Lad dette blive Dag Ét – indvielsesdag – for en ny æra for udviklingen af menneskeheden som helhed! LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 20. januar, 2017; Leder

Vi har et par emner, vi vil fremlægge her i dag, men vi lægger ud med en umiddelbar gennemgang fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche af de begivenheder, der fandt sted i dag, og vore marchordrer for de kommende par dage. Det er i dag naturligvis indsættelsesdag. Vi er nu officielt kommet til slutningen af 16 år med Bush/Obama-æraen. Vi står på tærsklen til noget nyt; vi har et nyt, officielt præsidentskab. Hvad dette nye præsidentskab vil blive, står endnu uklart; det er stadig udefineret, og det er Lyndon og Helga LaRouches vurdering, at vores job ikke har ændret sig. Det er stadig vores opgave at lægge Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love på bordet. Vi er, og må fortsætte med at være, dette lands intellektuelle lederskab, og det er vores ansvar nu at indvarsle et nyt, internationalt paradigme, som USA i høj grad må blive en del af – det, vi kan kalde for det »Nye Paradigme for Udvikling«.

Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er i dag 20. januar, 2017; indvielsesdag. Dette er vores special-webcast på indvielsesdagen fra LaRouchepac.com. Med mig i studiet i dag har jeg to kolleger – Benjamin Deniston her i studiet; og, via video, Michael Steger, som er med os i dag fra Houston, Texas, hvor han har tilbragt nogen tid sammen med Kesha Rogers.

Vi har et par emner, vi vil fremlægge her i dag, men vi lægger ud med en umiddelbar gennemgang fra både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche af de begivenheder, der fandt sted i dag, og vore marchordrer for de kommende par dage. Det er i dag naturligvis indsættelsesdag. Vi er nu officielt kommet til slutningen af 16 år med Bush/Obama-æraen. Vi står på tærsklen til noget nyt; vi har et nyt, officielt præsidentskab. Hvad dette nye præsidentskab vil blive, står endnu uklart; det er stadig udefineret, og det er Lyndon og Helga LaRouches vurdering, at vores job ikke har ændret sig. Det er stadig vores opgave at lægge Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love på bordet. Vi er, og må fortsætte med at være, dette lands intellektuelle lederskab, og det er vores ansvar nu at indvarsle et nyt, internationalt paradigme, som USA i høj grad må blive en del af – det, vi kan kalde for det »Nye Paradigme for Udvikling«.

Dette er nogle af de emner, vi vil diskutere i dybden senere i programmet, med vægt på to, store projekter, der er eksempler på, og paradigmatiske for, dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling: Kra-kanalprojektet i Thailand og Transaqua-projektet i Afrika – to projekter, som hr. og fr. LaRouche i årtiernes løb har været meget involveret i, og som blot eksemplificerer den form for store projekter for *menneskelig* udvikling, som må forfølges i de kommende måneder og uger, både internationalt, men også store projekter af den art, som vi må gennemføre herhjemme i USA.

Lad mig begynde med en næsten ordret gennemgang af nogle kommentarer, som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche kom med umiddelbart efter præsident Donald Trumps indsættelsestale her i eftermiddag, og vi vil så diskutere dette lidt mere i detaljer, før vi går videre med en gennemgang af disse store, internationale udviklingsprojekter.

LaRouche sagde omgående, at det er meget uklart, mht. principper, hvad præsident Donald Trump har i sinde ud fra det, han fremlagde i sin indsættelsestale i dag. Lyndon LaRouche sagde, »De er meget forvirret på overfladen, og vi må

vente og se, hvad der ligger under denne overflade. På baggrund af det, der blev fremlagt i denne tale, er der ingen klarhed over principper i det.«

Helga LaRouche sagde: »Det vigtigste på hjemmefronten er, hvordan Donald Trump vil honorere de løfter, han har afgivet. Hvilke handlinger vil han faktisk tage?« spurgte hun. Med hensyn til den internationale front, var Helga LaRouches vurdering, »Trump burde vide, at det ikke fungerer sådan; blot at sige 'Amerika først'. Spørgsmålet er: Hvordan finder man fælles interesser, som er fælles for mange nationer, og ikke kun 'Amerika først'? Hvad er de fælles mål for mange nationer, og hvordan handler man for at forfølge disse mål?«

Dernæst sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Problemet er, at princippet endnu ikke er klart. Det kunne gå i retning af et forenende princip; men, ud fra det, der blev fremlagt, står det endnu ikke klart, at det nødvendigvis vil blive det, eller præcis, hvad dette princip vil være.« Helga LaRouche gentog, »Generelt set var talen en meget blandet pose. Der er bestemt løfter om, at dette kunne gå i den rigtige retning, men vi må se konkrete planer for handling. Vi, LaRouche-bevægelsen, LaRouche Political Action Committee, må forstærke vores mobilisering for Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love. Det er godt, at Obama er ude. Vi vil få en frisk vind, en frisk brise, men der er brug for langt mere klarhed.«

Sluttelig sagde Lyndon LaRouche: »Vi vil ikke gå for meget ind på deres argumenter. Lad dem selv forklare deres egne argumenter.« Helga LaRouche sagde: »Vi behøver ikke nødvendigvis støtte ethvert aspekt af, hvad præsident Trump siger. Vi behøver heller ikke være overdrevent kritiske, men vi bør fokusere på vore egne principper og vore egne mål.«

Først og fremmest: Hvad er disse mål?

