

Det afgørende punkt er, at menneskehedens fælles interesse er dens fremskridt.

**LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast,
13. januar, 2017; Leder**

Vores udsendelse i aften falder i tre dele. De tre dele er naturligvis indbyrdes forbundne, men første del er et klip fra et interview, som vores ven og kollega Jason Ross lavede med Ray McGovern, en CIA-veteran, der har været analytiker i 30 år, og som nu er medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity.

Udsendelsens anden del er et klip fra en præsentation af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der var et gennembrud i Stockholm, Sverige, i går (11. jan.), for et publikum, der bl.a. bestod af et bredt udsnit af det internationale diplomatiske samfund.

Og det tredje indslag i aften forfølger vores igangværende understregning af en intensivering af forståelsen af Lyndon LaRouches økonomiske opdagelser; og det vil omfatte en gennemgang ved Rachel Brown af en artikel, som hr. LaRouche offentliggjorde for nogen tid siden, med titlen, »In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton« (http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2017/2017_01-09/2017-02/pdf/32-42_4402.pdf), som hun komplementerer med en gennemgang af noget af materialet fra hr. LaRouches opgradering og fordybelse af ideen om, ikke infrastruktur (i sig selv), men om økonomiske platforme. Disse tre dele vil udgøre vores

udsendelse for i aften.

For at indlede vores første del, kan vi referere til et indslag på LaRouchePAC's webside i dag. Titlen er, »The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia« (indholdet er dækket i Tom Gillesbergs indledning til Nyhedsorientering januar, læs: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=17270>), og det handler direkte om de efterretninger, som vi vil få klarhed over i aften. At de, som virkelig intervenserer i amerikansk politik, ikke er de russiske efterretningstjenester, men snarere direkte er britisk efterretningstjeneste. Det 35 sider lange – hvad man vel må kalde et falsk dossier – om Trumps angivelige forbindelser med Rusland, og som blev citeret af CNN tidligere på ugen i en nyhedshistorie; og som dernæst blev offentliggjort eller lækket af Buzzfeed. Det afsløres nu, at dette blev forfattet af en fremtrædende, angiveligt pensioneret MI-6-efterretningsmand ved navn Christopher Steele; han blev først hyret af operatører fra det Republikanske Parti, der var modstandere af Trump i primærvalgene, og som dernæst blev hyret af Hillary Clintons kampagne for at udføre politisk kontra-research om Donald Trump. Det skulle bruges, ikke som en efterretningsfil, men til at tilsværte Trump under valget. Så dette er slet ikke en efterretningsrapport, som den blev præsenteret for at være af visse amerikanske medier, der lækkede den; men den var snarere blot en politisk misinformationsfil, der, som vi ser, kommer direkte fra britiske efterretningsoperatører. Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump brugte igen her til morgen twitter til at udfordre dette. Han sagde: »Det viser sig nu, at de falske anklager imod mig blev sammensat af mine politiske modstandere og en mislykket spion, der er bange for at blive sagsøgt. Totalt fabrikerede fakta fra foragtelige politiske operatører, både Demokrater og Republikanere. Falske nyheder. Rusland siger, at der intet findes; det er sandsynligvis udgivet af 'efterretningstjenester', vel vidende, at der intet bevis findes, og aldrig vil findes.«

Det, der står klart, er, at efterretningssamfundet har erklæret krig mod USA's nyvalgte præsident, der vil blive indsat om under en uge fra i dag. Dette er en situation uden fortilfælde; og briternes rolle er klar, som det ses af denne mand, Christopher Steele. Som jeg sagde, så, på trods af den narrativ, at det skulle være russerne, der kører en eller anden enorm indflydelses-kampagne for at forsøge at intervenere i og influere de amerikanske valg, så begynder det at se ud som om, at den virkelig misdæder her, var briterne.

Med denne indledning vil jeg nu gerne vise et klip fra interviewet med Ray McGovern. Som sagt har han 30 år som CIA-veterananalytiker bag sig; han var i sin tid ekspert i Rusland eller Sovjetunionen, da han var dér. Han var ansvarlig for at udarbejde nationale efterretningsestimater, og en daglig brief til præsidenten. Efter sin tid i CIA blev han medstifter af en organisation ved navn Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, der nu har omkring 50 medlemmer, pensionerede efterretningseksperter, der for nylig udstedte en erklæring, der satte seriøse spørgsmålstegn ved den narrativ, der blev offentliggjort om russisk indflydelse og russisk hacking. Hele interviewet vil være tilgængeligt fra søndag (15. jan.), på LaRouchePAC websiden og LaRouchePAC YouTube kanalen; og vi har udlagt andre uddrag af dette interview hen over de seneste par dage. Det uddrag, vi bringer her, er begyndelsen af interviewet, der blev udført af Jason Ross, med hr. Ray McGovern.

Jason Ross: Det er den 10. januar, 2017; jeg er Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC. Vi er meget glade for i dag at have Ray McGovern med os i studiet, en veteran, der har været i CIA i årtier, og som i 2003 var medstifter af Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Mange tak for at være med os i dag, Ray.

Ray McGovern: I er meget velkomne. Jeg er glad for at være her.

Ross: Lad os springe direkte til ét af de store spørgsmål, vi hører så meget om i medierne i øjeblikket – spørgsmålet om den angivelige russiske hacking af de amerikanske valg. Jeres gruppe, Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, udstedte en pressemeddelelse den 12. december, der sagde, at alle beviser pegede på en læk snarere end et hack. Siden da er to rapporter kommet frem; en fra DHS (Department of Homeland Security) og en, der hovedsagligt er forfattet af ODNI, Director of National Intelligence, og som siger, at her er beviset. Vi ved, Rusland gjorde det. Det var tvivlsomt, hvor brugbar denne rapport var. Og for et par dage siden var du så medforfatter af en kronik i *Baltimore Sun* sammen med William Binney, hvor du gentog dit standpunkt; at alle beviser peger på, at dette er en læk snarere end et hack, og under alle omstændigheder er der ikke blevet fremlagt nogen beviser for, at det skulle være et hack. Hvorfor har du dette standpunkt?

