

# **Afsæt Mueller og vedtag de Fire Love som politisk, økonomisk program. LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 22. dec., 2017.**

**Vært Matthew Ogden:** Det er den 22. dec., 2017, og jeg er vært for vores faste udsendelse fra [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com) med vores strategiske gennemgang her ved ugens afslutning.

Der er nu 40 dage til præsident Trumps planlagte 'State of the Union'-tale for den samlede Kongres den 30. januar. Hen over de kommende 40 dage vil vi se en kamp af hidtil usete proportioner udspille sig på verdensscenen og den internationale scene; en kamp om selve dette præsidentskabs sjæl. Selv om dette har taget form af en angivelig juridisk kamp mht. den såkaldte Mueller-efterforskning, må vi aldrig fortabe os i den konstant udviklende histories ugræs, med alle disse 'connectos' og skikkelser i denne virkelig tragiske komedie af meget dramatiske proportioner. Vi må aldrig glemme, at det, der til syvende og sidst står på spil her, er en krig, der raser på højeste niveau af politisk beslutningstagning i dette land om, hvad USA's fremtidige politik skal være. Dette gælder især for vore relationer med resten af verden, og i særdeleshed med Rusland og Kina. Spørgsmålet er, om USA vil fortsætte med at vedtage det 20. århundredes fejlslagne geopolitik, der har bragt verden på randen af Tredje

Verdenskrig? Eller vil vi forkaste hele denne fejlslagne ideologi og i stedet vedtage en vision for verden, hvor suveræne nationer ikke blot arbejder for deres egne snævre egeninteresser og i relationer, der udgør en slags imperialistisk blok, som vi har været så vant til under den Kolde Krig; men derimod arbejder for alles fælles fordel.

Sammenhængen i hele dette kupforsøg, som nu udspiller sig og er ved at blive optrævlet, blev fremlagt i det oprindelige **dossier**, som vi nu genoptrykker – 2. oplag på 10.000 eksemplarer.

Hvis man ser på det afsnit, der hedder, »The True Origins of the Coup Against the President« (Den virkelige oprindelse til kuppet mod præsidenten), så fremlægger det præcis, hvad den globale, politiske sammenhæng var, for fremkomsten af de operationer, der medgik til skabelsen af det såkaldte »Steele-dossier« og lagde fundamentet for det, der har fået betegnelsen »Russiagate«. Som forfatteren af dette dossier (EIR's Mueller-dossier) gennemgår, så er den virkelige historie her spørgsmålet om krig og fred og involverer hele spørgsmålet om det, der voksede frem fra det tidspunkt, hvor præsident Xi Jinping annoncerede Bælte & Vej Initiativet i Kasakhstan i 2013, hvor han fuldstændig styrtede den eksisterende, geopolitiske verdensorden og fastslog en fuldstændig ny vision for et potentielt »win-win«-samarbejde mellem alle verdens nationer, til alles gensidige fordel.

Som dette dossier gjorde det meget klart, så er og var »disse begivenheder i 2013-2014 en direkte udfordring af det britiske imperiesystem. De udfordrer direkte det monetære system, som er kilden til den angloamerikanske verdensdominans. De udfordrer direkte fundamental, britisk, strategisk politik, der har eksisteret siden Halford Mackinders dage. Under initiativet for 'Ét Bælte, én Vej', og i forening med Ruslands Eurasiske Union, vil Mackinders 'verdensø', bestående af Eurasien og Afrika, blive udviklet, gennemkrydset af nye højhastigheds-jernbaneforbindelser, nye byer og vital, moderne

infrastruktur, baseret på den gensidige fordel for alle de derværende nationalstater. Under den britiske, geopolitiske model«, har krig, ustabilitet og udplyndring af råmaterialer været virkeligheden for hele dette område i århundreder. »Xi Jinping har også angrebet de geopolitiske aksiomer, ved hvilke USA og briterne har opereret« i årtier. »Han foreslog i stedet en model for 'win-win'-samarbejde, hvor nationalstater samarbejder om udvikling, baseret på menneskehedens fælles mål.«

Så igen, dette er sammenhængen for hele denne krig over det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Spørgsmålet er altså, om USA vil opgive disse geopolitikker og i stedet vedtage dette totalt anderledes paradigme med menneskehedens fælles 'win-win'-mål?