Nummer 1 – og det er stadig dagsordenen – må Glass-Steagall omgående genindføres som landets lov. I løbet af de seneste 24

timer har vi atter set et udbrud, i vid udstrækning pga. den mobilisering, som I, dette webcasts seere, og medlemmer af LaRouche-bevægelsen i USA har været engageret i; Glass-Steagall er nu tilbage i forreste front, tilbage på dagsordenen. Dette sås tydeligst af de spørgsmål, der blev stillet under høringen for godkendelsen af den udpegede finansminister, Steven Mnuchin, og som rejstes af senator Maria Cantwell. Hun har, som folk ved, længe været en støtte af en tilbagevenden til Glass-Steagall, i mange år. Hendes første, og *eneste* spørgsmål til Steven Mnuchin, var, »Støtter De Glass-Steagall?«

Steven Mnuchins svar – og dette er Helga LaRouches analyse – var, »ægte sofisteri«. »Lyndon LaRouche har været meget klar omkring, at dét, vi har brug for, er den *originale Glass-Steagall, uden ændringer.* Så kommer denne Mnuchin-fyr og taler om en *modificeret* Glass-Steagall og blander det med Volcker-reglen«, sagde hun. »Dette er ægte sofisteri. Det er virkelig godt, at Maria Cantwell har meldt klart ud om dette spørgsmål, og nu må *vi* lægge meget pres på hende og andre, inklusive på præsident Donald Trump, for at få den ægte Glass-Steagall vedtaget. Som Maria Cantwell sagde, så kræver det en klar, skarp linje mellem investeringsbankaktivitet og kommerciel bankaktivitet sådan, som Glass-Steagall oprindeligt blev udarbejdet af Franklin Roosevelt.«

Men Glass-Steagall er blot det første skridt til det fulde program for de Fire Love; og jeg mener, vi vil diskutere dette, ikke nødvendigvis stykke for stykke, men som en generel gennemgang, det princip, der forener Lyndon LaRouches program. Og vi må, som Helga LaRouches analyse siger, tænke på det som blot Dag Ét af de første 100 dage.

Hvad vi omgående må få at se, fra dette øjeblik, er en omgående forbedring i de amerikansk-russiske relationer. Det er der allerede positive indikationer på. Der er en invitation til præsident Donald Trump til at deltage, eller sende en delegation til at deltage, i Astana Fredsforhandlingerne i

Kasakhstan; fredsforhandlingerne om Syrien. Det kunne ikke være mere presserende, end det er nu, med nyhederne her til morgen om, at ISIS på tragisk vis nu har ødelagt de storslåede, romerske ruiner i Palmyra, det smukke amfiteater og de andre ruiner. Så det er presserende vigtigt.

Men samtidig må der blive et seriøst partnerskab mellem USA og Kina. Den store mulighed for dette – i kølvandet på præsident Xi Jinpings tale om en fremtid for en fælles og almen skæbne, som var temaet i hans tale for Davos Økonomiske Verdensforum under sit nylige besøg i Schweiz – er en konference, der kommer til maj i Kina, om Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, og som mange statsoverhoveder vil deltage i. En eksplicit invitation er blevet overgivet til Donald Trump personligt for hans personlige deltagelse i denne konference.

Det, der står klart, er, at vi befinder os midt i en global proces for dramatisk og radikal forandring. Der kommer et betydningsfuldt skifte i dynamikken, som allerede finder sted, men som vil fortsætte med at udkrystallisere sig i de kommende måneder. De franske valg er i horisonten. Ifølge nogle beregninger er 75 % af vælgerne nu for at reducere sanktionerne mod Rusland. Dernæst er der de tyske valg, der kommer lidt senere efter de franske. I løbet af disse måneder kunne vi få at se en meget anderledes verden komme til syne. Det står klart, at det ikke længere er »business as usual«. Bush/Obama-æraen er forbi, og vi står nu på tærsklen til noget helt nyt.

Jeg vil gerne invitere Michael [Steger] og Ben [Deniston] til at sige lidt mere om dette, før vi går over til disse projekter, men, lad mig blot sige, om denne nye æra, som Helga LaRouche refererer til som nødvendigheden af at definere fælles interesser blandt mange nationer, og dernæst at samarbejde om at opnå disse interesser, eller, som præsident Xi Jinping udtrykker det, en fremtid for en fælles skæbne.

To store projekter, som jeg nævnte det, og som eksemplificerer

mulighederne for at engagere sig på et sådant niveau og indvarsle dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling, er Kra-kanalen i Thailand, der nu er meget konkret tilbage på dagsordenen – jeg kommer med flere detaljer senere – og Transaqua-projektet i Afrika. Det, vi ser, er, at den Nye Silkevej, Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, går støt fremad og nu bærer frugt efter årtiers arbejde fra LaRouche-bevægelsens side internationalt. Senere i aftenens udsendelse vil vi vise et kort klip af en video, vi har lavet, og som belyser Kra-kanalens historie, og som i de kommende dage vil blive ledsaget af et interview med en af hovedarrangørerne af dette projekt, Pakdee Tanapura. Og så får vi en slags generel præsentation af dette Transaqua-projekt i Afrika.

Men dette er store projekter, der blot eksemplificerer det, der, kan man sige, må blive det »nye normale« i dette Nye Paradigme for Udvikling, og for det, som USA som en *presserende* sag må deltage i.

Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet:

LET'S MAKE THIS DAY ONE – INAUGURATION DAY –
OF A NEW ERA FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR MANKIND AS A WHOLE!

LaRouche PAC International Webcast, January 20, 2017

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! It's January 20th, 2017. Today is Inauguration Day, and this is our Inauguration Day Special Webcast from Larouchepac.com. I'm pleased to be joined today by two of my colleagues – Benjamin Deniston, here in the studio; and, via video, Michael Steger, who is joining us today from Houston, Texas, where he's been spending some time with Kesha Rogers.

We have a few items that we're going to present to you today, but we're going to begin with an immediate overview from

both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche of the events that occurred today,
and our marching orders for the days to come. Obviously, today is
Inauguration Day. We've come now, officially, to the end of 16
years of the Bush/Obama era. We're on the verge of something new;
we have a new Presidency, officially. What that new Presidency
will be, is unclear; it is very much still undefined, and Lyndon
and Helga LaRouche's assessment is, our job has not changed. We
still have the task of putting Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws on the
table. We are, and must continue to be, the intellectual
leadership in this country, and we are having the responsibility
now of ushering in a new international paradigm of which the
United States must very much indeed be a part — what we can call
the "New Development Paradigm."