McGovern: Først må jeg sige noget om Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Vi oprettede vores organisation, da vi så, at vore kolleger – de kolleger, vi havde arbejdet sammen med – havde ladet sig forlede til at skabe, til at fabrikere efterretninger med det overlagte formål at franarre vore valgte repræsentanter deres forfatningsmæssige, særlige rettigheder til at erklære eller på anden vis bemyndige krig. Det var før Irak; og det kan ikke blive værre.

Bush, Cheney og de andre sagde alle sammen, »Åh, det var en frygtelig fejltagelse.« Det var ikke nogen fejltagelse; det var slet og ret bedrag. Da vi så dette finde sted, dannede vi en lille gruppe – vi var fem til at begynde med – og vi begyndte at gå offentligt. Vi udgav tre memoranda før krigen, hvor vi advarede præsidenten. Vores første memorandum blev udgivet samme dag, som Colin Powell (udenrigsminister 2001 – 2005) holdt sin tale – den 5. februar, 2003 – og vi gav ham et C- for indhold. Og vi advarede præsidenten (George W. Bush), »Efterretningerne bliver manipuleret, og de bør virkelig udvide kredsen af Deres rådgivere«, sagde vi mod slutningen,

»til at omfatte andre end dem, der tydeligvis er opsat på at få en krig, for hvilken vi ikke kan se, der skulle være nogen tvingende grund, og de utilsigtede konsekvenserne af hvilken sandsynligvis vil blive katastrofale.« Den kendsgerning, at vi havde ret, fryder os ikke; der var et par andre personer, der sagde det samme, men der var ingen, der kom igennem til de etablerede medier.

Hvis vi spoler lidt frem, så ser vi, at de daværende NSA-folk ikke alene var rystede over, hvor mange penge, der blev smidt ind i programmer, som de vidste, aldrig ville virke; men de var også oprørte over et billigere program, som de selv havde udarbejdet – som blot kostede \$330 mio. at indføre. Det andet program, som general Hayden støttede, kostede \$3 mia. med et 'b'; så der var ingen sammenligning. Bortset fra, at det ene ikke fungerede; det gjorde dette her. Grunde til, at jeg nævner dette, er, at dette havde masser af beviser for, hvad der ville ske under 11. september; det lå i det. De gik tilbage og så efter; de lukkede dette hovedprogram ned, og da Tom Drake, som stadig var ansat der, gik ind og så efter, så fandt han masser af beviser, der ville have – hvis det var blevet omdelt – forhindret 11. september. Så man var dobbelt oprørt, og Bill Binney havde været teknisk direktør i NSA før han trådte af kort tid efter 11. september. Han tilsluttede sig så os, som så mange andre vidunderlige folk har gjort; og da dette kom på nettet online, dette her med den russiske hacking, så var det mest naturlige for mig at sige, »Hej, Bill. Vi har brug for et memo fra dig; vi har brug for, at du laver et udkast. For du designede de fleste af disse systemer, og du ved, hvad Ed Snowden har afsløret. Disse billeder? De ser virkelig interessante ud for os, men vi har brug for nogen, der kan gennemgå dem for os.« Så sagde han, »Helt i orden«. Så gav han os et udkast, og det, vi typisk gør, er, at vi cirkulerer det blandt de fem, seks eller syv personer, der har særlig interesse i det, eller særlig erfaring; og mellem os fandt vi ud af det rigtige. Vi var én af de første, der kom ud af starthullerne og sagde, »Jo, dette er en spand (lort)!

Hvorfor? Af tekniske grunde.« Der var masser af andre grunde, men nogle folk – til deres ære, mener jeg – de er teknisk orienteret, og de vil vide, »Er dette muligt? Kunne russerne have gjort dette?« Svaret er, »Ja, men NSA ville have vidst besked med det.«

Det er chokerende, Jason, det er chokerende. Men NSA sporer *alle e-mails på denne planet*. Hvis disse går til udlandet, så har de samarbejdende tjenester og regeringer. Ikke blot seks, men de har 13 af dem. Hvis de går igennem USA, så får de dem; hvis de kommer udefra, får de dem alle. Og de kan spore dem; de har disse her små sporingsmekanismer forskellige steder i netværket. Så de ved, hvor hver eneste e-mail kommer fra, og hvor den ender.

Føj hertil den jernovervågning de har af den ecuadorianske ambassade i London, hvor Julian Assange er; og jeg er sikker på, at de overvåger hans kolleger også, uanset, hvor de er. Lad os nu sige, de russiske hack, og de fik det frem til Julian, og til en af hans medarbejdere. »OK, russere er virkelig dårlige mennesker«, siger folk; »Vis os meddelelserne.« »Åh, det kan vi ikke; vi har ikke meddelelserne. Men vi kigger på det.« De fik så præsidenten til, før han tog på ferie på Hawaii, at pålægge sanktioner, baseret på disse flygtige beviser, som de ikke kan vise os. Disse memoer – min første reaktion var at le ad dem, men det er meget sørgeligt at se, hvad efterretningssamfundet er blevet til; meget, meget sørgeligt. For dette er et vigtigt spørgsmål.

Hvad gjorde præsidenten så? Han slog ned på sanktioner; han smed 35 diplomater ud. Alt sammen ud fra hvis udsagn? John Brennans. Hvordan fik så *New York Times* al denne information? John Brennan. Det ved vi, fordi *Wall Street Journal* blev lidt sur over det, og de siger, »Ja, det er John Brennan, der taler med de andre fyre; han taler ikke med *Wall Street Journal*.« Hvad har vi så? Vi har en præsident, der tager en chance på lemfældigt grundlag og forårsager en endnu større fare, mere

aggressiv kritik, flere spændinger i vore relationer med Rusland. På baggrund af hvad? Lad mig sige det sådan; jeg vil måske sige det sådan: Jeg sad og så på nogle YouTube-klip; og jeg faldt over et af Christiane Amanpour, der sendte fra London. Hun er i færd med at interviewe Lukyanov, en af de russiske guruer. Hun siger, »Hr. Lukyanov [imiterer Amanpours stemme] De siger, at der absolut *ingen* beviser er, *ingen*, siger De. Jamen, når der ikke findes beviser, hvorfor har USA's præsident så smidt sanktioner på Rusland?«

Ross: Den er god.