Dette blev meget klart formuleret af præsident Xi Jinping, faktisk før det nylige Bælte & Vej Forum (maj 2017); dette går tilbage til FN's Generalforsamling i 2015. Præsident Xi Jinpings tale dér havde titlen, »At arbejde sammen for at udarbejde et nyt partnerskab for 'win-win'-samarbejde og skabe et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid'. Så dette er ikke blot en abstrakt idé. I sin historiske tale for FN's Generalforsamling fremlagde præsident Xi Jinping især, hvad denne idé med et 'win-win'-samarbejde og et «fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid» i virkeligheden vil sige. Her er et par uddrag fra Xi Jinpings tale. Han sagde:

»Verden gennemgår en historisk proces med accelereret udvikling: Fredens, udviklingens og fremskridtets solskin vil være stærkt nok til at trænge igennem krigens, fattigdommens og tilbageståendehedens skyer.

Som et kinesisk mundheld lyder, 'Det største ideal er at skabe en verden, der i sandhed er fælles for alle'. Vi bør indgå en fornyet forpligtelse til at 'bygge en ny form for internationale relationer med win-win-samarbejde og skabe et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid'.

Vi bør vedtage en ny vision, der søger win-win-resultater for alle, og afvise den forældede tankegang, at 'den enes død er den andens brød' eller 'vinderen tager alt'.

Vi bør 'opgive koldkrigsmentaliteten i alle dens manifestationsformer og skabe en ny vision for fælles, omfattende, samarbejdende og vedvarende sikkerhed'.

Vi må 'arbejde sammen for at sikre, at alle er befriet for nød, har adgang til udvikling og lever med værdighed'.

I deres interaktioner må civilisationer acceptere deres forskelligheder. Kun gennem gensidig respekt, gensidig læring og harmonisk sameksistens kan verden bevare sin diversitet og trives. Hver civilisation repræsenterer sit folks enestående vision og bidrag. De forskellige civilisationer bør have dialog og udvekslinger i stedet for at forsøge at udelukke eller erstatte hinanden. Vi bør lade os inspirere af hinanden for at styrke den menneskelige civilisations kreative udvikling.«

Så igen, det er den vision, som Xi Jinping fremlagde i sin tale for FN i 2015, med titlen, »At arbejde sammen for at udarbejde et nyt partnerskab for 'win-win'-samarbejde og skabe et fællesskab for menneskehedens fælles fremtid«. Denne tale i 2015 ligner faktisk temmelig meget den vision, som Lyndon LaRouche fremlægger i sin bog, der blev udgivet i 2005, med titlen *Earth's Next Fifty Years (Jordens kommende 50 år)*. I denne bog definerer han rammen for denne nye form for relationer mellem landene. Hvis man går tilbage til denne bog af Lyndon LaRouche fra 2005, så var det en samling af flere artikler, han skrev, og ligeledes nogle taler, han tidligere havde holdt under en turne, han foretog i Europa og Eurasien. Men i denne bogs hovedartikel, der havde titlen, »Den kommende eurasiske verden«, forklarer Lyndon LaRouche detaljeret ideen om, hvad denne vision for en ny form for relationer mellem lande bør være. Og faktisk, hvad er det princip, det videnskabelige princip, ud fra hvilket nationer kan relatere

til hinanden ud fra standpunktet om den højeste fællesnævner, i modsætning til det laveste.

Her er den vision, som Lyndon LaRouche fremlagde. Han sagde, »Tag en anden fremgangsmåde. Denne anden fremgangsmåde er menneskehedens fælles interesse. Det, vi bør tilsigte med kulturen, er ideen om menneskets natur; at mennesket har en vis, iboende rettighed, der adskiller mennesket fra dyret. Lad os individuelt og kollektivt bekræfte regeringsstyrelsens forpligtelse over for menneskets værdighed, som det kommer til udtryk i dette menneskes, denne families, rettighed til, for deres børn og børnebørn, at have udsigten til forbedrede livsbetingelser, en meningsfuld fremtid og en anerkendelse af deres personlige identitet som en person, der i sin levetid har fået muligheden for at bidrage til menneskehedens fremtid som helhed; til ære for fortiden og til fordel for fremtiden. Vi må indse, at intet folk kan være funktionelt suverænt mht. forpligtelsen over for sit eget folks overbevisninger, med mindre de er fuldstændigt suveræne mht. deres nationale anliggender. Denne suverænitets afgørende funktion må erkendes som værende kulturel i sin essens. For at regere sig selv må et folk have et fælles grundlag af viden. Relationerne staterne imellem må finde sted efter princippet om en platonisk, sokratiske dialog om ideer. Der er almene principper, der forener nationer omkring et fælles mål, men denne almenhed må udarbejdes i udviklingen af ideer; af nationale kulturer i dialog med nationale kulturer. De principper, der står frem som fornødne, fælles mål, er hovedsageligt sådanne principper som videnskaben om fysisk økonomi. Processen med udvikling af missionsorienteret samarbejde mellem denne planets kulturer må ses som en fortsættelse af en fortsat proces henover de fremtidige generationer.«