That will be some of what we will discuss in substance later
in this broadcast with an emphasis on two major projects which
are exemplary and paradigmatic of that New Development Paradigm:
the Kra Canal Project in Thailand, and the Transaqua Project in
Africa — two projects with which the LaRouches have been very
much involved over decades and which are merely exemplary of the
kinds of great projects for {human} development that must be
pursued in the coming months, in the coming weeks, both
internationally, but also great projects of that type which we
must carry out here at home in the United States.

Let me begin with an almost verbatim overview of some
comments that both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche had, immediately

following President Donald Trump's inaugural speech this afternoon, and then we will discuss that in a little bit more detail before we get to the overview of these great international development projects.

What Mr. LaRouche said, right off the bat, is that it's very unclear, in terms of principle, what President Donald Trump has in mind, just based on what he presented in his inaugural speech today. Lyndon LaRouche said, "It's very confused on the surface, and we will have to wait and see what is underneath that surface. On the basis of what was presented in that speech, there is no clarity of principle there."

Helga LaRouche said, "The most important thing on the domestic front is how Donald Trump will deliver on the promises that he's made. What are the actions that he will actually take?" she asked. Regarding the international front, Helga LaRouche's assessment was, "Trump should know it doesn't work that way; merely saying 'America First.' The issue is: how do you find {common} interests, shared among {many} nations, not just 'America First'? What are the common objectives of multiple nations, and how do you act in pursuit of those objectives?"

Lyndon LaRouche then said, "The problem is that the principle is not clear yet. It could go in the direction of a unifying principle; but from what was presented, it's not yet clear that it necessarily will, or exactly what that principle will be." Helga LaRouche's reiterating remarks were: "Overall, the address was a very mixed bag. There are certainly promises that this could go in the right direction, but we need to see concrete plans of action. We, the LaRouche Movement, the LaRouche

Political Action Committee, must increase our mobilization on Lyndon LaRouche's Four Laws program. It is good," she said, "that Obama is out. We will get a fresh wind, a fresh breeze, but a lot more clarity is still needed."

And then, finally, Lyndon LaRouche said, "We don't want to get too close to their arguments. Let them clarify their own arguments." And Helga LaRouche said, "We don't necessarily need to support every aspect of what President Trump says. We also don't need to be overly critical either, but we should be focusing on our own principles and our own objectives."

Now, first and foremost, what are those objectives?

No. 1 – and the agenda still stands – Glass-Steagall must be immediately reinstated as the law of the land. We saw, over the last 24 hours, an eruption again, largely due to the mobilization that you, the viewers of this webcast and members of the LaRouche Movement in the United States have been engaged in; Glass-Steagall is now back in the forefront, back on the agenda. This could be seen most clearly by questions that were raised during the confirmation hearing of Treasury designate-Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, that were raised by Senator Maria Cantwell. Maria Cantwell, as people know, has been a long-standing supporter of a return to Glass-Steagall for many years now. Her very first question and her {only} question of Steven Mnuchin was, "Do you support Glass-Steagall?"

Steven Mnuchin's answer — and this is Helga LaRouche's analysis
— was "real sophistry." "Lyndon LaRouche has been very clear
that what we need is the {original Glass-Steagall, without
modification}. And here comes this Mnuchin guy, going on about a
{modified} Glass-Steagall, mixing it in with the Volcker Rule,"
she said. "This is real sophistry. It is very good that Maria
Cantwell has now put herself on the spot on this issue, and now
{we} have to put real pressure on her and on others, including on
President Donald Trump, to get the real Glass-Steagall in place.
As Maria Cantwell said, that requires a clear bright line between
investment banking and commercial banking in the way that
Glass-Steagall was originally designed by Franklin Roosevelt."

But Glass-Steagall is merely the first step in the full Four
Laws program; and I think we're going to discuss that, not
necessarily piecemeal, but in terms of the broad overview, the
principle which unifies Lyndon LaRouche's program. And the way to
think about that is what Helga LaRouche's analysis was, that this
is merely Day One out of what must be the First 100 Days.

What we have to see, immediately, from this moment on, is an
immediate improvement in U.S.-Russian relations. There are
already positive indications of that. You have the official
invitation of now-President Donald Trump to attend, or to send a
delegation to attend, the Astana Peace Talks in Astana,
Kazakhstan; the peace talks for Syria. This could not be more
urgent than it is right now, with the news that we received

this
morning, that ISIS has, tragically, now destroyed the grand Roman
ruins of Palmyra, the beautiful amphitheater, and the other ruins
there. So, this is of urgent importance.

But, simultaneously, there must be a serious partnership
between the United States and China. The grand opportunity for
that, following President Xi Jinping's keynote speech on the
future of shared and common destiny – that was his theme at the
Davos World Economic Forum during his recent trip to Switzerland.
[http://america.cgtn.com/2017/01/17/full-text-of-xi-jinping-
keynote-at-the-world-economic-forum] The most immediate
opportunity is a conference that's coming up in May, in China, on
the subject of the Belt and Road Initiative, which many head of
state will be attending. There has been an explicit invitation
extended, for Donald Trump, himself, to attend this conference.

What is clear, is that we are in the midst of a global
process of dramatic and radical change. There will be a major
shift of dynamic which is already ongoing, but which will
continue to crystallize in the coming months. The French
elections are on the horizon. According to some calculations, 75%
of the electorate are now in favor of rolling back the sanctions
against Russia. Then you have the German elections coming later
after that. Over the course of these months, we could see a very
different world emerging. What is very clear is that this is no

longer "business as usual." The Bush/Obama era is over, and now
we're on the verge of something completely new.

Now, I would like to invite Michael and Ben to say a little
bit more about this, before we get into these projects, but let
me just say, this new era, what Helga LaRouche is referring to as
the necessity of defining common interests among multiple
nations, and then working together to achieve those interests,
or, as President Xi Jinping put it, a future of shared destiny.