McGovern: Jeg husker, at jeg fik stillet det samme spørgsmål omkring masseødelæggelsesvåben. [Imiterer igen Amanpours stemme] »Hr. McGovern, hvis De siger, at der ikke findes beviser for masseødelæggelsesvåben, hvorfor startede Bush og Cheney så en krig mod Irak?« Tja, svaret er det samme, det samme! Det er virkelig et dårligt flashback, for det, de må gøre, er at komme frem med beviserne. Det er min stærke opfattelse, at det vil de ikke gøre; ikke pga. kilder og metoder, men fordi, der ikke findes nogen.

(Engelsk udskrift af hele webcastet):

The Crucial Point Is that Our Common Interest As Mankind Is Man's Progress

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast January 13, 2017

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening; it's January 13, 2017.

My

name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our regular Friday evening webcast from larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the

studio today by Megan Beets from the LaRouche PAC Science Team;

and via video by two members of our LaRouche PAC Policy Committee

– Michael Steger, joining us from San Francisco, California;

and

Rachel Brown, joining us from Boston, Massachusetts.

We have a three-part show for you today. The three segments will obviously be interrelated, but they will feature first a clip from a feature interview that our friend and colleague Jason Ross did with Ray McGovern, a veteran CIA professional analyst for 30 years, and now the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. We have a second segment which features a clip from a breakthrough presentation that Helga Zepp-LaRouche made in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday to an audience comprised of a large cross section of the international diplomatic community. And then a third segment tonight which pursues our ongoing emphasis on deepening the understanding of Lyndon LaRouche's economic discoveries; and that will include a review by Rachel Brown of a paper that Mr. LaRouche published a while ago, called "In Defense of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton", complemented by a review of some of the material from the last few years of Mr. LaRouche's upgrading and deepening of the idea of not infrastructure, but economic platforms. So, that will be our three part show from this evening.

To begin our first part, I think that we can refer to an item that's posted on the LaRouche PAC website today. The title of that is, "The Foreign Power Corrupting US Politics Is Britain, Not Russia"; and this goes directly to the intelligence that we're getting clarity on today. That the ones who are in fact interfering in US politics, are not the Russian intelligence

services, but rather, directly, British intelligence. The 35-page – I guess you could call it dodgy dossier – on Trump's supposed connections with Russia that was cited by CNN earlier this week in a news story; and then published or leaked by BuzzFeed. This is now being exposed as being authored by a prominent supposedly-retired MI-6 officer, a man named Christopher Steele; who was hired first by Republican Party operatives who were opposing Donald Trump in the primaries, and then was rehired by Hillary Clinton's campaign to do political opposition research on Donald Trump. To be used not as an intelligence brief, but to politically smear Trump in the election. So again, this is not an intelligence report at all, as it was represented by certain US media outlets that leaked it; but rather merely a political disinformation brief, coming directly from, as we see, British intelligence operatives. President-elect Donald Trump took to twitter again this morning to call this out. He said, "It now turns out that the phony allegations against me were put together by my political opponents and a failed spy afraid of being sued. Totally made-up facts by sleaze-bag political operatives, both Democrats and Republicans. Fake news. Russia says nothing exists; probably released by 'intelligence', even knowing there is no proof and never will be."

What is clear is that the intelligence community has declared war on the President-elect of the United States, who is due to be inaugurated in less than one week from the present moment. This is an unprecedented situation; and the role of the British in this is clear, as can be seen by the role of this character Christopher Steele. As I said, despite the narrative

that the Russians were running some huge influence campaign to try to interfere and influence the American election, it's beginning to look like the real culprit here was the British.

With that said as a matter of introduction, I'd like to play a clip of this interview that we did with Ray McGovern. As I said, he's a 30-year veteran analyst with the CIA; he was a Russia or Soviet Union specialist at the time he was there. He's responsible for preparing national intelligence estimates and the Presidential daily brief. Now, since his time at the CIA, he has become the co-founder of an organization called the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, which now has about 50 members, retired intelligence specialists who recently put out a statement seriously calling into question the narrative being put out about Russian influence and Russian hacking. The full interview will be available beginning on Sunday on the LaRouche PAC website and the LaRouche PAC YouTube channel; and we have released other excerpts of this interview over the past few days. This excerpt you're about to see is the very beginning of the interview, which was conducted by Jason Ross, with Mr. Ray McGovern.

JASON ROSS: Hi! Thanks for joining us. It's January 10, 2017; I'm Jason Ross here at LaRouche PAC. We are very happy to have in the studio today Ray McGovern, multi-decade veteran of the CIA and the co-founder in 2003 of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Thanks very much for coming today, Ray.

RAY McGOVERN: You're most welcome; I'm glad to be with you.

ROSS: So, let's jump right into one of the big issues that we're hearing about so much in the media today – the issue of purported Russian hacking of the US elections. Now your group, the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity released a press statement on December 12th, saying that all evidence pointed towards a leak rather than a hack. Since then, two reports have come out; one from the DHS and one primarily authored by the ODNI, the Director of National Intelligence, saying here's the proof. We know Russia did it. The report was of questionable usefulness. Then just a few days ago, you co-authored an op-ed in the {Baltimore Sun} with William Binney, where you restated your position; that all evidence points toward this being leak rather than a hack, and in any case, evidence of a hack is not been presented. Why do you take that position?

McGOVERN: Well, I need to tell you something about Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity first. We established ourselves when we saw that our colleagues – the colleagues with whom we had worked – had let themselves be suborned into creating, into fabricating intelligence for the express purpose of deceiving our elected representatives out of their Constitutional prerogatives to declare or otherwise authorize war. That was before Iraq; and that's as bad as it gets.

Bush, Cheney, and the others all said, "Oh, it was a terrible mistake." It was not a mistake; it was out and out

fraud. When we saw that happening, we formed a little group – there were five of us in the beginning – and we started publishing. We published three memoranda before the war, warning the President. Our first one was on the day of Colin Powell's speech – the 5th of February, 2003 – and we gave him a C- for content. And we warned the President, "The intelligence is being manipulated and you really should widen the circle of your advisors," we said at the end, "beyond those who are clearly bent on a war for which we see no compelling reason, and from which, we believe the unintended consequences are likely to be catastrophic." We take no delight in the fact that we happened to be right on that; there were a couple of other people saying that, but nobody got into the mainstream media.

