparent. It is beautiful. It is absolutely overwhelmingly uplifting, and many of the other conductors are just playing along, with no respect for what the composition is.

And he really described, with many quotes from Furtwängler, that what is needed is this inner quality of truthfulness. That you don't fake it, because if you're not truthful – for example, you cannot recite poetry, if you're not truthful. You cannot sing beautifully, if you're not truthful. Sure, you can sing brilliantly, you can do all kinds of tricks, and it impresses people, but to really produce art, you have to be truthful. You have to try to understand the poetical idea, the musical idea. You have to step back with your ego behind what the composer or the poet wrote. And that's what is wrong with modern theater. In Regietheater, they just say, 'I don't care what Schiller wrote, or what Shakespeare wrote. I just make my modern interpretation. I put Harley Davidson's into Shakespeare, and it doesn't matter.' And that is not art.

And I think the question is, 'What do you do with your life?' That is really the question. Are you becoming a creative person, devoted to that with your life, you contribute to enable mankind to move on a little step further, and become better.

Or, are you just eating three tons of caviar, and have 3,000 Porsches. And then, when you die, they write on your gravestone, 'He/she ate three tons of caviar, and had 3,000 Porsches,' and that was it.

No, you should try to be an honest person, trying to make human society better with what you do. And, once you do that, you become happy. Then you are free. This inner freedom, is what you should try to find. And that is the only way that we will win that battle. It's not Trump. It is, can we get enough people to be innerly free.

And then we win.

End of discussion

Et frit Aleppo

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 12. december, 2016 – I dag erklærede den syriske hær officielt sejren over terroristerne i Aleppo. Dette sker efter terroristernes fire år lange besættelse af byen; men det sker henved 24 dage efter, at den syriske regering, med russisk støtte, lovede at generobre byen fuldstændigt. De handlede imod hele oppositionen forøvet af London, Paris, Washington og Saudi-Arabien, der støttede »moderate« oprørere på jorden og førte løgne- og chikanekampagner i De forenede Nationer i New York.

SANA, den syriske regerings nyhedstjeneste, sender i aften en video, hvor præsident Bashar al-Assad ønsker syriske tropper tillykke ved deres stillinger i Aleppo. Prisen for denne sejr for principper har været forfærdelige lidelser og tab af liv, men sejren er godt og grundigt vundet. Folk fejrer den nu.

✘ Vi må nu tænke på nødvendigheden af en Marshallplan for området – de '5 søers plan', eller »Fønix«-plan, for en genopbygning af Syrien og hele området, som Hussein Askary og Ulf Sandmark har udviklet, og som Schiller Instituttet har promoveret.

I sidste uge, den 8. dec., midt i de sidste dages kampe om Aleppo, var Kinas særlige udsending til Syrien, Xie Xiaoyan, i Damaskus for at drøfte humanitære hjælpeoperationer, såvel som også andre planer om hjælp til den krigshærgede nation. I mellemtiden, i New York i sidste uge, stod Kina sammen med Rusland og andre nationer om at modsætte sig de svigagtige resolutioner om våbenstilstand og hjælp til Aleppo, der, i et forsøg på at opretholde kampen om Aleppo, var blevet foreslået af aksen bestående af Det Hvide Hus, London, Saudi-Arabien og Frankrig.

I USA foregår der en hysterisk kampagne imod Rusland og præsident Putin, hvor man bruger løgner om, at russiske, statslige hackere skulle have grebet ind i de amerikanske valg, og også, at det var til fordel for Donald Trump. Dette kommer efter rapporter i medierne i sidste uge om, at CIA er i besiddelse af »hemmelige« beviser for, at Rusland begår disse kriminelle handlinger og er blevet en farlig modstander. Putin er den stærke mand, der udøver trusler, han er en krigsforbryder i Syrien, osv.

Efter at Lyndon LaRouche i dag blev briefet om situationen, bestilte han en kronologi (se nedenfor), der går tilbage til juli 2016, over denne løgnekampagne, og hvor WikiLeaks publicerede e-mails, der afslørede det aftalte spil mellem Hillary Clintons kampagne og det Demokratiske Partis Nationalkomite, om at favorisere Clinton og lægge forhindringer i vejen for Bernie Sanders. Daværende formand for Demokraternes Nationalkomite, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, måtte træde tilbage før Demokraternes partikonvent. Siden da – og især efter at have tabt præsidentvalget – har Obama- og Clinton-flokken bestræbt sig endnu mere på at aflede opmærksomheden fra den folkelige afvisning af deres mange forbrydelser, ved at fokusere på en svigagtig dæmonisering af Rusland og Putin.

Måden, dette skal forstås på, sagde LaRouche, er den, at dette er et britisk svindelnummer, en bestræbelse fra Dronningens side for at beskytte Obama og forhindre muligheden for, at Londons og Wall Streets politik skrottes. De aktuelle 'aggressiv hund'-angreb mod Rusland bør ses i denne globale sammenhæng – med sammenbruddet af det mislykkede system i USA under Bush og Obama, og af selve Det britiske Imperium, og ligeledes i sammenhæng med de brud, der nu kommer fra Europa, og nu, gennembruddet i Aleppo. Vores kamp er en kamp for principper.

Supplerende materiale (engelsk):

Chronology: The 'Blame Russia' Operation for Election Interference Is a British Fraud

Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS)—The current hysteria to blame Russia for hacking and interfering in U.S. elections is no civic vigilance, but a classic British fraud operation, for the Queen to protect her Obama and avert the dumping of his failed London/Wall Street policies. It should be seen in the widest international context, of the collapse of the U.S. economic and political system, as well as the potential break-away from this collapse by populations around the world, from the Philippines, to Italy, to Bulgaria, to Moldova, to the U.S., to the Brexit voters, and more.