Two great projects, as I mentioned, which exemplify the
opportunities to engage on that kind of level and to usher in
this New Development Paradigm, are the Kra Canal in Thailand,
which is now back on the agenda in a very real way – and I'll
get into some of the details on that later – and the Transaqua
Project in Africa. What we see is that the New Silk Road, the
Belt and Road Initiative, is steadily moving forward, and it's
coming to fruition after decades of work by the LaRouche Movement
internationally. Later in this show, we will be playing a brief
clip of a video that we made highlighting the history of the Kra
Canal, which also will be accompanied in the coming days by an
interview with one of the key organizers of that project, Pakdee
Tanapura. And then we will have sort of an overview presentation
of this Transaqua Project in Africa.

But what these are, are great projects which are merely
exemplary of what must become, you could say, the "new normal" in

this New Development Paradigm, and what the United States must {urgently} become a participant in.

Let me leave it at that. We can have a little bit more discussion and then get into some of the bulk of those projects.

MICHAEL STEGER: Well, I think everyone's fairly happy watching this broadcast, given the fact that especially the last eight years under Obama were a kind of psychological terror. There's definitely a relief. The one thing that's clear, is that it's a moment of action. Perhaps President Trump understands that. As, Matt, you indicated, as Lyn said, himself, we have to see what this actually means. But we, the LaRouche PAC and the LaRouche Association internationally know very well what this means. It's largely determined by the actions that both Russia and China have taken over the last three years around the New Silk Road initiative and a real collaboration, as Vladimir Putin himself called for in the 2015 United Nations General Assembly — an anti-Nazi coalition, like you saw in World War II — has to be brought together, a collaboration of nations.

And what that means — I think President Putin understands this — and I think it's very important that the American people grasp this. The eradication of this kind of terrorism, is the elimination of the British Empire, in the essence of a construction orientation; that you're actually building up the civilizations again, you're building up the populations. You're taking the areas of Southwest Asia, North Africa; the project of the Transaqua is in a key area to begin to develop many parts of

Africa that are right now threatened by this terrorist scourge.
The same is true from India through Pakistan, the Kra Canal. The
areas of Myanmar and Thailand and into Malaysia are also
threatened. The Philippines.

So these questions of development are really the means by
which an international coalition eradicates the terrorism;
eradicates the drug trade; and begins to collaborate on mankind's
true destiny, which is really much greater than simply solving
some of these basic problems.

I'll say that for now. I think Ben might have more to say.

BEN DENISTON: That's exactly the issue. Maybe we can get it
to it a little bit more, but you look at the United States, you
look at the issue of Mexico and our relation to Mexico, for
example, which has been a big subject of discussion. But what
hasn't been put on the table, is, again, the kind of campaign and
the programs that the LaRouche Movement has led up for major
development projects. Mr. LaRouche, again, has a very rich and
high-level history of relations with top Mexican officials,
including one-time President JosÃ© LÃ³pez Portillo of Mexico,
with whom he had a direct personal relationship around this idea
of common development.

This can be directly taken to one of the key issues we'll
get into — the issue of water development, as we'll discuss in
the case of Africa; but that can serve as a model for the kind of
projects that we could bring back to the United States. What

Michael is saying here is critical: development is the key; development is the future; development is what's needed to actually {solve} these problems, not just address immediate crises, not just deal with catastrophes as they occur. But actually how do you move the world in many of these regions that have been plunged into years if not decades of horrific activities led by the Saudis, Obama, Bush – all of these factions? How do you actually bring that into some real solutions and resolutions that will create a long-term substantial change?

I think what Mrs. LaRouche said was very right on, in terms of her response to the inauguration speech; is that it's a new world. We can no longer be thinking about individual nations alone; that's just part of the natural state that mankind is at, at this point. Mankind has developed to the point where we're a global force; the level of development and growth needed is something that goes beyond individual national boundaries. You have to do it with respect to nations and their interests and their boundaries and their cultures; but it's also undeniable that we're at a point where we have to think as a global species – and really, an interplanetary species.

That's the basis for the future of mankind now. Where do you define these common areas of mutual benefit, mutual interest that nations can participate in; which creates a net higher amount of wealth and growth for all participants involved? There's a principle! Mr. LaRouche was raising the issue of where's the principle; that's an actual scientific principle rooted in the scientific nature of mankind as a creative

species,
and rooted in the very historical view of the point of human development that we're currently at. That is a principle; that is something which you can continue to come to as the defining point for policy and what's needed now.

OGDEN: Absolutely! There is obviously a sense of dramatic change which is sweeping the country; and I think that President Trump addressed what is a reality. That there is a desperation among the American people; and that is obviously what rendered this election. The forgotten men, the forgotten women who feel a desperation and a despair as they look at these old abandoned factories, as he said, standing like tombstones scattered across the territory of this country. People who feel like they have no voice; and the sense that they now have the opportunity to participate once again in the policies of the United States. But participating in the policies of this country means a necessity for a deeply held education and profound understanding of principle, not just policies but a principle around which those actions can be taken. The sentiment of saying we're going to look at ourselves as standing on the threshold of a new millennium and unlocking the mysteries of space; and using American labor to build infrastructure across the United States, and roads and railroads and tunnels and bridges, is a positive one. But the understanding of where mankind is at in our history

as a species right now, and what are the true scientific challenges that are facing us that require our creativity [in order] to be solved. That is where the real questions lie in terms of clarity of principle. And great leaders of the United States always had an understanding of what the principles were that mankind as a whole must resolve; the principled questions which are there to be solved.

So, we're going to take a look at these two case studies which we're selecting because of, first of all, their magnitude in terms of the importance of their role in this interconnection of a World Land-Bridge or a new land-based and maritime Silk Road, as it's being called with the initiative from Xi Jinping; but also because of the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played in these two projects over a number of decades, and the fact that their progress at this point does actually represent a milestone in terms of the coming to fruition of a campaign of inaugurating this new era of development for mankind.