So, if you fast forward now, you see that the NSA people who were in place at the time, not only were appalled at how much money was being thrown at programs that they knew would never work; but were outraged when they found out that a cheaper program that they devised themselves – which only cost \$330 million to emplace. The other one that General Hayden went for, cost \$3 billion with a "b"; so no comparison. Except that one didn't work; this one did. The reason I mention that, is this had plenty of evidence what was going to happen in 9/11; it was in there. They went back and they looked; they closed that main program down, and when Tom Drake, who was still employed there, went in and looked, he found plenty of evidence that would have

– had it been shared – prevented 9/11. So, double outrage here, and Bill Binney had been the technical director at NSA before he left shortly after 9/11. So, he joined us, like so many other wonderful people have; and when this went viral, this business about Russian hacking, it was the most natural thing for me to do to say, "Hey, Bill. We need a memo from you; we need you to do a draft. Because you know, you designed most of these systems, and you know what Ed Snowden has revealed. Those slides? They look really interesting to us, but we need somebody to take us through them." So, he said, "Sure." So, he gave us a draft, and what we typically do is, we circulate it around the five or six or seven people who have special interests in that, or special experience; and we got it right together. We were one of the first ones off the block saying "Yeah, this is a crock! Why? For technical reasons." There were plenty of other reasons, but some people – and I think it's to their credit – they're technically oriented, and they want to know, "Is this possible? Could the Russians have done this?" Well, the answer is "Yes, but NSA would know about it."

Now, it boggles the mind, Jason, it boggles the mind. But NSA traces {all emails on this planet}. If they go abroad, they have cooperating agencies and cooperating governments. Not only six, they have about 13 of them. If they go through the United States, they get them; if they come from outside, they get them

all. And they can trace them; they have these little trace mechanisms at various points in the network. So, they know where

each and every email originates and where it ends up.

Now, add to that the ironclad coverage they have of the

Ecuadoran embassy in London, where Julian Assange is; and I'm sure that they monitor his colleagues as well wherever they happen to be. So, let's say the Russians hack, and they got it

to Julian, they got it to one of his associates. "Well, OK, Russians are really bad people," people say; "Show us the messages." "Oh, we can't; we don't have the messages. But we'll

look at it." Now, they got the President, before he went on vacation to Hawaii, to impose sanctions based on this elusive evidence that they can't show us. These memos – my first reaction was to laugh at them, but this a very sad thing to see

what the intelligence community has become; very, very sad. Because this is an important issue.

So, what did the President do? He slapped on sanctions;

threw out 35 diplomats. All on whose say-so? John Brennan's. Now, how did the {New York Times} get all this information? John

Brennan. We know that because the {Wall Street Journal} was a little ticked off about it, and they said, "Yeah, it's Brennan that's talking to these other guys; he's not talking to the {Wall

Street Journal}." So, what do we have here? We have the President going out on a limb, causing even more danger, more flak, more tensions in our relationship with Russia. On the basis of what? Well, let me just say this; maybe I'll put it this way: I was looking at some YouTube clips; and I happened upon one of Christiane Amanpour, broadcasting from London. She's

interviewing Lukyanov, one of the Russian gurus. She says, "Mr.

Lukyanov, [imitating Amanpour's voice] you say there's {zero} evidence, you say {zero}. Well, if there's zero evidence, why is it that the President of the United States has slapped sanctions on Russia?"

ROSS: That's good.

McGOVERN: I remember being asked that question about weapons of mass destruction. [Again imitating Amanpour's voice]

"Mr. McGovern, if you say there's no evidence of weapons of mass destruction, why did Bush and Cheney start a war on Iraq?" Well, same answer; same answer! It's a really bad flashback, because what they need to do, is come up with the evidence. My strong view is that they're not going to do that; not because of sources and methods, but because there isn't any.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, that's part of a much longer interview, and part of it has already been posted on YouTube under the title "Sources and Methods Versus National Interests"; and you can expect the full interview to be posted and available coming Sunday, the day after tomorrow.

But I would like to just use that to invite the other members of the broadcast here today to just open up a bit of a discussion on this subject.

MICHAEL STEGER: In all of this discussion, apparently some people are not pulling back over so-called "Trump's ties to

Russia." What this whole situation now makes clear, is that the entire attack on the Trump campaign and the President-elect's policy towards Russia, has been the target explicitly of British Intelligence the entire time. The report that was released, this 35-page dodgy dossier, starts in June once Trump consolidates the nomination, essentially, for the Republican Party, and doesn't stop until mid-December of this just past year. And so, it's clear that British Intelligence were the ones pushing this the entire time. It's clear that Christopher Steele was close friends with now-head of MI-6, Alex Younger. The British media are panicking. A former Secretary General of the NATO, a British Lord, came out and said this is a total panic. We could be sleepwalking into a complete catastrophe.

It's clear the British had an explicit intent to manipulate the U.S. elections, to fabricate false intelligence on a major candidate, to drum up a conspiracy – so-called "hacking" by the Russians to disrupt U.S. foreign policy and U.S. interests – against the welfare of the American people. To those who know history, and know Mr. LaRouche's role in the last 40-50 years of American politics, this role of British Intelligence, includes people who represented British outlooks, like Henry Kissinger, a public advocate of British foreign policy against the American outlook; the British hand, not just in an attempt to destroy and manipulate the Presidential election and alter U.S. foreign policy changes, but the direct role of the British in support of the terrorists in Syria, via Saudi Arabia, and other nations;

the
direct role of the British, such as David Cameron, who just
high-tailed it out of Downing Street and the British
Parliament,
because he was directly exposed in a fraudulent-led campaign
against Libya; the false intelligence of Tony Blair on the
Iraq
war, which Ray McGovern was just referring to.

Besides that, you've got then the international drug
trade,
which we documented beginning in the 1970s, with {Dope, Inc.},
and the international drug trade run by Her Majesty, Queen
Elizabeth. Who, by the way, could be on her death-bed; and
that
wouldn't necessarily be a bad thing.