The chronology below shows the beginnings of the fraud, with the July 2016 Clinton campaign charges against Russia, made after leaks showed that the Democratic National Committee was secretly acting in Hillary's favor against Bernie Sanders, her

principal

Democratic opponent. Next, the Obama Administration itself jumped

in to make accusations against Russia, as voters started lining

up against Clinton. Then, after the electorate went for Trump, Obama formally called for an investigation of Russian

involvement. Now there are calls for delaying the Electoral College vote altogether, and even for a re-election, plus

denunciations of Russian President Vladimir Putin for hijacking

the election.

– Spring, 2016 –

JUNE. The Democratic National Committee said that two hacker groups had invaded its IT systems. The assertion was then later

made by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the Obama Administration

that the hacking, and subsequent release of emails, was

"consistent with" Russian tactics, while not denying the illegal

activity that had been exposed by the release.

– Summer, 2016 –

JULY. Before the Democratic Party Convention began, WikiLeaks posted some 20,000 emails from the DNC showing it was favoring Hillary Clinton, and prejudiced against her primary opponent Bernie Sanders, a breach of their own rules of impartiality.

The

DNC Chairman, Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, was forced to resign

just before the convention due to the exposure. Julian Assange,

head of WikiLeaks, denied that Wiki had hacked the emails, but said that they came from a leaker.

OCT. 7. The Obama Administration formally accused Russia of conducting cyber attacks aimed at the elections. A statement was

issued by James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence, and

Jeh Johnson, Department of Homeland Security, saying that, "We believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities." Such "belief," and never evidence or proof, has remained the basis of all charges. The activities referred to

were hacking attempts against state election systems. Clapper and

Johnson, while not blaming the Russian government specifically,

asserted that the patterns of "scanning and probing" could be traced in many cases to servers operated by a Russian company.

A careful review of the Clapper-Johnson statement, however,

made clear that there was no unanimous consensus among the U.S.

intelligence agencies that there was adequate proof to accuse the

Russians of being behind the alleged hacking. In fact, by October, according to a Dec. 12, 2016, *Washington Post* account,

quoting FBI officials, the Bureau had greatly scaled back its five-month long probe of Russian interference and ties to the Trump campaign, due to lack of sufficient evidence.

OCT. 8. The Russian Foreign Ministry responded that the hacking

accusations lacked any proof, and were intended for the purpose

of inciting, "unprecedented anti-Russian hysteria." Dep.

Foreign

Minister Sergei Ryabkov, on the Ministry website, denounced the U.S. statements as "dirty tricks."

NOVEMBER. During October through Nov. 6, WikiLeaks released several batches from a trove of over 50,000 emails, from the private email account of Clinton's campaign manager, John Podesta. Again, WikiLeaks spokesmen stated that they did not receive the documents from hackers, but obtained them from whistleblowers inside the United States.

– Winter, 2016 –

DEC. 9. The *Washington Post* and *New York Times* reported that the CIA knew that Russia was behind hacking during the elections.

Naming no sources, nor facts, the *Post* wrote, "The CIA has concluded in a secret assessment that Russia intervened in the 2016 election to help Donald Trump win the presidency ... according to officials briefed on the matter."

The London *Guardian* reports the same line full-blast. However, the *Guardian* itself quoted an expert debunking this. ZeroHedge reproduced a *Guardian* article, featuring a British diplomat (friend of Assange) who has met and knows the leaker of the DNC emails. Those who know the leaker know, says the diplomat, that the emails were leaked, not hacked, and the leaker is not Russian but American.

From the *Guardian* piece: "Assange has previously said the DNC leaks were not linked to Russia. A second senior official cited by the *Washington Post* conceded that intelligence agencies did not have specific proof that the Kremlin was directing the hackers, who were said to be one step removed from

the Russian government.

"Craig Murray, the former UK ambassador to Uzbekistan, who is a close associate of Assange, called the CIA claims 'bullshit,' adding: 'They are absolutely making it up.

"`I know who leaked them,' Murray said. 'I've met the person,

who leaked them, and they are certainly not Russian, and it's an insider. It's a leak, not a hack; the two are different things.

"`If what the CIA is saying is true, and the CIA's statement refers to people who are known to be linked to the Russian state, they would have arrested someone if it was someone inside the United States.

"`America has not been shy about arresting whistleblowers and it's not been shy about extraditing hackers. They plainly have no knowledge whatsoever,' said Murray."

DEC. 9. Obama ordered a review of Russia's involvement in hacking to rig elections, going back to 2008.

DEC. 9. Nancy Pelosi, House Minority Leader, issued a statement, saying, "Any Administration should be deeply troubled by Russia's attempt to tamper with our elections."

DEC. 9. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC), to CNN, "I'm going after Russia in every way we can go after Russia....they're one of the most destabilizing influences on the world stage. I think they did interfere with our election, and I want Putin to personally pay a price."

DEC. 10. Sen. Lindsey Graham issued a stream of tweets that Russia "is trying to break the backs of democracies—and democratic movements—all over the world." He wrote, "Don't have to be Sherlock Holmes to figure out what Russia is up to—they're trying to undermine democracies all over the world."

DEC. 10. Reporter Glenn Greenwald, on Intercept: "There is still no evidence for any of these [CIA] claims. What we have instead are assertions, disseminated by anonymous people, completely unaccompanied by any evidence, let alone proof... Anonymous claims leaked to the newspapers about what the CIA believes do not constitute proof, and certainly do not constitute reliable evidence that substitutes for actual evidence that can be received. Have we not learned this lesson yet?"

DEC. 11. Four Senators issued a joint statement calling for an investigation of Russia's involvement in election interference. Democrats Charles Schumer (NY) and Jack Reed (RI); and Republicans John McCain (R-AZ) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC).

