

President Donald Trump and Coordinated Belt & Road Investments

This is an edited transcript of the exchange between Roger Stone and Helga Zepp-LaRouche following Mr. Stone's presentation.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Hello Roger, I'm happy that you are able to talk to us, because you are one of the more fun people of America. [laughter]

But, I really do think that Willy Wimmer, the former Deputy Defense Minister of Germany during the Kohl Chancellorship, is right—that the only thing standing between all of us and World War III is Donald Trump. I think that, unfortunately, is correct.

But in light of this, I think it's very unfortunate that President Trump's relationship with Xi Jinping—which I think is still existing and very good—but with the tariffs, the Chinese are now extremely upset, and feel that this is what could become a trade war. Prime Minister Li Keqiang has said repeatedly that there is a better way to balance the trade deficit, by increasing the size of the cake: If the United States would agree to collaborate with the Belt and Road in third countries, like Latin America, Asia, Africa, even some European countries, there could be joint investments, so by increasing investments, you would balance the trade.

I think that would be more profitable, because I think some of the tariffs also hurt American consumers, because of the increased prices. And some American corporations have also explained that they're not happy, because it also hurts American firms.

Do you see any way to correct policy in the direction I'm suggesting? There is a tremendous opportunity right now. The Forum on China-African Cooperation summit in Beijing consolidated an enhanced and much deeper relationship between all of Africa and China.

The Chinese have repeatedly invited the United States to co-invest together. There are so many projects which are vital for the future of all of these countries.

So, my question is, do you agree with this approach, and what can we do to help to move things in this direction?

Roger Stone: I do agree with that approach. First of all, I must tell you, I don't think Donald Trump is a big fan of tariffs. I think he used them as a tool, as a tactic to get the attention of the people he wants to negotiate with, and to bring them to the table. The President has said repeatedly that he's a free trader, and I think he is. But he wants *fair* trade, reciprocal trade. How about a trade agreement that benefits both countries, as opposed to the NAFTA agreement, for example, that seems to benefit our trading partners, but not benefit us?

The Chinese, I think, had a major impact on the President when they visited Mar-a-Lago in Palm Beach, Florida and I think that the personal diplomacy is the way to break through. The only way the President can get around his own deep-state advisors, is at the urgent request of the Chinese. From the President's point of view, he could say, "Well, the tariffs worked. They got the attention of the Chinese, who have been taking advantage of us in some areas."—and they have. "They're ready to come back to the table! So, I've achieved my goal."

Recognize that the President's trade policies and his imposition of tariffs in some cases, is to negate old trade agreements which seem to fit in this "one size fits all" multinational bastion, as opposed to sitting down with individual countries—the U.K., France, Germany, China, Russia—and negotiating individual deals that speak to the strengths and weaknesses of those individual countries and our own country. That's a far more intelligent approach than this one size fits all, sign here, 300-nations trade deal, which just hasn't served our country very well.

When the President met with the Chinese in Palm Beach, they asked for the extradition of a Chinese na-

tional who is seeking asylum in the United States; the President promised to hand the man over. He is not wanted for crimes in the United States, he is wanted for crimes in China. Yet the President's own State Department and his own Justice Department have stalled what is very important to the Chinese, but frankly unimportant, at least on the surface, to our country. And that—believe it or not—is a sticking point, so much so that the Chinese went to Dr. Henry Kissinger and asked him to send word to the President that this was important to them! And meaningless to us.

Yet, there has been no effort, to date, to send that

Chinese national back to face justice in his own country, where he's wanted for mega-cyber-financial crimes. What business is it of ours?

So, I'm still hopeful that you can have even a Big Three, even a Big Four summit, where we could make substantial progress on these issues. We would be much better, from the point of view of world prosperity, and the prosperity of our own country, working with China, working with Russia, as opposed to having a new trade war.

I'd be happy to take another question. Thank you, Helga. That was a good one.