

# Lyndon LaRouche: Obamas ord er en trussel om at dræbe

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. december, 2016 – Fredag erklærede præsident Barack Obama i et truende tonefald i et interview på NPR Morning Edition, der blev landsdækkende transmitteret, angiveligt som respons på beskyldninger om, at russerne skulle have hacket Demokraternes Nationalkomite,*

*»Jeg mener, at der ikke kan være nogen tvivl om, at, når en fremmed regering forsøger at få indflydelse på integriteten af vore valg, så må vi gribe til handling, og det vil vi gøre på et tidspunkt og et sted, som vi vælger. Men, hr. Putin er udmærket bekendt med mine følelser om dette, for jeg talte direkte med ham om det.«*

Lyndon LaRouche sagde:

*»Disse ord er en trussel om at myrde betydningsfulde mennesker. Det er, hvad han lærte af sin [sted-]fader.«*

LaRouche opfordrede borgerne til at *»holde øje med denne fyr, så han ikke dræber«*. Obama truer offentligt verden. *»Planetens nationer trues nu af Obamas plan om massedrab af mennesker ... «*

Dernæst gentog Obama, under sin pressekonference i Det hvide Hus her til eftermiddag, sin trussel mod *»russisk hacking«*. Han sagde, at han havde sagt til Rusland, at

*»de skal ophøre med det og indikerede, at der vil blive konsekvenser, når de gør det ... Vores mål er fortsat at sende Rusland et klart budskab.«*

Desuden erklærede Obama sig enig opsummeringen fra CNN-reporteren i Det Hvide Hus om, at *»præsidenten mener, Vladimir Putin autoriserede hackingen«*.

Anklagen om russiske indgreb i selve valget lugter langt væk, i betragtning af, at der nu i månedsvis ikke er blevet fremlagt noget bevis, der viser Ruslands skyld, men kun uophørligt gentagede påstande. I dag sagde talsmand for den russiske præsident, Dmitry Peskov, at USA bør ophøre med ubegrundede beskyldninger om russisk indgriben.

*»De bør enten holde op med at tale om dette, eller også i det mindste fremlægge nogle beviser.«*

Torsdag nægtede efterretningsfolk fra Obama-administrationen direkte at gå til Kongressen, da de blev bedt om at gøre det af Repræsentanternes Hus' Efterretningskomite, for at levere beviser under et møde bag lukkede døre. Der har været mange indikationer på, at andre efterretningstjenester ikke er enige med CIA-direktør John Brennans konklusion om russisk hacking.

Faren kommer fra Obamas forkærlighed for mord – samt den kendsgerning, at han snart vil forlade embedet og derfor hverken vil have eksekutive magtbeføjelser, eller beskyttelse mod eventuel retsforfølgelse for sine forbrydelser.

Lad os kigge på Obamas kendte meriter. Der er hans tirsdagsmøder, hvor han udarbejder mållister over de ofre, der skal dræbes ved hjælp af droner. Der er de forsatte deployeringer af amerikanske mænd og kvinder, som udsættes for skade og død, i amerikansk militærtjeneste i de 16 år, hvor Obama/Bush/briterne har ført krige for regimeskifte (Irak, Afghanistan, Libyen, Syrien). I selve USA er der et massivt antal borgere, der lider og dør pga. Obamas katastrofale økonomiske politik, som han selv kalder en succesfuld, økonomisk genrejsning. Der er en voldsom stigning i tilfælde af overdosis af narkotika og dødsraten generelt.

Lad os se på Obamas historie. Hans trang til at dræbe stammer fra hans egen opvækst, har LaRouche mange gange understreget. Hans stedfar, Lolo Soetero i Indonesien, var en drabsagent i den undergravende virksomhed og nedslagtning (1965-66), der

skulle vælte præsident Sukarnos regering. I sin selvbiografi skriver han, hvordan han i denne periode lærte, at drab på de svage er, hvad de stærke gør. (*Dreams from My Father*)

LaRouche bemærkede, at

*»internationalt har vi netop nu folk, der leder et globalt program for udvikling og fred [den eurasiske Nye Silkevej, med præsidenterne Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin, og andre], men Obama vil ikke bare lade tingene forløbe på en fredelig måde«.*

De vil dræbe; så har vi problemet, og det hele er blodig uorden. LaRouche understregede, at *»Alle signalerne er til stede. Obama har gjort det ganske klart«.*

LaRouche krævede, at man tog skridt til at advare folk. *»Obama har gentagne gange vist, at han er parat til drab i stor skala i USA og andre nationer.«* Det, der må gøres, er, at *»Obama må lukkes ned«* for at forhindre det, han har til hensigt at gøre.

*Foto: Præsident Obama kæmper for TTP under et møde i House Democratic Caucus på Capitol Hill, juni, 2015. (Foto: Whitehouse.gov)*

---

**Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale på  
Schiller Institutets og  
EIR's  
seminar i København:**

# **Donald Trump og det nye internationale paradigme. ENGELSK udskrift af tale samt Spørgsmål og Svar**

*København, 12. december, 2016* – I dag var Helga Zepp-LaRouche særlig gæstetaler ved et Schiller Institut/EIR-seminar i København, med titlen, »Donald Trump og det Nye, Internationale Paradigme«. Otte diplomater fra seks lande deltog, inklusive to ambassadører. Nationer fra Vesteuropa, Sydvestasien, Vest- og Østasien var repræsenteret, samt fra Afrika. Desuden deltog henved 30 af Schiller Instituttets medlemmer og kontakter, såvel som også et par repræsentanter for diverse danske og internationale organisationer.