DEC. 12. Ten electors in the Electoral College (from six states and the District of Columbia) released an open letter to Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, asking for confirmation of whether Russia interfered in the 2016 elections, as a condition for the electors to formally cast ballots in the Electoral College when it meets Dec. 19 in respective states. This initiative is endorsed by the Hillary Clinton campaign. The electors' letter says they, "require to know from the intelligence community whether there are ongoing

investigations

into ties between Donald Trump, his campaign or associates, and

Russian government interference in the election, the scope of those investigations, how far those investigations may have reached, and who was involved in those investigations." A leader

of this ploy is Christine Pelosi, daughter of Nancy Pelosi.

DEC. 12. John Podesta, on behalf of defeated and conceded candidate Hillary Clinton's "campaign," of which he was manager,

requested that the CIA or "intelligence community" give a briefing to the Electors at the Electoral College meeting, before

they cast their votes. Clearly aimed to have an official executive agency intervene to tamper with the Electors' votes.

Politico: "In his statement released on Monday [Dec. 12],

Podesta said 'The bipartisan electors' letter raises very grave

issues involving our national security,' and added that electors

have a solemn responsibility under the Constitution and we support their efforts to have their questions addressed...'

The statement describes how 'we' continually protested that

the Russians were doing it, indicating Podesta is speaking here

for Clinton's campaign. 'We now know that the CIA has determined

Russia's interference in our elections was for the purpose of electing Donald Trump. This should distress every American.'"

The "bipartisan electors" refers to the 10 led by Nancy

Pelosi's daughter.

If done, this would be the most serious such executive

interference in elections since Andrew Johnson requested that the Army help him convene a Congressional session including southern slave owner "Congressmen" whose entry Congress had rejected.

Kinesisk energiekspert til nyvalgte præsident Trump: USA kan tilslutte sig Kinas Bælt-og-Vej

9. dec., 2016 – Dr. Patrick Ho, en fremtrædende politisk og sundhedsvidenskabelig personlighed fra Hong Kong, der var hovedarrangør af »Bælt-og-Vej Forummet«, som afholdtes i Washington onsdag (7. dec.), afsluttede konferencen med et magtfuldt overblik over Kinas historiske forbindelser med verden i de sidste 1000 år, og konkluderede med fem forslag til nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump til, hvordan USA kan blive integreret i Bælt-og-Vej-projektet:

1. Betragt Bæltet-og-Vejen som en platform, som kan være spydspids for initiativer og programmer, der vil frembringe et tættere samarbejde mellem USA og Kina;
2. Juster handelsaftaler med de asiatiske stillehavsnationer, så de imødekommer Bæltet-og-Vejen;
3. Juster USA's holdning til at imødekomme de internationale udviklingsbanker og promover deres evne til at være med til at støtte infrastrukturudvikling;

4. Vær med til at sikre sikkerheden langs med Bæltet-og-Vejen;
5. Få de internationale institutioner til at arbejde sammen med Bæltet-og-Vejen.

Dr. Ho sagde, at Bæltet-og-Vejen ikke blot er forbindelser fra ét sted til et andet, men forbindelser mellem hjerter og hjerner, der forbinder sjæle, som et middel til at virkeliggøre fredeligt samarbejde, der forbinder den kinesiske drøm med den amerikanske drøm, og andre nationers drømme: frihed for afsavn, frihed for frygt,[1] harmoni med naturen og fred.

Hans gennemgang af Kinas historie beskrev tre »Bank på Kinas dør« fra Vestens side og tre »Bank på Vestens dør« fra Kinas side:

1. Matteo Ricci og jesuitermissionærerne, der fandt en åben dør i slutningen af det 16. århundrede og med sig bragte vestlig religion, filosofi og videnskab. Dette blev undergravet og kollapsede i det 18. århundrede;
2. Det britiske Imperium, der slog døren ind med Opiumskrigen og lancerede et århundrede med underkastelse og fattigdom;
3. Nixons besøg i Kina i 1972, der indledte det økonomiske samarbejde og Kinas fremvækst.

Med hensyn til Kinas bank på Vestens dør:

1. Den første Silkevej, med Zhang Qians rejse til Centralasien i 139 f. Kr.
2. Zheng Hes skatteskibe i det 15. århundrede, der sejlede gennem det Indiske Ocean og den Persiske Golf og til den afrikanske kyst. Dr. Ho viste et billede af Cæsar, der siger, »Jeg kom, jeg så, jeg sejrede« og et af Zheng He, der siger, »Jeg kom, jeg så, jeg fik venner, jeg tog hjem«.
3. Den Nye Silkevej, som Xi Jinping annoncerede i 2013, og som Obama nægtede at åbne døren for. Nu banker vi på Trumps dør, sagde han. »Et stort opråb« om, at Bæltet-

og-Vejen er den institution, der kan fremme en ny alliance mellem vore nationer; en impuls til at gentænke politikkerne.

Foto: Dr. Patrick Ho, fra okt., 2014.

[1] En reference til Franklin Roosevelts globale 'Fire friheder', som han formulerede i sin tale om nationens tilstand den 6. jan., 1941. De to andre er tale- og ytringsfrihed og trosfrihed.

NATO's udenrigsministre mødes i skyggen af Trump

7. dec., 2016 – Udenrigsministrene i NATO-landene mødtes i dag i Bruxelles for anden dag for at drøfte Ukraine og Afghanistan, og fortsætter med at agere, som om verden ikke har ændret sig. NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg sagde, at der fortsat må lægges økonomisk pres på Moskva pga. Ruslands angivelige involvering i Ukraine.

Mødet i går producerede en 42-punkts plan for sikkerhedssamarbejde med den Europæiske Union, en opfølgning af Fælleserklæringen, som blev udstedt af de to organisationer ved NATO-topmødet i Warszawa i juli måned. Aftalen, rapporterer Reuters, gør det muligt for de seks EU-stater uden for NATO at drage fordel af noget af den militærstøtte, som Trump har foreslået, kunne blive betinget af større forsvarsudgifter fra europæernes side. Forslagene har også til hensigt at berolige Europa mht., at USA er forpligtet over for

regionen, på trods af nyvalgte præsident Trumps bemærkninger under sin kampagne, som har foruroliget allierede, sagde NATO-folk.