Dette var et kort uddrag af en meget omfattende bog, udgivet af Lyndon LaRouche i 2005. Men man ser harmonien mellem den vision, som Lyndon LaRouche her fremlægger, og så det, Xi

Jinping siger i sin tale for FN ti år senere, i 2015. Men imellem de to ser man en vision, og nu ser man virkeligheden i det, som denne idé om et 'win-win'-paradigme for relationer mellem landene faktisk repræsenterer; i modsætning til den fejlslagne form for vision, vi kender fra den Kolde Krig, og som har bragt verden til punktet, hvor vi har haft flere verdenskrige, og nu til punktet, som kunne være truslen om en atomar konflikt mellem nationer.

Ser man på, hvad Lyndon LaRouche sagde i denne bog, og ser man dernæst på, hvad Xi Jinping så smukt sagde i sin tale for FN, og sætter man det i kontrast til det katastrofale, beskæmmende, nationale sikkerhedsdokument, der netop er blevet offentliggjort af Trumps Hvide Hus; så ser man et meget signifikant problem mht. den kamp, der stadig raser omkring dette præsidentskabs sjæl og politik. Dette er på ingen måde en sort/hvid eller fuldført kamp. Vi ser, at, på højeste niveau, inkl. internt i administrationen, foregår der stadig denne kamp over, hvilken retning USA vil tage. Vil vi fortsat vedtage geopolitik? Eller, vil vi gå i retning af denne idé med 'win-win'-relation mellem lande, som det er blevet forklaret af præsident Xi Jinping og Lyndon LaRouche?

***Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet.***

So, let me just give you a little taste of some of the attitude that is represented in this national security policy document. Here are two short quotes. Let's start with this one:

"After being dismissed as a phenomenon of an earlier century, great power competition returned. China and Russia began to reassert their influence regionally and globally. Today, they are fielding military capabilities designed to deny America access in times of crisis, and to contest our ability to operate freely in critical commercial zones during peace time. In short, they are contesting our geopolitical advantages and trying to

change the international order in their favor.” Here’s another short excerpt: “Although the United States seeks to continue to cooperate with China, China is using economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other states to heed its political and security agenda. China’s infrastructure investments and trade strategies reinforce its geopolitical aspirations. Its efforts to build and militarize outposts in the South China Sea endanger the free flow of trade, threaten the sovereignty of other nations, and undermine regional stability.” Etc., etc., etc. Those are just two very short excerpts from a document which is very lengthy; but you can see from those two quotes that the inclination of the authors of this report is to continue to view the world from the standpoint of geopolitics, geopolitical competition between nations and blocks of nations. And you can even see a not-so-veiled reference to the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative right there in that quote where they said China’s economic and trade agenda is only being used to try to advance its geopolitical advantage. So, that’s a view straight out of the think tanks in Washington and the {Economist} magazine of London. It’s very curious, because it actually goes contrary to exactly what President Trump himself has represented on the world stage; including on his recent “state visit-plus” to China, where he talked very positively of the initiatives that China has taken and has forged a very close personal relationship with President

Xi Jinping. Exactly contrary to this view that China is somehow our economic and strategic rival, and that we have to compete with them on the geopolitical world stage. People have pointed out that when President Trump presented this national security policy, in a highly unusual way; it's very unusual for the President himself to make the speech presenting the policy document. But when he did make that speech, he used very different language, especially in regards to China. He spoke about the importance of sovereign nations that are respecting each other and are working together. He did not use some of the more egregious and inflammatory language which is contained within this document. But still, the very fact that this document was published shows you that we have a lot of work to do to continue to wage this battle inside the United States over what our policy will be. Will we continue to embrace geopolitics, or will we embrace this new "win-win" paradigm which is emerging now as a replacement to that failed Cold War mode of thinking?