You've got an international drug trade, and
international
war program, international terrorism, and, of course, the
Wall-Street/London nexus of international finance, which has
run
this absolute cult of financial policy for decades, for
centuries, in essence. This is the same institution which was
responsible for the assassination of Alexander Hamilton,
Abraham
Lincoln, William McKinley, the attempted assassination of FDR,
the backing of Hitler. By the way, I think the Russian
Embassy
in London made it clear that it was the Brits, such as the
Cliveden set, who were responsible for backing Hitler. That
they're coming out now and targeting the potential policy
changes
in the United States, one towards Russia, potentially towards
China – to end the threat of nuclear world war.

They're also attempting to disrupt what could be a
very
important – as I think we'll see from Helga Zepp LaRouche's
clip

– relationship between the U.S., China, and Russia, on an economic policy; and, as we know it to be very important that we'll get to later as well, a fundamental change in U.S. financial policy. This British nexus is targeting the Trump campaign and targeting this entire change in U.S. policy. This is British imperial tactics. This is what they do; they are at the source of it. If there's going to be a Congressional investigation of any foreign nations' or foreign agents' involvement to manipulate U.S. democracy, I think first and foremost, it has to be the United Kingdom.

RACHEL BRINKLEY: The fact that on page 15 of these 35 pages, it attacks LaRouche by name, saying that there were Trump factions travelling to meet with Putin factions, as part of this alliance in the summer of 2016. They cite LaRouche directly in this report as having representatives that went to Russia as part of this discussion; which did not happen. As this was authored by the British, this is just the British Empire freaked out about LaRouche's policies taking over, and the potential of a United States/Russia/China alliance, especially the Russia/U.S. cooperation.

I think it is notable that if you have the United States, Russia, and China working together, there's no problem on the planet that can't be solved. That's an unstoppable alliance. I think the British are desperate, and that's what we're seeing.

OGDEN: That's exactly what Helga LaRouche presented at this conference that happened in Stockholm, Sweden just yesterday.

This was an extraordinary conference, and I'm going to play a clip of her opening speech to you right now. This was a standing-room-only capacity audience that included 17 diplomats, a cross-section of the entire planet, including seven ambassadors. She delivers her analysis of what we've really seen behind this showdown, as we've been discussing, of the British and American intelligence establishment vs. the incoming President-elect. She highlights, towards the end of these excerpted remarks – and again, this is only an excerpt, in bits and pieces – the whole speech contains a lot more substance in terms of what you just said, Rachel.

The motivation behind ending this confrontational policy towards Russia and towards China, is that if Russia, China, and the United States were to join, in a grand alliance, around what is now a concrete policy initiative coming out of China – the One Belt, One Road, or New Silk Road project – to bring development to the interior of not only Eurasia, but also Africa and the North and South America landmass, and were to reorganize our relations around what's now being called the "win-win" paradigm among nations – then everything is possible. She explores a lot of these questions in the {full} speech, which will be available in video form in just a few hours.

In what you're about to hear, she touches on what must be done, both strategically and economically, to shape the policy of this incoming new Presidency. I apologize for the quality of the audio. It was not the best audio recording, but again, in just

a few hours, we will have the full video that will be available. This is just a taste:

HELGA ZEPP LAROUCHE (Audio excerpt): ... Let me start with the Trump election. Now, I have in my whole political life, which is now becoming quite long, several decades – I have never in my whole political life, seen such hysteria on the side of the neo-cons, on the side of the mainstream politicians, on the side of the liberal media, as concerning Trump... But what was caused Trump, is that he simply promised end the political paradigm which was the basis of eight years of George W. Bush and eight years of Barack Obama, which was a direct continuation of the Bush-Cheney policy.

And it was a good thing, because it was very clear that if Hillary Clinton would have won the election in the United States, that all the policies she was pursuing, including an no-fly zone over Syria, and an extremely bellicose policy towards Russia and China, would have meant that we would have been on the direct course to World War III.

The fact that Hillary did not win the election was {extremely} important for the maintenance of world peace. And I think that of all the promises that Trump made so far, the fact that he said ... that he will normalize the relationship between the United States and Russia, is, in my view {the most important

step}. Because if the relationship between the United States and Russia is decent, and is based on trust and cooperation, I think there is a basis to solve all other problems in the world. And if that relationship would be in an adversary condition, world peace is in extreme danger.

So from my standpoint, there is reason to believe that this will happen. The Russian reaction has been very moderate, but optimistic that this may happen. If you look at the appointments, you have several cabinet members and other people in other high posts who are also for improving the relationship with Russia, such as Tillerson who is supposed to become Secretary of State; General Flynn, who is a conservative military man but also for normalization with Russia, and many others, so I think this is a good sign.

Now, if you look at the reaction of the neo-con/neo-liberal faction on both sides of the Atlantic to this election of Trump, you can only describe it as {completely} hysterical. The {Washington Post} today has an article "How to Remove Trump from Office," calling him a liar, just every derogative you can possibly imagine, just on and on unbelievable...

And then naturally, you have the reports by the different U.S. intelligence services, Clapper, Brennan, Comey from the FBI. They all put out the fact that that it was Russian hacking of

the
emails of the DNC and Podesta which would have stolen the
election, because they would have shifted the view of the
Americans to vote for Trump.

Now, I think this is ridiculous. Not only have many
cyber
experts, in Europe but also in the United States, already said
that all the signs are that it was not a hacking but an
insider
leak giving this information out, which is more and more
likely,
and there's absolutely {zero} proof that it was Russian
hacking.

Naturally, what is being covered up with this story is what
was

the "hacking" about? It was "hacking" of emails that proved
that

Hillary Clinton manipulated the election against Bernie
Sanders!

That is not being talked about any more....

The real narrative is that it was the injustice of the
neoliberal system of globalization which has violated the
interests of the majority of the people, especially in the
"rust

belt." Hillary Clinton in the election campaign was so
arrogant

that she didn't even go to Ohio or some of the other states
which

were formerly industrialized. You have to see that the United
States, contrary to what mostly is reported in the Western
media

in Europe, is in a state of economic collapse...

[T]here is one indicator which shows if a society is
doing

good or bad, and that is if the life-expectancy increases or
shrinks. In the United States it's shrinking for the first
time

for both men and women. In the period of 16 years of Bush-Cheney and Obama, which you can take as one package, the suicide rate has quadrupled in all age brackets; the reasons being alcoholism, drug addiction, hopelessness, depression because of unemployment.