»Der er blevet stillet spørgsmålstegn mht. styrken af det transatlantiske forbund«, sagde Stoltenberg med henvisning til Trumps karakterisering af NATO som værende »forældet« under sin kampagne. »Jeg mener, at den bedste måde at respondere til disse spørgsmål, er at levere et stærkere NATO-EU-samarbejde«, sagde han.

Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry på sin side forsøgte at forsikre NATO om, at USA's forpligtelse over for alliancen ikke vil ændre sig under den tiltrædende Trump-administration. Kerry indrømmede, at billedet her ikke er helt klart, i betragtning af, at Trump stadig mangler mange udnævnelser, såsom til udenrigsministerposten, men, »Jeg har tillid til de personer, jeg hidtil har set«, sagde Kerry og nævnte i denne forbindelse general James Mattis, Trumps valg af forsvarsminister.

Foto: NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg (højre) og EU's højeste repræsentant for EU-udenrigspolitik, Federica Mogherini, under hvis overværelse NATO's udenrigsministre støttede flere end 40 forslag til at styrke samarbejdet omkring cyber-sikkerhed, søfartsoperationer og hjælp til nabolande for bedre at kunne forsvare sig.

Ved et uafgjort øjeblik i historien er

den personlige faktor endnu vigtigere: Gør det Nye Paradigme til virkelighed!

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 6. december, 2016 – Den formelle overgang til USA's næste præsidentskab – der er 45 dage til Indvielsesdagen for Donald Trump – får uophørlig opmærksomhed i USA og i andre medier, men, den historisk vigtige overgang i verden som helhed er det følgende: hvor hurtigt og vist vil USA og Europa opgive det geopolitiske, kasino-økonomiske system og gå med i det nye, globale win-win-paradigme? Udfordringen består i at mobilisere folk til at være med til at få dette til at ske. Dette omfatter, at de foretager en personlig ændring og bliver aktive, og ikke længere blot ser passivt og afventende til. Der gives øjeblikke i historien, hvor den subjektive faktor er altafgørende. Vi befinder os ved et sådant øjeblik.


Omstændighederne er dramatiske. Yderligere initiativer for fred og udvikling kommer i denne uge fra Rusland og Kina.

I dag var premierminister Dmitri Medvedev vært for mange møder i Moskva med den tyrkiske premierminister Binali Yildirim, inkl. møder med præsident Vladimir Putin. Sammen med afgørende, økonomiske engagementer, såsom byggeri af kernekraftværker og gasledningen Turkish Stream, bekræftede lederne det, som Yildirim kaldte behovet for en ny, international sikkerhedsarkitektur for at besejre terrorisme, og en ny dialog med vestlige magter på dette grundlag.

I Tokyo fremlagde en kinesisk embedsmand fra den magtfulde Nationale Udviklings- og Reformkommission (NDRC) i går et tilbud om at opkoble Bælt-og-Vej-programmet til Japans og

Sydkoreas økonomiske »arbejdsplaner«. Hr. Cao Wenlian, generaldirektør for NDRC's Internationale Samarbejdscenter, talte om at styrke komplementariteten i de tre nationers økonomiske aktiviteter, der tilsammen allerede udgør 36 procent af verdens BNP. Cao talte i anledning af det Første Forum for Samarbejde om Industrikapacitet mellem de tre lande. Dette fremstød med det kinesiske tilbud tilsidesætter Japans mangeårige underdanighed under transatlantisk, økonomisk og militær, tvivlsom og aggressiv manipulation.

Selv Henry Kissinger – hvis personlige historie kan siges at indbefatte særdeles uønskede paradigmer – taler offentligt til fordel for samarbejde mellem USA og Kina. Kissinger mødtes den 2. dec. med præsident Xi Jinping i Beijing. I dag mødtes han med Donald Trump i New York City. I går aftes under et Manhattan-arrangement svarede Kissinger på et spørgsmål, der var stillet af LaRouchePAC's Daniel Burke, som spurgte: »Hr. LaRouche deler stærkt Deres mening om, at USA og Kina må samarbejde. Og han understreger, at USA og Kina kan samarbejde omkring politikken med Ét bælte, én vej; at dette ville være en indlysende vej til at genopbygge USA's kollapsende økonomi ... « Kissinger svarede: »Jeg mener, at konceptet med Én vej, ét bælte [sic] er et vigtigt spørgsmål. Jeg mener, at Kina kan og bør finde en måde at tale om det. Det er et af de spørgsmål, hvor samarbejde sandsynligvis er muligt ... «

I denne uge vil LaRouchePAC-aktivister fra flere  østkyststater anføre angrebet på Capitol Hill i Washington, D.C., for at lægge pres på virkeligheden og politikken med det formål at få USA til at gå med i det nye paradigmes æra, med start i en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der følges op af gennemførelse af de handlinger, der fremlægges i LaRouches *Fire Love*.

Ved et arrangement i går i Washington, D.C., talte både vicepræsident Joe Biden og Thomas Hoenig, vicepræsident for den amerikanske Statslige Indskudsgarantifond, FDIC, offentligt til fordel for Glass/Steagall-loven. Biden fordømte

sin egen stemme til fordel for en ophævelse af Glass-Steagall i 1999 (Gramm-Leach-Bliley-loven) som »den værste stemme, jeg nogensinde har afgivet i hele min tid i USA's Senat«. Men så vendte han rundt og sagde, det er derfor, vi nu »ikke kan tillade en ophævelse af Dodd-Frank«, fordi vi har brug for »en opmand i marken«.

Hoenig udtalte imidlertid støtte til genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og forklarede, at ophævelsen af denne lov førte til de risikable omstændigheder, der skabte krisen i 2008.