So, we're going to start with a short excerpt from a video that LaRouche PAC made a number of years ago on the Kra Canal; the Thailand canal which has a long history going back over a century in terms of people looking at the different possible routes of cutting a canal through the isthmus of Thailand. But it's also something that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche personally was involved in, in the 1980s. There are a lot of new developments and hopeful developments around this, including a new book that just was published called {Kra Canal: The Strategic History of

Thailand}, which Pakdee Tanapura, who is an associate of the LaRouche Movement in Thailand and who was one of the prime organizers in the 1980s, is a contributor to this book; but also a number of generals and admirals and other high-ranking and leading figures inside Thailand. This book is now being printed in 10,000 copies and is being circulated among some of the leading government institutions. With the passage of the previous king and the new king coming to power in Thailand, there is a strong openness; not to mention that there is a strategic shift now underway in Asia as a whole. The abandonment of the Obama Asia Pivot, the crumbling of the TPP; there's a strong potential in terms of the possibility of this project moving forward.

So, I'll have a little bit more to say about this after we play this clip; but again, this project – taken together with the other project we're going to talk about today – are merely exemplary of the type of new era of development that we must inaugurate today.

VIDEO voice [begins mid-sentence]: century, the concept of the preferred location for the canal route generally shifted towards southern Thailand, as compared to the earliest proposed routes.

We can compare the dimensions of a proposed Kra Canal with other well-known canals. The width of the Kra isthmus at its narrowest point is around 27 miles. Compare this to the width of the Panama Canal – about 48 miles. The length of the various Kra Canal proposals range from between 30 and 60 miles. The Suez

Canal, for comparison, has a length of 119 miles. The height of the interior mountain chain where the Kra Canal would be constructed is about 246 feet. Compare this to the height of the Gaillard Cut of the Panama Canal, which is slightly lower at 210 feet.

The Straits of Malacca are not sufficiently deep for many large ships to pass through; the straits are 620 miles long, but very narrow – less than 1.6 miles at the narrowest, and only 82 feet deep at the shallowest point. Currently, large ships are required to travel much further south to the Lombok Straits near Java; which have a depth of 820 feet.

OGDEN: This is the beginning of the clip that we're going to play for you. We're going to explore a little bit more of the advantages of cutting this Kra Canal through the Thailand isthmus. What Mr. LaRouche has emphasized, is that you're linking together two very crucial oceans in the world – the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean; this is a key connection in terms of this new Maritime Silk Road, and will completely transform the potential relationships between the countries in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. So, we'll continue playing this clip for you right now.

VIDEO voice: Clearly, a Kra Canal poses a more reasonable option than travelling so much further south for larger ships;

or
for any ship taking the 620-mile detour through the congested and
pirate-infested Straits of Malacca.

The 600-plus-mile Malacca Straits are by far the most heavily travelled of the world's canals, with more than twice the
traffic of the Suez and Panama Canals combined. By a recent estimate, one-fifth of world trade goes through the Malacca Straits; congestion or obstruction of the straits would dramatically increase the cost of trade. The maximum capacity of
the Singapore-Malacca Straits being 200,000 ships annually. A more recent assessment estimates that the traffic of the straits
has been increasing at an annual rate of 20%.

In 1973, Tams Engineering had conducted a study of choices
of Kra Canal routes, and suggested that route 5-A was the most suitable for the construction of a Kra Canal. At either end of
the canal would be located industrial zones estimated to span collectively about 100,000 acres. A decade later, in 1983-84, the Fusion Energy Foundation and {Executive Intelligence Review},
together with the Thai Ministry of Communication, held two successful conferences on the Kra Canal project. FEF updated the
earlier feasibility study done by Tams, and developed further on
the project's economic and industrial benefits. The Fall 1984 conference entitled "Industrialization of Thailand and the Kra Canal" took place in Bangkok, Thailand. The conference brought
together businessmen, engineers, and government officials from all of the ASEAN countries, to hash out the feasibility of building the canal.

PAKDEE TANAPURA: The idea of building the canal, of course, was picked up again in 1983 when Lyndon LaRouche travelled to Thailand and organized an international conference on the Kra Canal. The participation was very good; we had representatives from India, representatives from Indonesia, representatives from Malaysia, representatives from Japan. In 1983, we didn't have a representative from China, but the Chinese are very observant about what we were doing. We had participation of the Ministry of Transport and Communications of Thailand, the Minister, Mr. Samatzu Tamaraif [ph] himself came to deliver a speech at the conference along with Lyndon LaRouche. Also, we had the participation of the GIF, the Global Infrastructure Fund group; from Japan, we had Dr. Yamamoto from the GIF group, as well as participation from Japan; a very prominent figure, Mr. Nakajima of the Mitsubishi Research Institute — a very prominent figure from the Mitsubishi Group. We had Mr. Saito also from the Toshiba Group, and we had lots of participation from [inaud; 28:55]. So, that was back in 1983.

VIDEO voice: The four panels covered all aspects, including a presentation by EIR/FEF researchers on the use of PNEs — or peaceful nuclear explosions — as the fastest, most efficient and cost effective method of construction.

OGDEN: So, the full video that that was just an excerpt from, is available on YouTube — "The Kra Canal; The Development of Southeast Asia"; and the link to that video is available in

the description of this YouTube video. But as you heard Mr. Pakdee Tanapura mention, Lyndon LaRouche was a keynote speaker at both the 1983 conference and the 1984 conference that were organized there in Bangkok, Thailand with very high-level representation from almost every Asian country and from the Thai government itself.

What Lyndon LaRouche said in a recent interview, and he continues to emphasize, is the absolute critical nature of the Kra Canal. But he delivered an interview in 2014 to the {Fortune Times} of Singapore, on the Kra Canal project. I'm just going to read a short excerpt of what Mr. LaRouche said, which will clarify, I think, why this is such a key project in the overall global development perspective that we're talking about. Mr. LaRouche said the following:

"Divide the maritime region of East and South Asia into three principal categories: China — a giant; India — a giant; and the maritime connection throughout Southeast Asia's maritime regions. Add the impact of such a triadic maritime and related connection to the physical economic relations to the Americas to the east, and the Middle East's underbelly and Africa. Then, the potency of a Kra Canal development appears not only as an eminently feasible feature, but as a strategic, political, economic force for the planet." He went on to say, "The sheer volume of maritime trade between the two great nations of Asia — China and India — and their connections through the South Asia

maritime regions make the canal probably the most potentially beneficial and also efficient project for the entire region of the Pacific and Indian Oceans regions; and the co-development of the major regions of planet Earth as a whole."