I'd like to play for you just a short excerpt from the webcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche conducted yesterday, where she spoke about her reaction to this national security policy document. So, here's what Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say:

[\(Hele Helgas tale kan ses på dansk her\)](#)

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: This document is clearly looking at the world from the standpoint of, as you said, geopolitics, and if you look at it from that standpoint,



naturally, then China and Russia, but especially China which is rising, are regarded as rivals or enemies. And I think that this paper – Trump, which is very unusual – insisted that he present the paper, and not the National Security Advisor who normally is presenting such a report; and obviously, it seems that he did that in order to soften certain formulations. For example: Apart from going through some of the language of the report, he also said that he wants to build a very strong partnership with Russia and China, and for example, this had the ridiculous effect that some European newspapers would say, “he can’t even read the paper, because he said things which are different than in the report.” And I think it reflects the fact that the faction fight in the Trump administration is far from being over, that there is still the effort by the neo-cons and by leftovers of previous administrations, in various aspects of this administration, which expressed themselves in this report. And Trump, who after all had a very successful state visit to China a little while ago and who has talked successfully on the telephone with Putin in the last week, defeating a terrorist attack which was planned for St. Petersburg and similar very productive things; so I think Trump still has the inclination that he wants to work with Russia and China.

But I think if you look at the very sharp, extremely sharp reactions coming from the Russian Foreign Ministry, from Peskov, the spokesman of the Kremlin, from {Global Times}, from the Chinese Foreign Ministry, from the Chinese Embassy in Washington, they all basically say this doctrine reflects an outmoded kind of thinking; they point to the fact that there is a completely new era shaping especially the West Pacific, because in this paper, there are six regions, one of them being the western or eastern Pacific, and obviously this is one of the areas which is completely changed through the Belt and Road Initiative, where all the countries in the region are cooperating with China in a "win-win" cooperation to the mutual benefit of each of them; and that therefore, and since the offer was made many times to the United States, and to Europe to cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative, there is actually no reason to go into such an adversarial position. The Russians basically called it an "imperial document," insist it still reflects the desire to still insist on a unipolar world, which is long gone, so it's a completely futile effort. And the Chinese also were extremely critical and saying this is an "outmoded way of thinking" and cannot lead to anything positive. But it shows you that the world is very far from being out of danger zones, and I'm normally giving credit to Trump because unlike his predecessors, Bush and Obama, he has stretched out his hand to Russia and China, and he still has the potential to

move

the world into a different direction. But nevertheless, when he

does something which I'm not so happy about, I also take the liberty to say so.

But I think we are in one of these areas, and one of the commentaries in one Chinese paper said, that there are many different conceptions how the future of mankind should be shaped,

and that is not yet a settled question. And I think that that is

absolutely true, but that is why it is so absolutely important to

overcome this geopolitical view which has the idea that you have

groups of countries, or one country which has a legitimate interest against the others, I mean, that is the kind of thinking

which led to two world wars in the 20th Century, and I think it

should be obvious to anybody, that in the age of thermonuclear weapons, that thinking can only lead to the possible annihilation

of the human species: We should get rid of it.

OGDEN: So, as you just heard Helga Zepp-LaRouche say, we are in the midst of a continued battle over really what will be

the soul of this Presidency. This national security study report

reflects a very bad and failed geopolitical mode of thinking.

Those who are the authors of that represent a leftover aspect of

this kind of neo-con approach to the world which has gotten us into endless wars, and has really brought us to the brink of a possible world war conflict between the United States and Russia,

or the United States and China. In fact, we need to embrace the new “win-win” paradigm of thinking, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said. On that note, there is a continued development on the front of this battling against this attempted coup against this Presidency, and to try to create the conditions where President Trump can remain true to what is clearly his personal commitment to a positive relationship between the United States and Russia, and the United States and China, to solve the world’s problems.

To take problems which are common problems to the entire world – terrorism, economic crises, other things such as that – and to work together in a great powers relationship to resolve those problems.