»Man gav de kommercielle banker, der har et statsgaranteret sikkerhedsnet, lov til« at engagere sig i alle former for aktiviteter, og man »forsynede dem endda med udvidet statsstøtte til at handle ... « Hoenig er en potentiel Trump-udnævnelse til viceformand for banktilsynet i Federal Reserve (USA's centralbank).

Hvis man træder et skridt tilbage og betragter historien, ser man, at visse øjeblikke træder frem som tidspunkter, hvor en afgørende, personlig ændring finder sted. I denne uge tænker vi med alvor tilbage på den 7. december, 1941, Pearl Harbor Day, hvor amerikanske borgere, som nation, gennemgik en ændring over en nat.

Vi skal i dag forstå, at vi alle er kaldede til aktivt at intervenere for at være med til at afgøre det historiske udfald.

Madame Fu Ying: »Det

menneskelige element i international adfærd«

4. dec., 2016 – Kinas *Global Times* publicerede som kronik den forberedte tale, som Fu Ying, forkvinde for Kinas Nationale Folkekongres' Komite for Udenrigsanliggender, holdt på New York Universitet den 1. dec. *Global Times* udgav talen under ovenstående titel.

China Daily USA og *China News Services* officielle engelsksprogede webside, Ecn.cn, udgav nyhedsrapporteringer om hendes tale og fokuserede på ideen om, at »Infrastruktur kan blive en bro mellem Kina og USA«. Begge nyhedsmedier tager udgangspunkt i udtalelsen om, at »Fu Ying ser infrastruktur som en stor mulighed for samarbejde mellem USA og Kina under Amerikas nyvalgte præsident«.

Som *Global Times* rapporterer, begyndte Fu sin tale således:

»Efter præsidentvalget i USA talte den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping den 14. nov. i telefon med nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump, hvor han sagde, at det eneste rigtige valg for deres to lande var samarbejde, og at 'de to lande har brug for at styrke koordinationen, fremme deres respektive økonomiske udvikling og globale, økonomiske vækst samt udvide udveksling og samarbejde inden for diverse felter med henblik på at bringe flere fordele til de to befolkninger og promovere en jævn udvikling af relationerne mellem Kina og USA'. Hr. Trump var helt enig med den kinesiske præsident og gav udtryk for, at han var overbevist om, at 'der vil blive en endnu større udvikling af de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer'. Dette var meget opmuntrende.

»Kina og USA har opbygget en stærk relation i årenes løb, men atmosfæren er ikke altid god. I årenes løb har jeg truffet amerikanere fra forskellige samfundslag, og jeg er undertiden

overrasket over manglen på forståelse mellem os. Én årsag er, fik jeg at vide, at nogle mennesker i USA anser, at Kina har et forkert politisk system, og at de har haft forventninger om, at Kina burde ændre sig i den retning, de ønsker, og at de føler sig skuffet, når dette ikke sker.

Nu, hvor nye generationer vokser op i begge lande, vil grundlaget for forståelse da forbedres i takt med, at de unge måske er mere interesseret i at udveksle ideer og forstå hinanden?«

Madame Fu fortsatte med at fortælle om sine oplevelser som diplomat, hvor hun satte udviklinger i Afghanistan i kontrast til dem i Cambodja i de seneste 20 år, som hun så det, og konkluderede dernæst:

»I mit land Kina løftede de seneste tre årtiers succesrige reform og åbenhed over en mia. mennesker op over eksistensniveauet. Dette er først og fremmest muligt, fordi vi har haft generel social stabilitet, og fordi folk er trygge og kan forfølge deres drømme.

Kina må i lang tid fremover koncentrere sig om at modernisere landet, der stadig er langt bagefter de udviklede nationer ... Kinas udenrigspolitik bør tjene samme formål, og målet er at sikre et favorabelt, ydre miljø for national udvikling og samarbejde udadtil ...

Der er ligeledes i Kina en voksende bevidsthed om behovet for, at Kina spiller en mere aktiv rolle inden for internationale anliggender, samt sørger for offentlige tjenesteydelser. Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping har foreslået at opbygge et verdenssamfund for en fælles fremtid. Dette repræsenterer på den bedste måde tankegangen i Kina. Det, som Kina kan bidrage til verden med, bliver på linje med de kinesiske værdier og inden for felter, hvor vi ved bedst.

Som en forholdsvis nytilkommen i internationale affærer har Kina behov for at lære og samle erfaringer. Der er nu flere

end 300.000 kinesiske studenter i USA, og flere end en million i hele verden. Mange universitetsuddannede vender hjem til Kina, og de kommer til at spille en afgørende rolle i at forbinde Kina med verden. Samtidig må Kina også rekruttere talenter fra hele verden og lære af andre lande, især USA.

I konklusion, så skabes og udøves udenrigspolitik af menneskelige væsener, og ikke af døde maskiner. Og, en succesrig udenrigspolitik må bringe fordele til mennesker. Det, som diplomati har med at gøre, er ikke 'stater' bag masker, men spørgsmål, der berører mange mennesker som jer og mig. Det, der ligger til grund for nationens interesse, er befolkningens velbefindende. Jeg håber, I forstår, hvad det er, jeg forsøger at sige, og vil erklære jer enige med mig i, at folk i alle lande, især den unge generation, bør tage hinanden i hånden for at sikre, at, i det 21. århundrede, bør beskyttelsen af menneskers ret til at leve i fred og tryghed udgøre en fælles værdi inden for international adfærd.«

Foto: Fu Ying i diskussion under US-China Forum på NYU, 1. dec., 2016.

**Højtplaceret kinesisk
diplomat foreslår Trump-
regeringen
at slutte sig til Kina
omkring udviklingen af Bælt-**

og-Vej-initiativet

4. dec., 2016 – »Infrastruktur kan blive en bro mellem Kina og USA«, lyder overskriften i *China Daily's* dækning af den intervention, som Fu Ying, forkvinde for Kinas Nationale Folkekongres' Komite for Udenrigsanliggender, leverede på New Yorks Universitet den 1. dec.