Then, later, the following year, in 2015, some comments in an informal discussion, but here's quote from those comments: "With the completion of the Kra Canal, on top of the Suez Canal expansion which is ongoing in Egypt, there will be no longer a separation between the Atlantic and Pacific economies. China and India will greatly benefit from those two canal projects, along with the smaller nations along the Southeast Asian Rim. This must be pushed, hard. This will end the British geo-political games in the Eurasian region; it will change the economic character of the entire world."

So, I think that's the key here. What we're looking at; {this} is what Helga LaRouche was referring to when you identify a vision of common destiny or principles which are shared for the mutual benefit of many nations, of an entire region, or potentially even, the entire globe; and then work together to achieve those benefits. That's the era of development; that's the new era of development which we have to inaugurate here. And I think that's exemplary – as Mr. LaRouche was just saying – of these kinds of global visions of how we can bring mankind to the next platform in terms of our development of the planet for the mutual benefit of all nations.

So, let's take that as one project; and then, shift over to Africa and look at what is now progressing around this really unprecedented project in terms of water transfer in terms of the magnitude and the potential benefits for that continent also.

DENISTON: Regular viewers of our website might have seen this, but it was just this past December that there was a new Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Lake Chad Basin Commission, the Nigerian government, and also a major company out of China, called China Power. This is now a new, formal, serious step towards a feasibility study, a detailed engineering study of what it would take to actualize this Transaqua project, as it has been called in its earlier designs. As it now stands, as the designs stand and even a slightly smaller version which was cited in this new Memorandum of Understanding would be the single largest water transfer project ever created on the planet Earth; being brought right into Central Africa to address some of major needs of that region. This has been on the table for decades – we'll get into that in a second – but what stands out now, again? We're in a new global paradigm, and what appears to be the key change that's now bringing this out of design and discussion and general acknowledgement of it being important; but into actual realization? Again, we have China's role. China Power is the company that led the construction of the Three Gorges Dam in China.

So again, we're seeing China playing a key role in bringing these much-needed, much-discussed mega-projects of development into fruition. While it might not technically be included as part of the whole New Silk Road or what they are now calling the Belt and Road initiative; it is intimately part of that entire perspective, that entire program. This design to bring water from the Congo River Basin, not necessarily the end of the Congo River where all the tributaries become the Congo River itself, but many of the upper tributaries that are at higher elevations further inland; to bring a fraction — 5%, 8% of this water flow — divert it to the north and to the west into Lake Chad to begin refilling Lake Chad. This was designed in the early 1980s by certain Italian engineers; in particular, Dr. Marcello Vichi, who has worked with the Bonifica Engineering Consulting Firm, who has been very happy to collaborate with the Schiller Institute and Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the past and recently in his promotion of this project.

But again, this would be an incredibly amazing contribution to this entire region. Just compare it to the level of discussion you still get in the West around poverty in Africa; you still just get disgusting discussions of how we need to provide them with gravity-powered light bulbs because they don't have electricity, so you can create a mechanism to provide light by a certain gravity-powered mechanism. And that's some kind of amazing contribution to the people of Africa who need

electricity. That's just such a disgusting low level of thought
from this whole anti-development, Green perspective. And you
look what China is saying: Let's bring the most modern, the most
advanced, the largest water infrastructure project ever built on
the planet Earth; and let's engage Africa in building it there.
Just to clarify, despite some of the lies that are put out, this
would not be China coming in and building the entire project with
their own people and their own labor force. That's often stated,
but it's not the case, and it's being demonstrated that it's not
the case. Just look at what's already happened and what's
ongoing with the rail projects that China is working with various
African nations in developing. New standard rail lines in Kenya,
for example; just look at the figures on that. About 3000
Chinese are employed on that project there; 30,000 Kenyans are
employed, and Kenyans are being trained to run these rail systems
in addition to the skill sets being developed to construct these
things. It's similar with other rail lines in other African
nations. So, just to clarify that, this is not China coming in
and employing their own people and exploiting these African
nations. This is coming in with this "win-win" perspective of an
investment; engaging with the populations there and developing
the region for the benefit of all parties involved.

Just to emphasize, we have a first slide here [Fig. 1]

just
to show a couple of examples; but this is a project and a general
idea that Mr. LaRouche and his associates have been advocating
for decades. Prior to the design of the Transaqua itself, which
is the name given by this Italian engineer who did a more
detailed initial engineering study for this project, the general
idea was recognized as feasible and made sense if you just look
at the region – which we'll look at in a second – you can see
where there's an abundance of water; you can see where there
might regions where you can transfer it. It was recognized,
going back to Mr. LaRouche's famous 1975 International
Development Bank, that these kinds of investments into
large-scale water transfer is exactly typical of the kinds of
projects we need for Africa, for example; for nations in Africa.
Similar ideas were featured in the Fusion Energy Foundation
report, "The Industrialization of Africa", just to cite another
example. This has been often discussed and developed and
proposed in various other publications by {Executive Intelligence
Review}, by LaRouche PAC, by the Schiller Institute.
But it's probably also worth just highlighting that in March
2016, {Executive Intelligence Review} held a seminar in
Frankfurt, Germany to discuss the development perspective needed
to solve the refugee crisis in northern Africa and stretching
into the Middle East; which has been something that Mrs. LaRouche
has campaigned on for well over year now. That the solution to
this refugee crisis is to reverse the destruction that's been

caused by Bush's wars, Obama's wars in that region, the support
of terrorism through support of Saudi Arabia and more directly.
But do the complete opposite and engage in large-scale
development of this region to ensure that there's a future for
people; especially for the younger generation. That's the only
way you're going to fundamentally get rid of terrorism; the exact
opposite of Obama's drone strike policy, where every wedding
party he drones, he creates ten times more future terrorists –
because their lives have been destroyed – than he killed with
his drone strikes. So, this was a very high-level seminar on
that topic; and one of major projects that was featured, was this
Transaqua project. It featured two of the leading engineers;
again this Dr. Marcello Vichi – and one of his associates who's
also involved and is an expert on the project – as well as a
representative of the Lake Chad Basin Commission. This is the
level of promotion and discussion that our organization
{Executive Intelligence Review}, Mrs. LaRouche, also our friend
over in France, Jacques Cheminade who's currently running a
campaign for the Presidency in France, has been a major supporter
of this project. So, we have a very close history with this
entire thing. Now again, with China actually taking the lead,
this is becoming a reality.