Now, a couple of updates on the continued unravelling of the so-called “Mueller-gate” as we continue to see that there was really, as it’s been characterized, a fifth column inside this apparatus; who really before Trump was elected, already had made it clear through those text messages from Peter Strzok and others for example, that they were completely opposed to the election of Donald Trump and politically biased beyond hope. But then have allowed that political bias to be continued in after his election, and even after his inauguration to try to bring down this Presidency from the inside. More and more people are now beginning to see that there was an actual collusion between the intelligence agencies and the Obama administration and the

Clinton campaign to try and set this thing in motion. That has continued to operate. Here is an article from a news publication called {The Tablet} magazine. The title of this article is "Did President Obama Read the Steele Dossier in the White House Last August?" The question that they have is a very legitimate question. The beginning of this article reads as follows, and I think it raises some very important aspects of exactly how this collusion operation worked. Here's the beginning of the article.

It says:

"To date the investigation into the Fusion GPS-manufactured collusion scandal has focused largely on the firm itself, its allies in the press, as well as contacts in the Department of Justice and FBI. However, if a sitting president used the instruments of state, including the intelligence community, to disseminate and legitimize a piece of paid opposition research in order to first obtain warrants to spy on the other party's campaign, and then to de-legitimize the results of an election once the other party's candidate won, we're looking at a scandal that dwarfs Watergate – a story not about a bad man in the White House, but about the subversion of key security institutions that are charged with protecting core elements of our democratic process while operating largely in the shadows".

"Understanding the origins of the 'Steele dossier' is especially important because of what it tells us about the nature and the workings of what its supporters would hopefully

describe

as an ongoing campaign to remove the elected president of the United States. Yet the involvement of sitting intelligence officials – and a sitting president – in such a campaign should

be a frightening thought even to people who despise Trump and oppose every single one of his policies, especially in an age where the possibilities for such abuses have been multiplied by

the power of secret courts, wide-spectrum surveillance, and the

centralized creation and control of story-lines that live on social media while being fed from inside protected nodes of the

federal bureaucracy.”

Then the story goes on, using public-source documentation to link together this entire apparatus going all the way back to the

origins of the Steele dossier. But this question – Was a sitting President involved using his intelligence agencies to try

to bring down a political opponent? That is a story that rises

to the level of Watergate and beyond. What Helga Zepp-LaRouche

has pointed out, is that this entire thing – that as an example

– the questions are now being asked; including by members of the

United States Senate and United States House. Devin Nunes, Grassley, Trey Gowdy, Jim Jordan. And she acknowledges that there has been a full mobilization of activists here in the United States to distribute this Mueller dossier that’s been circulated in the Congressional offices and the Senate offices.

There’s been very in-depth interest from the relevant people involved in this counter investigation into what’s contained

in

this dossier. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche said in her webcast yesterday, "The tide is now beginning to turn."

So, let me play another short excerpt from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's webcast from yesterday:

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: There are rumors circulating that Trump may come out with a "Christmas surprise." Now if that would happen, it would be an interesting thing, and it obviously

would be somebody to investigate this whole complex in the form

of a special investigator. But I think also, already now, these

Congressmen and Senators you mentioned, Nunes, Grassley in the Senate, Gowdy, and Gaetz, and various others, I think they're quite fired up already about what they're finding.

And even the media are not entirely covering it up any more.

There was a quite good article in Denmark, in the conservative daily {Berlingske Tidende}, which said: Obama bureaucrats conspired to prevent the election of Trump and after that failed

they're trying to topple him; and then they go through the whole

story of who are the culprits. So it is coming out. Even the [major German daily] {FAZ} could not avoid reporting it, even though, in their typical way, they tried to downplay it and say,

all these people who say "Deep State," these are conspiracy theorists, and so on. But the truth is coming out.

Now, we in the United States that is, our colleagues from LaRouche PAC, they made a full mobilization with a lot of activists; they distributed the dossier about Mueller in all the

Congressional offices and all the Senate offices, and as they were saying they had many in-depth discussions where the interest

about what is happening has been increasingly there. Because it seems that some people in the Congress realize that what's at stake is the Constitution of the United States. Congress has oversight rights against the intelligence agencies, and if these agencies are loyal to a previous administration who was involved in such incredible schemes, they are aware of the fact that if they don't act right now, then you can throw the Constitution of the United States in the wastepaper basket. But I think it will require a continuous effort and mobilization, because these people are quite desperate. Because they see that their whole system is coming down, and if this investigation continues, I mean, there were several people who said what was done by the Department of Justice, or some people in it and in the FBI, were felonies. So they are trying to twist the situation to avoid the consequences of their doing, but I think it's reaching a very, very serious point where the tide is turning already. But it is a fight, so stay tuned with us, and don't be complacent, don't eat too many cookies over Christmas: Stay tuned and stay mobilized.

