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“Helga Zeppe-LaRouche in Milan: ‘Italy on the New Silk Road’”

On March 13, 2018, Schiller Institute Founding President Helga Zeppe-LaRouche spoke in Milan, Italy at a joint event in the MiCA (Il Movimento Internazionale per i Diritti Umani), a movement and organization in Italy, and the Lombardy region government.

Helga Zeppe-LaRouche: It is one in quite a quite amusing to see what high levels the political elites are going to in order to cause China in causing right now. Because, when Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road in 2013, it was a bombshell for all our friends in the mountains, the fact that I think 112 countries have already signed up, including six major industrial corridors, the Belt and Road Initiative and the Belt and Road Forum and so, it is very evident that the largest infrastructure project in history, over the last four years, in the mainstream media in the United States and Europe, there was practically no reporting about this, and the only thing that we heard was a catastrophe where we would wind up in World War III with nuclear weapons, meaning the extinction of civilization.

So in that sense, what Italy is doing right now, is of the greatest historical importance, because of what you are doing, with the Memorandum of Understanding of March 22, with China and the Belt and Road, but also with the joint ventures that are appearing in Spain, and become the role model for all other European countries.

The British Empire and its neocolonialists are saying that what Zeppe-LaRouche is proposing, and when and when she proposed it: it is after, after, after, German political lead- ers, as well as the head of the International Schiller Foundation, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, was still leading and feared by the British Monarchy for her leadership as the Empire’s principal opposition. She is the one who has proposed a completely new system in international relations.

But if you talk to some strategic insiders on both sides of the Atlantic, they easily admit that the much more dangerous con- flict is actually the one between the United States and China. Will the United States accept the rise of Asia, and because, of course, because of the cancellation of the AIT Treaty, then the reaction to that, and now the dilution of the UN Treaty—there are many who think that we are actually done, in worse strategic crisis than during the height of the Cold War, Clinton to Bush, that concerns of the relations between the United States and Europe.

Well, obviously, this is something we have to change, and I think that the best way to change it, is in order to bring in a new system of thinking that all together: We have to leave geopolitics. We have to leave the idea that there can be a legitimate interest of one country, or a country of group, against another bloc. This is the Italian Renaissance, was safeguarded. Mr. President, I am writing to you on another day.
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The Life of Lyndon LaRouche

Since the passing of Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. on February 19, 2019, the response from leaders and citizens throughout the world and here in the United States has been to recognize him as a leader who had built to move forward around the same principles which accompanied the American Revolution, the Italian Renaissance and the Enlightenment—forward for the human race.

We cannot help but note that he was not some special treasure, known only to his close friends, and not at all the cause of his enemies’ concocted defamation campaigns. In fact, many knew him as their special friend but could not imagine how wisely he was treated or the number of people who carried his ideas close to their hearts and souls.

LaRouche's own statement (published in the February 27 issue of this newspaper, page 1) is his last, he has now left the earth. We hope that recognition of this man will make his voice ring throughout the world, that we will spark their actual full realization in the world, only the real way to honor a great mind that passed from us.

We have also launched a campaign for a new Silk Road Road Initiative to carry up the same force now attacking Donald Trump and U.S. Committee do so to deny his enemies one tool they have used in attempting to bury or distort his ideas. Let them then come out of the shadows and propose a better alternative for the world for the next 100 years. It is impossible for them to do so. Their limited minds and eternal jidgal fools hindered them to the future. Robert Kennedy once said, “The more you see they are, and ask why, I dream of things that never were, and ask why.”

Lyndon LaRouche not only persistently asked, “why?” He discovered the fundamental principles and laws animating successful and creative human societies and economies and their coherence with the fundamental laws of our universe.

The climate of the earth, as it exists in our solar system, is much more complex than a simple yes-no question of believing in or "denying" climate change. And how can any such changes be detected? The question is not whether or not there is a change, but how large the change is, and how confident we can be that the change is real. Even in the face of overwhelming scientific evidence, there is a debate about the extent of human influence on the climate. 