Just to put that in a little bit of context, I want to
briefly look at this map; because it's well known that water is a
major issue for many parts of the world. And it's expected to
become a growing issue for many regions as water use increases,
population grows; and under the assumption that we're not

going
to have the level of water infrastructure that we need. If you
just look at this map, put out by a United Nations report on
global water issues, you can see in the lighter blues, you see
regions where there is water scarcity due to the physical
availability of water; and that's probably not a surprise in the
regions you see. In the west and southwestern United States, we
see physical water scarcity. But you see much of Africa is not
light blue, it's dark blue, which indicates economic water
scarcity; meaning the water is there, but the infrastructure
hasn't been developed to utilize the water supplies that are
there. So, I think that's an immediate reference point that's
worth making. You have major water supplies available throughout
the African continent; what's been lacking is the ability to
facilitate the kind of projects needed to develop and take
advantage of those.

Here [Fig. 2] is just a global depiction of river run-off
globally for all the major coastal watersheds combined that run
into different oceans and basins. Here, you can see where I'm
indicating, the Congo Basin has a very large and significant
water flow out into the South Atlantic Ocean there. So, it's a
major – maybe not the largest – but a major region of water
flow that's available; the vast majority of which is not being
used for any economic purposes. The Congo River itself, if
people don't know, is the second largest river on the planet in
terms of discharge into the ocean. It's kind of hard to compete
with the Amazon itself, but the Congo is the second globally

largest river; running at 1300 cubic kilometers per year of outflow. For a comparative reference for Americans, the Mississippi is 500 [cubic km]. So this is over 2.5 times the size of the Mississippi River. The Nile River, another major river in Africa, that obviously supports a very large population
and development, is more in the range of 80-90 cubic km per year.
So, we're talking about an order of magnitude plus larger than the Nile River.

Here [Fig. 3] we have a quick breakdown of the different water basins in Africa. This graphic is actually labelled in German,
so my German-speaking friends can read this just fine. But the entire Congo River Basin, as I'm indicating here, so you can get
a sense of the size; all funneling down into the Congo River out
into the Atlantic again. Then, just bordering it to the north and to the west, is the Lake Chad Basin. So this entire region,
all water deposited in here filters into Lake Chad itself.
Currently, this basin and the water in this basin, the water in
the Lake Chad system supports somewhere in the range of 30-40 million people. Over the past 40-45 years, Lake Chad – in terms
of total surface area – is now only one-tenth of its former size. So, if you compare 1972 to today, it's one-tenth of the size it was then. There have also been issues of rainfall decreasing in the past 20 years or so on the order of 15% to 20%.

So, none of these figures are new or a surprise; this has
been known since our organization has been campaigning for the development of this project. But it is a very real and

developing crisis in the region, and it can be alleviated. Here's a depiction [Fig. 4] of the actual change in the size of the lake; it's rather dramatic. The total outlying area here is the 1972 level; it had a low record in 1987, and it's recovered just a little bit. But it's still a tenth of its original, expected size.

So this rather brilliant, beautiful proposal is to create a canal – again, that would not connect all the way down to the headwaters of the Congo River itself; but it would feed off many of the tributaries up in the highland regions and collect the water through a series of dams and reservoirs and canals in that region in the Democratic Republic of Congo and in the Central African Republic. You can see here an indication of the Congo River Basin as a whole, and the catchment region, and this is the canal that would be developed. Once it captures the water in that region, it could then be funneled into canals and existing rivers crossing the Congo River divide into the Lake Chad Basin, and then funneled directly into Lake Chad. What is being proposed here is something in the range of 50-100 cubic kilometers per year for the diversion. The original designs by the Italian leaders who originally did the engineering studies on this project, were looking at 100 cubic kilometers per year. Again, that's something on the order of 8% of the total water flow of the basin.

It's also worth noting that this would also provide

flood
control for the Congo Basin itself; so you could alleviate some
of the periodic flooding which itself can be very problematic
with the lack of infrastructure in the region.

So, the original designs are looking on the order of 100
cubic kilometers a year; this new Memorandum of Understanding
threw out the figure of half of that – 50 cubic kilometers per
year. Both of which are massive figures. You're talking about
on the order of a Nile River of flow, created by man, refilling
Lake Chad over some number of years. Again, just to help to get
a sense of some of these figures and what they mean, if you take
all of the western water projects in the United States: the
Central Valley Project; the Franklin Roosevelt projects of the
'30s; the Pat Brown projects of the '60s; the projects to divert
from the Colorado River into various regions. You combine all of
that, and you look at what is the total functional capacity of
all these projects; you're talking about a maximum of 20 cubic
kilometers per year. So, this is already 2.5 if not 5 times
larger than all of California's water projects combined.

You take China's beautiful brand new South Water North
project; they've completed two of the three routes for that
project; the so-called eastern route, and the so-called central
route. Those combined are going to be transferring about 30
cubic kilometers a year. When the western route is added on,
that'll be closer to 45. But again, even the lower estimate of
the Lake Chad Transaqua diversion project is 50 – is larger than

the South Water North project in its entirety; and it could be even twice that if the full extent is developed.

Hydropower will be developed along this region to provide much-needed electricity; and obviously the water will be used not just for refilling the lake, but an entire development of this region. If the full design is developed in its entirety, you can have a navigable canal that will be part of that; along with which, you can have inland ports, new industrial development, all kinds of economic activity along the canal itself. The level of land irrigation for farming that's being discussed – even with the current proposal of 50 cubic km per year – is equivalent to the entire California Central Valley.