OGDEN: Well, as Helga LaRouche said, the tide is indeed turning, and we're seeing evidence of that. But the sense of urgency has to be there. Over this next 40 days, through the holiday period, all the way up to this State of the Union, the fight to protect the constitutionality of the US Presidency and the integrity of that, is definitely something which is



continuing to rage. However, at the same time, we have to continue to have a sense of urgency around the fight for the economic program. The positive economic solutions to the crisis

that we face, which is this Four Economic Laws campaign. To bring the United States into this New Paradigm of development. That sense of urgency for a victory on that Four Economic Laws package came into stark perspective again this week with this horrific tragedy, this horrific train derailment that occurred up

near Tacoma, Washington. The Amtrak train that jumped the tracks

and came over the bridge and onto the I-5 interstate below.

An

absolutely horrific tragedy. President Trump actually responded

quite properly to that horrible accident by issuing the following

tweet. As you can see on the screen here, he said "The train accident that just occurred in Dupont Washington shows more than

ever why our soon-to-be-submitted infrastructure plan must be approved quickly. \$7 trillion spent in the Middle East, while our

roads, bridges, tunnels, railways and more crumble. Not for long."

Indeed, this brings the attention to the necessity for a massive infrastructure plan. And as President Trump said all the

way back to the beginning of his administration, he's called for

a \$1 trillion infrastructure plan. Now, we don't know what that

infrastructure policy will be once it's finally submitted, and once it finally becomes public. We don't know what kind of funding mechanisms the Trump White House is thinking about; we don't know what kind of form that's going to take. But the

form

that it must take is the form that's contained in those Four Economic Laws by Lyndon LaRouche. There can be no variation, there can be no compromise. We need to have an immediate Glass-Steagall reorganization in order to erect a firewall between productive credit that should be going into infrastructure and productive employment, and speculative gambling that takes place on Wall Street. But we need to have a

national bank; we need to go back to what Hamilton originally conceived when he created the first national bank. And we can apply it in the way that Hamilton did, or we can apply it in the

way that Franklin Roosevelt did. He had an idea for a national

infrastructure bank. But you need to have this kind of direct Federal credit that is directed into these projects and into productive employment.

Unfortunately, we haven't seen anything from President Trump in now almost a year, even though he's professed that his number

one agenda item was infrastructure. According to some accounts,

the reason why President Trump won the Rust Belt was because of

his commitment to infrastructure. These areas of the country where infrastructure has been crumbling, responded to what President Trump was talking about with \$1 trillion of infrastructure investment. However, under the current situation,

first President Trump's attention was completely focussed on repealing Obamacare; now it's completely focussed on the so-called tax reform package, which has done nothing. It's done

nothing but continue to delay the follow-through on President Trump's stated, professed agenda of \$1 trillion for infrastructure investment. It's also, by the way

incidentally,  
set the stage for Paul Ryan and others of that ideological bent,  
to admit that they're already setting things in motion to come right on the heels of the so-called tax reform package with major cuts to Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid – so-called “entitlement reform”.

But this is a distraction. This so-called GOP agenda is a distraction and we must stay focussed on exactly what the agenda

must be. And it's these Four Economic Laws. As Helga LaRouche

said in her webcast yesterday, she was asked directly by the moderator what her reaction was to this so-called tax reform package. She stated unequivocally that this much ballyhooed tax

bill will do nothing without the full package of Glass-Steagall,

national banking, and the rest of the Four Economic Laws. So, I'd like to actually play for you in her own words what Helga Zepp-LaRouche had to say yesterday in response to this tax reform

bill during her webcast. Here's Helga Zepp-LaRouche:

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: obviously, this is celebrated as the first big victory of President Trump. I don't think it will solve anything, if you don't put it in the package of other measures, like for example Glass-Steagall, a credit system, like