Madame Fu talte for et publikum på 300 personer, for det meste studerende fra New Yorks Universitet, ved Kina-USA Forum, sponsoreret af NYU og Institutet for Kinesisk-amerikansk Udveksling. Sammen med hende på podiet var den tidligere amerikanske ambassadør til Kina, Roy Stapleton. Aktivister fra LaRouchePAC deltog også og tog aktivt del i diskussionsperioden, hvor de rejste spørgsmålet om, hvordan de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer kunne udvikles omkring samarbejdet om Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-projekt, sådan, som LaRouchePAC har skitseret det i sin brochure, »USA må tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevej«.

»Fu Ying ser infrastruktur som en stor mulighed for amerikansk-kinesisk samarbejde under Amerikas nyvalgte præsident«, rapporterede *China Daily*. Artiklen bemærker Fus diskussion om, hvordan direktøren for COSCO Group, Kinas største skibsreder, for to år siden sagde til den amerikanske Kongres, at Amerika måtte opgradere sine havne for at fremme vækst i eksporten. »Men Amerika ønsker ikke at tage imod investering fra andre lande som Kina, og I investerer ikke selv«, citerede hun direktøren for at have sagt.

Fu fremførte, at valget af Trump kunne føre til en ny fase, eftersom han har lovet at »transformere Amerikas smuldrende infrastruktur«, skrev *China Daily* med et citat af fr. Fu om, at »USA må være mere åben. Jeg mener, at der kan blive meget, meget godt samarbejde«.

»På et spørgsmål, om hun var bekymret for, at omstændighederne

omkring relationer mellem USA og Kina var under forandring under Trump-administrationen, sagde Fu, at det var for tidligt at sige noget om det, men at hun ikke er pessimistisk«, skrev *China Daily*. »Hun sagde, at telefonsamtalen mellem præsident Xi Jinping og Trump var 'meget opmuntrende', idet Trump var enig med Xi i, at samarbejde er den eneste valgmulighed for de to lande, og at de vil fremme forbindelserne for at bringe flere fordele til de to landes befolkning.«

China Daily bemærkede, at ambassadør Roy støttede Fu mht. ideen om samarbejde omkring infrastruktur, og sagde, at USA endnu kunne deltage i Kinas Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ, på trods af, at USA havde afvist at tilslutte sig projektet med Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB), hvilket han anser for at være en fejltagelse.

Foto: Fr. Fu Ying.

RADIO SCHILLER den 5. december 2016: Nu har Italien sagt "Nej": Den globale transformation fortsætter

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

At komme op af kviksandet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 1. december, 2016 – Kinas Xi Jinping og Ruslands Vladimir Putin fortsætter med at komme med tilbud efter tilbud til USA – og andre nationer, der stadig sidder fast i det transatlantiske systems dødbringende kviksand – om at gå med i opbygningen af det nye, globale paradigme, der er i færd med at erstatte geopolitiske krige og fascistiske nulsumsspil-økonomier, med den Nye Silkevejspolitikks win-win-resultater.

Den kinesiske regering har netop udgivet en hvidbog, »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«, som dokumenterer det forbløffende fremskridt, Kina har præsteret i løbet af de seneste årtier inden for områderne fattigdomsreduktion, levetid, uddannelse og så videre, og dernæst fortsætter med at forklare, at deres Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ har til formål at hjælpe andre nationer med at opnå lignende resultater. Retten til udvikling, proklamerer hvidbogen, er hele menneskehedens *umistelige rettighed*.

Den russiske præsident Putin gentog i sin »Tale til nationen« for den russiske Duma, det føderale parlament, at han var indstillet på at samarbejde med den tiltrædende Trump-administration i USA for at »sikre international stabilitet og sikkerhed«. Putin gjorde det ligeledes til fulde klart, at Ruslands fremtid ligger i at nære kreativitet, videnskab og evnen til at løse problemer hos den unge generation: »Vore skoler må fremme kreativitet ... Vore børn vil klart se, at Rusland har brug for deres ideer og viden.«

Dette er præcis den form for tankegang, som engang dominerede Franklin Roosevelts, og endda John Kennedys, USA, men det er blevet næsten uforståeligt for de fleste amerikanere i dag, i et USA, der er blevet transformeret af de seneste 16 års mareridt med Bush og Obama.

Og dog, så er genopvækkelsen af denne ånd selve nøglen til en strategisk sejr imod det døende, Britiske Imperium. For at opnå dette kræver det, at vi lever op til udfordringen med at få den amerikanske befolkning, og dens repræsentanter i Washington, til at tænke på det højere niveau, som er det sande potentiale, der er fremlagt for os, og ikke på niveauet for de kontrollerede 'trivielle selskabslege', som karakteriserer politikken i Washington og i lokale anliggender.

I en diskussion tidligere på dagen med medlemmer af LPAC's Politiske Komite og Videnskabsteam, samt Helga Zepp-LaRouche, understregede Lyndon LaRouche den afgørende rolle, som et fornyet rumprogram spiller for atter at tænde gnisten for optimisme og inspiration omkring spørgsmålet om, hvad menneskets formål i universet er. Den store, tyske rumforsker Krafft Ehrlicke er en vigtig prøvesten i denne bestræbelse, sagde LaRouche, for kampen for at bringe fremskridt inden for videnskab, kultur og økonomi tilbage, som en forenet, indbyrdes forbundet præstation.