If you know what the California Central Valley means for food production for the United States, this should tell you something. You're going to have a California Central Valley potential of food production right in the central heart of Africa. So this is an amazing project that will not just benefit the immediate nations touching the project; it will have spreading effects throughout [Africa], and is typical of the type of principle of development that is needed in this current period. You look for these large-scale actions that can benefit all the partners involved. China is making an investment; they're going to benefit from the project by being able to participate in its construction, but also getting new markets to work with as these African nations are able to grow and develop.

All these African nations are going to get power, water, skilled
training to construct and operate these projects, the related
industry that can go along with these development corridors.

This is exemplary of the type of programs that are needed
today. I think it deserves a very high level of support and
praise for the potential of this thing becoming a reality. Again,
it should serve as a reference point for the level of discussion
needed for the United States. Much could be said – we've
already taken up a fair amount of time with this, but the United
States' relation to Mexico; you have the entire NAWAPA design in
principle of managing the entire – and then potentials to add in
southern contributions from Mexico itself. So, you have similar
ideas of joint development that can not only alleviate current
drought conditions that are ravaging California, the southwest
United States, and much of northern Mexico; you can actually
create a qualitatively higher level of ability to support
completely new levels of agriculture development. You turn
entire territories that are now uninhabitable into potentially
some of the best land that you're going to want to get your hands
on.

It's this future-oriented level of development on this
scale, rooted in these types of principles, that I think is only
reference point and the only standard that we should really be
holding ourselves to at this point. So, you take, this is
exemplary; what we just discussed with the Kra Canal. These are
just a few keystone projects that really signify a new era for

mankind, and define the level of discussion that we need to rise
to in the United States.

OGDEN: So again, this is the paradigm which we wish to inaugurate today. This is something that the United States must be a part of, when we talk about a vision of common destiny for mankind; which was the way that Xi Jinping put it in his speech at Davos. When we talk about the mutual benefit among nations, it's defining these sorts of principles of the future and scientific challenges that can be overcome; and doing that together among nations, which is the paradigm of the 21st Century. We cannot retreat from that.

I think it's very clear, as President Trump said in his inaugural address, the time for empty talk is over; now is the hour of action. True! But the question is, what form will that action take? And according to what principle will that action be conceived? We go back to the Four Laws document of Lyndon LaRouche. The principle is very clear in that document; this is not just a policy paper. This is document which is formed around the principle that makes mankind different from animals; that we can master nature and improve it for the benefit of all mankind. Increasing the productive powers of the labor force through new technologies and new principles that are discovered; that's the

core principle of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws document. But I think that's what defines this hour of action which must be taken.

I'd like to put up on the screen right now the link to our petition – which we are still circulating – this is lpac.co/trumpsotu. Again, this is a petition demanding that Trump act on his words promising Glass-Steagall, which he said in his campaign; and it must be a strict Glass-Steagall as LaRouche has defined it. This is between now and the State of the Union address. So again, if you haven't signed that petition, this is still the active, leading campaign from LaRouche PAC here in the United States.

But let me let Michael say a little bit – if you wish to.

MICHAEL STEGER: I think what Ben indicated is that what are possible today are platform-like projects; and that's sort of the question for this new administration. Are we going to take actions which don't simply address the problems which we currently face? But as President Trump said, are we going to move into the future? That's not characterized by some linear notions of time; that requires a physical leap in mankind's sense of productivity and mankind himself as a species. The kind of projects that need to be taken up in the United States, being here in Houston with Kesha Rogers, we had a chance to meet with about 25 former rocket scientists from NASA. Leading figures, some of whom worked their entire careers in the manned space

program. They are ready to move forward; they see the potential, but I think what defines the Apollo-like project today is to conquer the fusion energy program. That's something mankind has yet to do; we've clearly got a capability internationally with robotics, and combined with the manned space program to begin to really advance our abilities of exploration on the Moon and Mars.

But the real question for mankind on Earth, and for mankind throughout the Solar System, is going to be this fusion platform. That's the kind of clear and distinct action that, if this administration takes, we will certainly move into the future in an un paralleled way.

OGDEN: We do see some references in this inaugural speech. As President Trump said, we're standing on the verge of a new millennium; and it's one in which we can unlock the mysteries of space, free Earth from the miseries of disease, and harness the energies, industries, and technologies of tomorrow. Fusion power as my example of what that could be. But, it's not enough to say those words; there has to be a clear pathway to achieve that, and the clear intention from the leadership of the United States to make that happen. But it requires an entirely new paradigm of thinking among the American people and among the nations of the

planet generally.

We must maintain a sense of common destiny, a shared future of common benefit; and I think if we take this as an Inauguration Day, but in a much broader sense of the word. Not just the inauguration of a new President in the United States; but potentially the inauguration of a new era of development for the planet. One which is already in motion; that paradigm is already underway, but it's waiting for the United States to become an active and willing participant in that new economic and strategic paradigm.

So, let me go back to the remarks that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche made earlier today which I cited in the beginning. Helga LaRouche was very clear; we must be focussed on our own principles and our own objectives, and proceed as we have been proceeding. We are very clear in terms of the fact that yes, the Bush and Obama era is over; a fresh breeze could be blowing through. A lot can change; this could potentially be the end of business as usual, but more clarity is still needed. And that clarity can only come from the leadership exemplified by the LaRouche Movement, defined and informed by clear scientific principle.

So, let's take these two great projects that we discussed here today – the Kra Canal and the Transaqua project in Africa – as paradigmatic of what the new era of development can be. Let's make the decision that this is not just Day One of the First 100 Days of new Presidency of the United States. It's not

just Day One of a new administration, but let's make this Day One, Inauguration Day, of a new era for development for mankind as a whole.

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Please be sure to watch the video of the Kra Canal project in full; the link is available in the description. And watch out for an interview with Pakdee Tanapura that will be coming very soon. And also hopefully, we will have more elaboration of the great and optimistic vision that Ben laid out in terms of this potential to develop the African continent as a whole.

Thank you very much for joining us here today, and please stay tuned. We're in for, I think, a wild ride; and we have a lot of work to do. Sign up to our email list if you haven't yet; subscribe to the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and stay tuned to larouchepac.com.