Roosevelt's Reconstruction Finance Corp. or like the National Bank of Alexander Hamilton; and basically ending the speculation

in the derivatives sector. If you only lower the taxes under these circumstances without curbing the other factors I just mentioned, what it probably will do, it will attract some investment in the United States for sure. But people in

Germany

already say, "well, we have to protect ourselves, take countermeasures against it," so it will lead to an increased tension internationally; and probably in the United States, the

present big corporations and banks will just use these tax cuts

to invest more in the stock market, in buying up their own shares, what they have been doing since the crisis of 2008 with

quantitative easing and the zero-interest-rate policy. And I think one reason why this is to be feared is Jamie Dimon, for example, laughed, and said: This is wonderful, this is quantitative easing four.

I think it just requires a continuation of our mobilization. I know our colleagues in the United States from LaRouche PAC, they have produced a new pamphlet with the demand to implement the Four Laws of my husband, of Lyndon LaRouche, and why the United States must join with China in building the New Silk Road,

both domestically and internationally. This pamphlet ["LaRouche's Four Laws & America's Future on the New Silk Road"]

is out. I would encourage you, our viewers and listeners to get

ahold of this document: Read it, because it has all the solutions, what are the correct economic conceptions for the United States and the rest of the world to get out of this present crisis.

This is all extremely urgent, because we could have a meltdown of the system any minute. And just to mention it briefly, this bitcoin mania which is going on, is really a reminder of the Tulip Bubble [in 1637] before it burst. China has recognized that danger, they're basically banning speculation

in bitcoins. And all of these crazinesses make just clear, the

urgent need to implement Glass-Steagall, and the entire Four Laws of Mr. LaRouche, which especially includes a massive increase in the productivity of the workforce through a crash program in fusion technology, in space cooperation, in high-tech investments in general; and unless that is done, including high-technology infrastructure – and the recent Amtrak accident in Washington State just underlines that this absolutely is necessary – unless this is all done as a package, I don't think the world will get out of this crisis.

OGDEN: So, as you just heard Helga Zepp-LaRouche state, we have in fact published a new pamphlet. This is LaRouche PAC's newest pamphlet, called "The Four Economic Laws: The Physical Economic Principles To Create a Recovery in the United States. America's Future on the New Silk Road". This is available both in print form and in digital form; it's on the LaRouche PAC website. You can see the front cover there, also the back cover which has got a map of some of the key nodal points of the connectivity of the planet through this idea of a World Land-Bridge. This is what would happen if the United States were to join the New Silk Road. Then, there listed in summary form, are the Lyndon LaRouche's Four Economic Laws. So, the contents of that pamphlet, as LaRouche said, absolutely must be studied; must be emulated by the citizens of the United States; and must be made the policy of the United States Presidency. That's in

fact how we started this program with the 40-day countdown to President Trump's State of the Union address on January 30th. As you heard, there is a battle which is raging for the soul of this Presidency. The role that the LaRouche movement is playing is indispensable. We have not achieved victory yet. We have very clear indications that victory is close at hand on many fronts, and that victory is indeed attainable. But it must be viewed from the highest possible standpoint; not just piecemeal victories here and there. We have to view this from the standpoint of a total policy shift in terms of how the United States sees itself in the world. We have to abandon geopolitics; we have to embrace the new paradigm of "win-win" relationships between countries. We have to return to the Hamiltonian principles of economics – credit creation for high technology investment. And we have to join the New Silk Road. This is our job over the next 40 days; and we can take encouragement from the standpoint of the fact that indeed, we have absolutely gained major victories in the past period. Both in terms of the victories against this attempted coup against the Presidency of the United States, but also victories in terms of securing the New Paradigm abroad. We should take a look at what President Xi Jinping said in that speech to the United Nations General Assembly, and continue to keep that vision in mind. In fact, we should continue to go back to what Lyndon LaRouche himself said in 2005 in that historic document, {Earth's Next Fifty Years}. That's our mission. We have 40 days between now and the State of the Union. With the new pamphlet that's just been

issued – that “The Four Economic Laws: The Physical Economic Principles To Create a Recovery in the United States. America’s

Future on the New Silk Road” – we have everything that we need to gain a victory over the course of the next 40 days.

So, thank you very much for watching, and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). We wish you a Merry Christmas, and we will

continue to be bringing you breaking developments over the coming

days. Thank you very much, and please stay tuned. Good night.