There are about 94 million Americans who are of working age who are not even counted in the statistics, because they have given up all hope of ever finding a job again. If you have recently travelled in the United States, the United States is really in a terrible condition; the infrastructure is in a horrible condition, and people are just not happy.

So the vote, therefore, the narrative, was that the reason why Hillary was voted out because she was being perceived as the direct continuation of these 16 years, and so the attempt to change that narrative by saying it was "Russian hacking" is pretty obvious....

I cannot tell you what this Trump administration is going to be. I think I mentioned the one point, I'm pretty confident about... But there are other interesting elements, for example: Trump had promised in the election campaign to invest \$1 trillion into the renewal of the infrastructure in the United States. That is very good, as I said, because the United States urgently needs repair. It will, however, only function if at the same time, another promise by Trump, namely, what he promised in October in North Carolina, that he would implement the 21st Century

Glass-Steagall Act, will also be carried out, because the trans-Atlantic financial system remains on the verge of bankruptcy. You could have a repetition of the 2008 financial crash at any moment; and {only} if you have a Glass-Steagall law in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what Roosevelt did in 1933 by separation of the banks, by getting rid of the criminal element of the banking system, and then replacing it by a credit policy in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton, can you remedy this situation. Otherwise, you cannot finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure...

OGDEN: Now, Helga continues from there to give a very inspiring overview of the development projects from the last three years that have been sparked by the initiative from China on the One Belt, One Road or the New Silk Road initiative. But she also gives an incredible history of the founding of the Schiller Institute and the role and she and Lyndon LaRouche have played over the last 30-40 years in the fight for a new, just, international economic and strategic order. A fight which is now coming to a certain point of culmination at least internationally; but the urgency of winning this fight here in the United States is something that she continued to emphasize, and it's exactly what she ended with there in that excerpt.

Right now, we must have the most urgent mobilization; there are no excuses for delay from {any} elected representative for an immediate restoration of Glass-Steagall. We have now launched

and are in the midst of a national mobilization; we've talked about this on previous broadcasts. But as you can see on the screen right now, we're circulating a petition which is collecting signatures; it needs to more rapidly accrue signatures. But it's accessible at lpac.co/trumpsotu; and again, this is a petition which originated from some citizen-activists in Ohio, who are associated with the "Our Revolution" movement, people who had been associated with the Bernie Sanders campaign during the primaries. But who have now taken it upon themselves to rally behind the initiative that LaRouche PAC has led; that we must have Glass-Steagall, and we must hold Trump to his word, when he called for a 21st Century Glass-Steagall at that speech in Charlotte, North Carolina. As I said, this has bipartisan support, and there are no excuses for delay. The only way this is going to happen, is if citizens across the United States decide to participate in this LaRouche PAC campaign and sign your name onto this petition: lpac.co/trumpsotu – State of the Union.

Now, we did have a day of action in Washington this week.

The Congress is now officially back in session; they've been sworn in and business is underway. There was participation from

many states up and down the East Coast in person.

Representatives coming in from Virginia, from Maryland, from Pennsylvania, from Connecticut, from New Jersey, from New York.

But there was also a lot of other participation from across

the country in terms of pressure being put on representatives to meet with members of the LaRouche PAC. There was a unique representative from the Manhattan Project, Mr. John Sigerson, who's the director of the Schiller Institute Chorus in New York City; who's been participating in some of the recent choral activities there, including the memorial at the Bayonne, New Jersey 9/11 Teardrop Memorial, where members of the Schiller Institute Chorus were joined by the PDNY Honor Guard and the Honor Guard from Bayonne, New Jersey to honor the tragic loss of the Alexandrov Choral Ensemble from Russia. This is just one example of the kind of power that the music program from the Manhattan Project, from New York City, has been able to play to shape the political dialogue in the United States and also across countries. In this case, the potential for a far-improved relationship between the United States and Russia. So again, this was a day of action in Washington, DC, but the mobilization has to continue. We are in a countdown; it's now a 7-day countdown until the inauguration. Then shortly after that, we will have the State of the Union; and again, this petition is to insist that Trump put a premium on highlighting the necessity for a return to the 21st Century Glass-Steagall Act during that State of the Union. This has to be one of the number one agenda items of the first 100 days.

But, let's discuss a little bit more broadly what Helga LaRouche brought up at the end of that discussion; that

Glass-Steagall is only the first step, and there's a much more far-reaching and profound approach to a revolution in the economic policy of the United States that's necessary and which has been framed by Mr. LaRouche.

STEGER: Well Matt, I think it's important to start with how Mr. LaRouche initially responded immediately after the Trump election. His response was that this was global; and I think that really does capture this. The political process that is shaping the United States in contradiction to this British intelligence operation to destroy the United States, is really a global phenomenon; and I'll get to that in a second. But what Mrs. LaRouche then touched on in her speech is something that most Americans are experiencing, but because of that British intelligence operation, because of this mass-lie campaign that the American people have been living under; the official lie, in essence, Orwellian policy that even the Russian Foreign Ministry now refers to, that Americans have been living in since 9/11. This has kept them from identifying what is now physically identified; that the actual quality of life is collapsing at such rates that life expectancy is now beginning to collapse.

We have officially, you might say, entered into a Dark Age; a mini-Dark Age has begun in the United States. Now, this can be reversed. But the level of drug addiction has more than tripled under Obama's Presidency; the level of opiate addiction, the abuse of drugs like marijuana has skyrocketed under an Obama-supported legalization campaign. Which is of course, backed by the same drug cartels which are providing the

financial

backing to the banking institutions. This was Obama's program.

You've seen a massive level of homicides and crime and murder rates escalating in severely impoverished areas, including Obama's so-called "own neighborhood" of the South Side of Chicago. This level of breakdown has never been seen in the history of the United States; and it is only characteristic of societies which are beginning to utterly break down. Long-term

survival is not even a question; what's at immediate risk for an

increasing majority of Americans is short-term survival.

That's

what you see when you have decreasing life expectancy rates, increasing numbers of people are dying faster and faster; largely

from things like alcohol addiction, drug addiction, diseases related to despair, suicide and so on.