»Hele formålet er at forstå, hvad fremtiden bringer, eller *kan* bringe, og fastholde udviklingen på denne basis«, sagde LaRouche. »Det er ligesom hele tiden at holde trit; hele tiden forsøge at gøre noget, der er vigtigere, at opnå det, og dernæst nyde det ... Der må være et element af overraskelse, et element af denne form for udtryk. Det er det, der får det til at virke. Det er ikke noget tomt; det er noget, man skal *få til* at virke.«

LaRouche fortsatte: »Vi lever i vort intellekt. Hvis vi kan tænke kvalificeret, så opererer vi i rummet. Vi bør håbe, at vi vil frigøre os og således bringe menneskeheden til et nyt niveau af præstationer.«

Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping mødes med Ruslands præsident Putin, Chiles præsident Bachelet, Indiens præsident Modi og Kasahkstans præsident Nazarbayev i sine bestræbelser

på at rekruttere nationer til den Nye Silkevejs økonomiske politik.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
november 2016:
Ny dansk regering//Forsøg på
at underminere Trump//
Kinesisk og russisk
teknologisk samarbejde med
udviklingslande**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

**USA: General Michael Flynn
kræver Marshallplan for MENA-
område**

24. nov., 2016 – General Michael Flynn, som nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump for nylig udnævnte til national sikkerhedsrådgiver, blev den 20. nov. interviewet af CNN's

Fareed Zakaria. General Flynn fremlagde et magtfuldt krav om en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten og Nordafrika (MENA) og nævnte den succesfulde Marshallplan for Europa ved slutningen af Anden Verdenskrig. Han fremførte, at befolkningstilvæksten i MENA-området og spredningen af radikal jihadisme kun kan imødegås gennem et langsigtet perspektiv for økonomisk vækst, og at Marshallplanen tilbyder det bedste eksempel på, hvordan man skal gå frem mod denne trussel.

Læs også: Schiller Instituttets Specialrapport: [Et økonomisk mirakel for Sydeuropa, Middelhavsområdet og det afrikanske kontinent.](#)

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 24. november 2016:

Drop paradigmet for krig og kaos og gå med Rusland og Kina, som Trump er på vej til

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Tidl. USA-ambassadør Chas Freeman: Forkert af USA at behandle Kina som en fremvoksende militærmagt

23. nov., 2016 – Den tidlige amerikanske ambassadør Chas Freeman kommer i dag med en analyse, der »rammer plet«, af Amerikas fejlagtige politik over for Kina i Del II af sit interview med *The Nation* »The Militarization of Diplomacy and Other Corruptions of U.S. Empire« (Diplomatiets militarisering og anden amerikansk imperiekorruption).

Efter at diskutere Amerikas enorme militære industrikompleks' historie tilbage til præsident Eisenhowers tid, siger Freeman, at USA måtte »opfinde en ny fjende, eller finde én, for at retfærdiggøre de udgifter, man havde, og gøre det, man gjorde, med militæret«.

Freeman fortsætter, »Andy Marshall [der var leder af det amerikanske forsvarsministeriums Office of Net Assessment, Pentagons interne 'tænk tank', 1973-2015], opfandt et vidunderligt koncept kaldet 'peer competitor' (ligeværdig konkurrent). Den ligeværdige konkurrent var en fiktiv, hypotetisk skabelse, der, uanset, hvad man gjorde i den militære sfære, ville gøre noget, der ville udkonkurrere én. Dette er en perfekt drivkraft for et program, fordi uanset, hvad man gør, så må man gøre mere, fordi der potentielt set er nogen derude, der med held kan konkurrere med det, man har gjort. Dette koncept blev sluttelig anvendt på Kina. Det har været drivkraft bag en masse afskrækkelse i de amerikansk-kinesiske relationer«.

Intervieweren Patrick Lawrence vender sig derefter mod Kina med reference til Chas Freemans bog fra 2013, *Interesting Times: China, America and the Whifiting Balance of Prestige* (Kina, Amerika og antydningen af prestigebalance). Lawrence siger, »Jeg syntes, ordet »prestige« var besynderligt – det drejer sig om magt – men alene titlen siger en masse om ens syn på dynamikken i det fjerne stillehavsområde. Efter min mening har vi et meget godt greb i den gale ende. Vi bør samarbejde med Kina for at lette en overgang til det, jeg anser for at være en uundgåelig udvikling af relationerne i Stillehavet. I stedet synes vi at udkæmpe en krig, der ikke kan vindes, for at kæmpe mod Kinas fremvækst ... «

Chas Freeman responderer, at Amerika blev den dominerende militærmagt i Stillehavet efter sejren over Japan og påpeger den efterfølgende, økonomiske vækst i Japan, Sydkorea og andre lande. Men, siger Freeman:

»Nu står vi over for realiteten med Kina, som er vokset frem i bemærkelsesværdigt tempo og grundlæggende set hævder sin historiske position i området, og som nu grundlæggende set er alles største handelspartner; alles største kilde til ny investering; alles største marked – ingens politiske model, for resten – og vi behandler det som en militær udfordring, fordi det er, hvad vi gør. Jeg vil tro, det først og fremmest er en økonomisk udfordring. Det er ikke en politisk udfordring, med mindre og indtil kineserne opfinder et attraktivt, politisk system, hvilket de ikke har gjort. Det er i færd med at blive en militær udfordring, og er nu en militær udfordring, *primært, fordi vi valgte at gøre det til en sådan*, siger Freeman. (fremhævelse tilføjet)

*Foto: Tidl. amerikansk ambassadør til Saudi-Arabien (1989-92)
Chas Freeman.*

NYHEDSORIENTERING november 2016: Donald Trump og det nye paradigme

Etablissermentet i både USA og Europa er rystet over Donald Trumps valgsejr, men rystelserne ender ikke der. I lighed med Reagan efter valget i 1980 vil han indtage Det Hvide Hus med sit helt eget team og egne nye rådgivere. Derfor er en helt ny politik mulig, hvor USA finder sin naturlige plads i et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina – og forhåbentlig dropper Bush/Cheneys og Obamas krigs- og konfrontationspolitik. Danmark og Europa skal dermed også finde en helt ny udenrigspolitik frem. Samtidig kommer Trump så til at skulle slås med et finanskrak større end i 2008, men hvis han lytter til Lyndon LaRouche, som Reagan delvist gjorde det i 1981, så er der med LaRouches Fire Love en vej ud af moradset. Dette er en redigeret udgave af en tale, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets formand, holdt den 21. november 2016, og som kan høres på www.schillerinstitut.dk.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Bush ' og Obamas krigsforbrydelser afsløret – Trump bør erklære sig enig

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 22. november, 2016 – Den følgende erklæring fra den republikanske senator Richard H. Black, Virginias Senat, kom som respons til en advarsel fra kongresmedlem Ted Lieu (D-CA) om, at USA's støtte til og samarbejde med Saudi-Arabien i den kriminelle krig mod Yemen udsatte amerikansk militærpersonale for en risiko for at blive retsforfulgt for krigsforbrydelser. Senator Black er tidligere chef for Afdeling for Kriminallov ved Pentagons militære strafferet.