The United States currently relies on hydrocarbon fuels for more than 80% of its energy needs. The recently proposed Green New Deal calls for a reduction of net CO₂ emissions to zero by 2030, which would require a significant shift away from fossil fuels and towards clean energy sources. This would involve major changes in the energy sector, including the transition from coal- and gas-fired power plants to wind, solar, and nuclear power. Such a transition would have significant implications for national security.

Statistics such as the 0.2% cited in this letter, and the commonly heard “97% of scientists” who agree with climate change are both misleading and inaccurate. First, there has been no meaningful survey of all scientists with relevant knowledge in this field. Secondly, it is essential to ask what it means to "agree with" or "acknowledge" climate change. Clearly, climate change exists, and has existed for the history of the earth, even without human intervention.

The question is not whether but to what extent human-caused changes in the atmosphere drive climate variations, and whether such changes are good or bad. A thoughtful statistic (but one that does not exist) would indicate levels of agreement that are far lower than 97%. What would be the impact of doubling, tripling, or quadrupling the concentrations of CO₂ in the atmosphere? What would be the consequences for national security?

The worldwide costs for the less ambitious policy path toward the target in the 2015 Paris Agreement, the goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, would be on the order of 3% of global GDP. The benefits would be on the order of 4% of global GDP. These numbers suggest that the cost of mitigation is small compared to the benefits of avoiding climate change.

There are many reasons why the current political landscape appears to be so polarized on this issue. Many people are concerned about the impacts of climate change, but others are skeptical or dismissive of the science. This polarization is driven by a lack of understanding of the science, as well as by political and economic interests. There is a need for more effective communication of the scientific consensus on climate change, and for policies that address the root causes of climate change, such as reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.
"Why the DNC Was Not Hacked by the Russians"

BY WILLIAM BINNEY, FORMER TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY; AND LARRY JOHNSON, FORMER STATE DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE

The phrase, "moderate confidence" is intelligence speak for "we have no hard evidence." Thanks to leaks by Edward Snowden, we know with certainty that the NSA had the capability to examine and analyze the DNC emails. NSA could have been tasked with "vacuuming up" email traffic transiting through the internet (whether or not anyone in the NSA chose to look for the data is another question). Those emails had been downloaded over the internet then NSA also would have been able to access the data because they traveled over the internet. This kind of data would have been easy to filter and preserve a reservation or caveat that the Russians were responsible for the hack. So, if one takes a fact in an unsatisfactory assessment without compromising sources and methods, then the NSA only claimed to have moderate confidence in the judgment rendered by the intelligence community. But why did the NSA have to announce the findings? Because their fingerprint was so obvious and undeniable that any judgment was going to be held up to the fire. The truth lies in the data alone. We know that the emails were obtained via a hacking attack. We know who did it and how they did it. The courts and law enforcement have a right to ask that these people be brought to justice.

In 2014, officials in the U.S. government and intelligence agencies began looking into allegations that Russia was interfering in the 2016 U.S. presidential election. The FBI and CIA, along with other agencies, began investigating the possibility that Russia was attempting to influence the election through cyber attacks. The FBI and CIA have high confidence in the conclusion that the Russian government was involved in the hacking of the Democratic Party and the Hillary Clinton campaign.

The Democrats are now looking at ways to protect themselves from similar attacks in the future. This is important because the security of the U.S. depends on the integrity of our democratic process. The U.S. is a country of laws, and if our elections can be hacked, then our system of government is at risk.

The U.S. government is now taking steps to prevent future attacks. This includes upgrading cybersecurity measures, increasing collaboration with other countries, and improving communication between agencies.

In conclusion, it is clear that the Russian government was involved in the hacking of the Democratic Party and the Hillary Clinton campaign. The U.S. government is now working to prevent similar attacks in the future.
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