That's where Glass-Steagall comes in; and this is what really has to be captured. And why it's not simply Glass-Steagall, but the full Four Laws. I think Megan and Rachel

can say more, because we're currently working on a project to make this clear. But the role of fusion and the space program really captivate the fourth law in what direction our country has

to take to reawaken a sense of optimism, a sense of development

within the American culture. To break out, not just of disrepair

– breaking down of bridges, bad roads – we all know the bad roads and highways, especially on the East Coast. But that's not

what we have to emerge from. Building better roads isn't escaping from the clutches of a Dark Age; something greater has

to capture the real spirit of human identity and creativity.

Now, this is why it's so important to identify this global phenomenon; because the steps of the Four Laws: Glass-Steagall immediately; shut down this Wall Street banking cartel and basically a drug operation. The second is the public credit of a national banking system, which Paul Gallagher elaborated last night; we could say more on. To consolidate, aggregate the US debt that exists, as well as other financial resources towards the most important projects of development for the country; the most advanced levels of infrastructure, or the broader physical platform of industry and production. And of course most importantly, the fusion and space program.

This phenomenon globally is just somewhat breathtaking; and Mrs. LaRouche touches on it directly. The Transaqua project in Africa is something that we've been promoting for decades; this is something which begins to take the sub-Saharan area of Africa from the great lakes near the eastern part of Africa towards West Africa and Nigeria, up into the southern border of the Sahara Desert. It begins to look at how we use major infrastructure projects of water transportation, the refilling of Lake Chad, and the development of this central African area. There's also a major rail line, which is not initiated – it's been inaugurated; it's now running from Ethiopia to the coastline of Djibouti. This rail line is one of the key continental rail passages that

the Schiller Institute and {EIR} have been fighting for, for decades; to begin to integrate the full potential of Africa's people and its resources and its industrial capacities into an integrated economic breakthrough. A real shift in the productivity and lifestyle and scientific potential of Africa. Those things are now unfolding; these are coming from largely Chinese investments, Chinese engineering companies are directly onboard.

The same is true from another project, and I think it's worth just highlighting, because we have gotten reports recently that it's practically shovel-ready. This is Kra Canal. All this contention over the South China Sea that everyone's heard about; and the Americans remain, I'm sure, still somewhat confused. What's the big deal about a couple of islands in the South China Sea? As the President of the Philippines said, we're not going to eliminate humanity over a couple of fishing spots in the South China Sea. The real question is the Kra Canal; this is something explicitly that the British Empire has prevented by diktat, to shut down. Matt, you and others have been involved in video production specifically on this project and the role of the British to shut this down over centuries to eliminate this project. The Chinese have said that they are ready to begin the development of the Kra Canal. The Thai government, with a new king, seems favorable; the military, the prime minister seem favorable. The question of Japan's collaboration is something that goes back to the 1980s; with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche directly

involved in this project. The people we worked with then, in Thailand, are again promoting and advocating for its initial construction today.

So, these projects are transformative. We've gone through more on that; I'm not going to give the layout of these projects.

But there are major development orientations taking place that are gripping mankind. There was an offer today, apparently, in the {Hindu Times} in India from a Chinese journalist, which said "Will Donald Trump Participate in the Silk Road Conference in China?" I think that really is the potential which we've got today.

So, the Glass-Steagall fight, this question of the United States deciding that we're going to build our nation again, we're going to shut down this Wall Street racket and take on this kind of potential; that's really what has to be ignited. And there's no reason Donald Trump should not take that up at the inauguration and the State of the Union.

BRINKLEY: Right! And on this question of the murder policy of Obama, there's an attempt now to cover it up and make him the cute President and Joe Biden getting an award. No, this is flat-out murder, and if this mass movement across the world is properly educated, it won't be stopped.

So, there was discussion recently around infrastructure, as Helga brought up, from Trump. It's still not to the level of LaRouche's conception of infrastructure. For example, here's

what Speaker Paul Ryan said about infrastructure: "In the spring budget, we believe we will be able to address the infrastructure issue." The chairman of the Republican study committee, Mark Walker, says "I don't know that we've settled on \$1 trillion. If it's \$1 trillion in infrastructure, that is something we'd have to say, 'There's a portion of this that we're not comfortable with and come back to the table.'|" And then Sam Graves, the head of the Transportation Subcommittee, says "We just simply can't afford it," adding that "It can't all be done through public-private partnerships as the President-elect is talking about."

They're still looking at this as an issue. LaRouche developed this concept. Helga LaRouche made the point that 2017 should be the year of the rejuvenation or flourishing of LaRouche's ideas. He wrote a paper in 2010 called, "What Your Accountant Never Understood; the Secret Economy". He goes through a universal history of the greater concept of infrastructure. He starts with the question of transoceanic travel; navigation across the oceans. He says, "For example, look back to the approximately hundred-centuries of the Earth's last great glaciation. While some part of the human population had remained mired in the habits of life of some fixed, relatively narrow regions free of glaciation, great transoceanic maritime cultures were also developed. The requirement of a stellar mapping for navigation for the existence of maritime cultures, gave us the stellar notion of the efficient existence of a functional form of an ontologically-actual universe; as echoed by such great residual artifacts as the Great Pyramid

of
Giza, and by the physical science of spherics. Now, into this
so-called Platonic long cycle, into the Pythagorean
predecessors
of Plato."

So, you have the concept of how to travel on an
ocean. How
do you navigate? By the stars. How do you map the stars? On
a
flat plane? No, you find you have to use a spherical map; so
the
beginning of this spherical foundation of a physical science
of
the Universe was discovered. This was applied to navigate the
oceans. He says from there it goes on to the idea of inland
travel, not just oceanic, but inland via internal waterways.
He
says this you saw developed with Charlemagne first. He says,
"Charlemagne's reforms served as a precedent for the
development
and role of the great internal system of rivers and canals,
which
provided the crucial steps toward modern European economy, and
the application of the same reform within our United States.
Those inland waterways prepared the leap toward the
revolutionary
US trans-continental railway systems. First, inside the
United
States; and in turn, the trans-continental rail systems of
Eurasia." So, this was John Quincy Adams uniting the country
with waterways and with the rail systems. He was the first to
fully unite the United States as a single territory. This was
followed by Bismarck in Germany and Mendeleev in Russia.
That
was the next advancement.