»Jeg er enig i kongresmedlem Lieus juridiske analyse. Jeg mener imidlertid, at denne sags mere praktiske aspekt er den juridiske afsløring af vore mest højtplacerede embedsfolk, der styrede vore militærfolks handlinger. Ifølge den præcedens, der blev sat af den Amerikanske Krigsforbryderdomstol i sagen mod den japanske general [Tomoyuki] Yamashita efter Anden Verdenskrig, kan den øverstkommanderende retsforfølges for generelle, kriminelle handlinger, begået af den øverstkommanderendes underordnede. Dette gælder for handlinger, som han kendte til, eller burde have kendt til.

Amerika har i vid udstrækning ladet hånt om internationale normer for opførsel i sine aggressionskrige imod Serbien, Irak, Libyen, Syrien og nu Yemen. Visse handlinger fremstår som forbrydelser iht. international sædvanelov – såsom vores afvisning af at acceptere oberst Gaddafis overgivelse, da han tilbød at forlade Libyen. USA, Storbritannien og Frankrig skal have ført rådslagning, før de besluttede at ignorere hans tilbud om at abdicere, og fremmede i stedet mordet på ham.

Ved at lade hånt om fastlagte normer for opførsel i krigstid

har USA i alvorlig grad undermineret sin moralske autoritet og formindsket sin magt over hele planeten. Alt imens jeg er tilhænger af et robust forsvar, så opnår vi intet ved at udkæmpe krige for at fremme globalisering – især ikke, når sådanne krige krænker Lov om Krig på Land.«

Præsident Donald Trump indikerer i stigende grad, at han er enig. Hans udnævnelse af general Michael Flynn (pens.) er en sådan indikation – general Flynn advarede som bekendt, da han var chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, Obama om, at hans tvivlsomme eventyr i Syrien, og også i Libyen, støttede etableringen af et »kalifat«, bestående af de mest ekstreme, saudiskstøttede, islamiske terrorister. General Flynn latterliggjorde også Obamas massive program for dronemord, der er så frydefuldt for dræber-præsidenten, som rent militært værende værre end unyttigt, idet hvert eneste drab »blot gjorde dem til martyrer og blot skabte en ny årsag til at bekæmpe os endnu hårdere«. Ligesom Trump er general Flynn fortaler for at arbejde sammen med Rusland for at forsvare den syriske stat og verden imod terrorister.

Mandag mødtes Trump også med kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI), med indikationer om, at hun kommer i betragtning som USA's ambassadør til FN. Gabbard, der er veteran fra Irakkrigen, har været en offentlig kritiker af Obamas evindelige krige og hans fiasko i bekæmpelse af terrorisme, til fordel for »regimeskift« imod sekulære regeringer. Sæt dette i modsætning til Obamas FN-ambassadør Samantha Power, der har tilsluttet sig de brølende dinosaurer ved i dag i FN at levere en tirade om, at hun ville »stille for retten« de syriske øverstbefalende, der har anført kontraterror-operationerne i deres land.

Verden befinder sig i en revolutionerende overgangsperiode. De europæiske ledere, der fulgte Obama og briternes diktater om at gennemføre sanktioner mod Rusland og forberede til krig, falder som fluer. Valget af François Fillon, en pro-russisk kandidat, i det franske Republikanske Partis primærvalg i

denne uge, følger i kølvandet på valget af pro-russiske præsidenter i Bulgarien og Moldova i sidste uge. Samtidig hænger de europæiske banker, med Deutsche Bank og Royal Bank of Scotland i spidsen, i en tynd tråd og kunne bringe hele det vestlige banksystem til fald, hvad dag, det skal være – med mindre USA's Kongres kommer til fornuft og gennemfører Glass-Steagall nu, uden at vente til den nye, amerikanske regering tiltræder i januar.

Endnu mere afgørende er kampen for at genoprette kreativ tænkning i de vestlige nationer, efter årtiers intellektuel gift fra Hollywoods og rock-narko-sex-modkulturens vold og perversion. For tre år siden, på 50-års dagen for mordet på John F. Kennedy, præsenterede Schiller Instituttet, stiftet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, en mindekoncert for JFK med en opførelse af Mozarts Rekviem-messe i D-mol i Washington-området, som efterfulgtes af en gentagelse af koncerten i Holy Cross katedralen i Boston, hvor, 50 år tidligere, Richard Cardinal Cushing holdt en mindehøjtidelighed for JFK med en højtidelig pavemesse, missa solemnis rekviem, hvor det samme, intense udtryk for klassisk skønhed var blevet præsenteret og fulgt på fjernsyn i hele verden. Det er netop skønhedens identifikation med sandhed, der er gået tabt i Vesten, og som må genoprettes for at bringe verden sammen for fred gennem fælles og samarbejdende udvikling.

Foto: Præsident Obama og førstedame Michelle Obama i Saudi-Arabien, 27. januar, 2015.

RADIO SCHILLER den 21.

november 2016:
Den gamle verdensorden kommer
ikke tilbage//
Silkevejen er nået til Syd-
og Mellemerika

Med formand Tom Gillesberg