Then he says, "Now, the prospect of the combined
effect of

magnetic levitation mass transport systems and rail, which will connect the principal continents of the world, would render most ocean transport of freight technologically obsolete; because the modern successor of ordinary internal rail transport will have rendered much of ocean freight technologically, and therefore economically, obsolete." We are starting to see the beginnings of this with things like the North-South transport corridor from India to Iran to Russia; which cuts off the maritime route by making it 40% shorter. There are also new rail lines developing between China and Europe. The first train of which, for example, just went from Beijing to London, starting January 1, 2017; the first time ever in history. There are 39 various routes now between China and Europe; inland rail following the route of the old Silk Road, but with modern rail. As LaRouche says, if you have high-speed magnetic levitation rail, that would be even a further advancement.

Next, he says, "Changes such as those, illustrate a general principle which will be expressed in certain nearby Solar System locations. Now, we're going to go to the next step, such as our Moon and Mars, when they will have come to be considered later, as within the bounds of our presently still-young, new century's plausible instances of work and habitation. Typical problems to

be overcome for the purpose of human transport and dwelling in nearby solar space, and later beyond, must look to such future developments already foreseeable for later in the present century. We should then recognize that the development of basic economic infrastructure had always been a needed creation of what is required as a habitable development of a synthetic, rather than a presumably natural, environment for the enhancement or even the possibility of human life and practice at some time in the existence of our human species."

So, he's bring up, one, this long-term conception; he says later, three generations – 75 years – should be our orientation for space. We have the questions of habitation and transport as fundamental challenges; and this is the idea of the next phase.

But in general, also this last question of synthetic versus natural; that these various new modes of habitation and travel were based off of new discoveries that created a whole new platform of existence, of habitation, of travel, where mankind could reach through these advances. And those were all creations of the human mind in the likeness of the Creator. Infrastructure is not just making a bridge or something to get from here to there; it's the question of a new advancement, of a new principle that is applied throughout your entire society. So, it's not an add-on to your economic policy as Paul Ryan was saying. "We'll get to that; we'll figure out how to fit it in the budget." It's

the beginning of your notion of economy.

MEGAN BEETS: Yeah Rachel, I think what you just put forward here from Mr. LaRouche's overview and what you were just saying, it's a way of thinking that most Americans have forgotten about.

People have lost touch with the kind of big thinking about long sweeps of human history, and I think that that way of thinking

— the idea that we can consider 50-100-year cycles of human progress in general — flies in the face of the biggest British Empire lie which has dominated for some time. The idea that human growth is bad; human progress is bad; population growth destroys the Earth and it's bad. We have to hold back technological progress; we have to go backwards. Instead of towards nuclear power, we have to go backwards towards solar power, wind power; and reduce our impact and our presence on the

Earth. That lie is exactly what's being threatened with both the

rise of the New Paradigm being led from Eurasia and the potentiality of Mr. LaRouche's ideas; which are really the most

advanced version of the American System ideas of Hamilton, Franklin Roosevelt, and Lincoln, of putting the creative power and really the responsibility of the creative human mind to change nature. To alter nature to better support human life; alter the biosphere to higher levels of productivity, as we do by improving agriculture, for example.

I just think that what you're bringing up here really is the crucial point; that our common interest as mankind is man's progress. That right now dictates that we can't accept

anything

lower than a long-term dedication to the highest forms of technological advance and growth; which is nuclear fusion power

and its companion, a space program. The colonization of the Moon

and eventual colonization of Mars. That would really be a beautiful renaissance expression of the American people working

with the rest of the world towards the uplifting of humanity toward our real, true potential.

OGDEN: Well, as I said, we are going to continue the discussion of the substance – this was, I think, crucial Rachel;

because it's exactly what you're saying. This insight into the

real meaning of something which has become banalized – infrastructure; that's the key to all of economic science. If humanity is going to make the shift into the next phase of our global existence as a species, it's only going to be possible if

we have a flourishing of this kind of philosophical understanding

of the science behind real, true economics. It's a critical ingredient of the ability of humanity to move forward. So, I think we're going to continue this; and there are a lot of interrelated works that Mr. LaRouche authored over the last several years which explore this concept of the real meaning of

infrastructure, the idea of the economic platform, and the role

that Hamiltonian credit should play in facilitating all of that.

So, that said, that's the crucial insight and understanding

that you need to fight with us right now for the necessary

policy

revolution here in the United States. This all revolves around

the initiation of Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws.

Michael

went through them, but it's Glass-Steagall, number one. We need

to return to Hamiltonian national banking, number two. We need

an initiation as Franklin Roosevelt did it, of Federal credit using that Hamiltonian national banking system to raise the productive powers of labor of the workforce as a whole. And this

all has to be driven by a dedication to the breakthroughs in science; most especially right fusion and space exploration.

So, there are two things that you need to do before this

program ends tonight. Number one, you need to immediately sign

the petition that's being circulated by LaRouche PAC. Again, the

address is: lpac.co/trumpsotu – all one word – trumpsotu for State of the Union. If you've already signed this, then it's a

great opportunity for you to spread it to your entire network and

help us reach the goal. We've set the goal of 10,000 signatures

on this petition. We are increasing the number of signatures, but it has to increase at a much more rapid rate. It's a perfect

opportunity to help us increase the outreach of the LaRouche Political Action Committee. Then, number two; immediately subscribe, if you haven't already, to the LaRouche PAC daily email list. For two reasons: 1. in the 7-day countdown between

now and the inauguration, you need to have the daily marching

orders and the daily updates. This is a very fast moving situation, as you can see from the intelligence situation that we presented at the beginning of this show. Then after that, in the critical first days of the new Presidency, as things change very rapidly, you need to have the insight that only LaRouche PAC can uniquely provide you. And then, another reason is, as we develop more crucial and unique, exclusive content like what you got a taste of here today, especially this interview with Ray McGovern, the veteran CIA intelligence analyst and the co-founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, you will receive a notice in your email inbox and this is material that you can't afford to miss. You really need to know as soon as we publish it and as soon as we make it available. So again, you can look for the full interview that Jason Ross did with Ray McGovern to be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and our YouTube channel on Sunday, the day after tomorrow. And you can also look forward to the full speech that Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered at this very important, breakthrough diplomatic seminar in Stockholm, Sweden.

So, thank you very much for tuning in tonight. I think this was a successful broadcast, and I'd like to thank Megan, Rachel, and Michael for joining me in the discussion. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com and good night.