Arrangementet indledtes af en forestilling, hvor Feride Istogu Gillesberg og Michelle Rasmussen fremførte en kinesisk kærlighedssang. Dernæst introducerede formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets stifter og internationale præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, ved at beskrive den historiske rolle, hun har spillet i skabelsen af politikken med Den Nye Silkevej.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte sin meget inspirerende og dybtgående tale med den revolution imod globalisering, som Brexit, Trumps valgsejr og Nej-resultatet i den italienske folkeafstemning udgør. Hun kom med en vurdering af potentialet i nogle af Trumps hidtidige erklæringer og udnævnelser og gik dernæst videre med en detaljeret diskussion af de to, modstridende paradigmer, der eksisterer i verden i dag. Dernæst opløftede Helga tilhørerne med Krafft Ehrickes og Nicolaus Cusanus' skønne ideer. Hun konkluderede med en appel til de tilstedeværende om ikke at handle som tilskuere på historiens scene, men derimod, sammen med os, at gå med i

kampen for det nye paradigme.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale, der varer omkring 1 time og 20 minutter, kan høres ovenover eller her:

[https://soundcloud.com/si\\_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1](https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1)

En dansk oversættelse af talen kommer på torsdag.

Herefter fulgte en intens, timelang diskussion, hvor der kom spørgsmål fra alle de forskellige grupper, der var repræsenteret. Helga afsluttede mødet med at udfordre tilhørerne til at beslutte, hvad de ønsker at bruge deres liv til; hvilket mærke, som vil være til gavn for hele menneskeheden langt ud i fremtiden, ønsker de at sætte? Et udskrift af Helgas svar vil ligeledes snarest blive udlagt her på hjemmesiden.

Helgas tale og efterfølgende diskussion havde en dybtgående virkning på alle de tilstedeværende.

**Diskussionen findes kun som engelsk udskrift (se nedenfor).**

—

### **English: Introductory article**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynotes Copenhagen Seminar on 'Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm'

COPENHAGEN, Dec. 12, 2016 (EIRNS) – Today, Helga Zepp-LaRouche was the special guest speaker at a Schiller Institute/{EIR} seminar in Copenhagen entitled, "Donald Trump and the New International Paradigm." Eight diplomats from six countries attended, including two ambassadors. There were nations from Western Europe, Southwest Asia, Western and Eastern Asia, and Africa. In addition, there were around 30 Schiller Institute members and contacts, as well as a few representatives of

various Danish and international institutions.

The event was opened by the presentation of a Chinese love song performed by Feride Istogu Gillesberg and Michelle Rasmussen. Afterwards, Tom Gillesberg, the chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark, introduced Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, describing her historical role in bringing about the New Silk Road policy.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's very inspiring, in-depth speech began with the revolution against globalization represented by the Brexit, the Trump election, and the Italian No vote. She gave an evaluation of the potential represented by some of the statements and appointments Trump has made so far, and then proceeded with a detailed discussion of the two conflicting paradigms in the world today. Zepp-LaRouche then uplifted the audience with the beautiful ideas of space scientist Krafft Ehrlicke and Renaissance philosopher Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa. She concluded with an appeal to those present not to act as spectators on the stage of history, but engage in the battle for the new paradigm with us.

Her speech, about 80 minutes long, may be heard above, or at: [https://soundcloud.com/si\\_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1](https://soundcloud.com/si_dk/helga-zepp-larouche-in-copenhagen-donald-trump-and-the-new-international-paradigm-1)

Afterwards, there was an intensive hour-long discussion, with questions from all of the different groups represented. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche ended by challenging the audience to decide what they want to do with their lives, what mark they will make to benefit all humanity, far into the future.

Zepp-LaRouche's speech and discussion had a profound effect on all present.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Discussion:**

(There is no video or audio of the discussion period, only this transcript.)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche in Copenhagen December 12, 2016

Discussion

(To facilitate free discussion, the questioners are not identified, and the questions are summarized. The answers are complete.)

Question: Can we be optimistic about Trump's presidency, because he is skeptical about climate change, is for trade war with China and Mexico, opposes the free trade deals, and has called for tearing up the nuclear deal with Iran.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: I said earlier that the potentialities for change are there, but it depends, to a very large extent, upon us – what we do. When Trump got elected, my first response was, this is what I call the 'dog pull-tail, let-go feeling.' What I mean by that is that when you pull the tail of a dog, which you should never do, naturally, and you let go, the pain stops. When you pull, there is pain, and when you stop pulling, the pain goes away.

So, in a certain sense, the election of Trump was the tail let-go feeling, because we were on an immediate course toward WWIII, and that was really the primary point, because if Hillary Clinton would have been elected – unfortunately, Hillary Clinton, when she was in the Obama administration, transformed from being a relatively OK person, she was never great, but in 2008, she was relatively decent, compared to what she became, because she capitulated to Obama, and when she made this terrible statement, for example, in Libya, about the murder of Gaddafi, "We came, we saw, and he died." This is barbarism.

Her behavior in the Ben Ghazi case. There were so many things where she became worse than Obama, almost. So the immediate thing was that that big danger, that she would have continued the policies of Bush and Obama, in the confrontation with Russia and China, that that was stopped is, already, for the survival of civilization, the most important step.

Now, on these other points. Naturally, there is climate change. There is no question about it. But the question is, what is the cause of it? And the Schiller Institute had several conferences where we invited extremely important scientists who presented, beyond a doubt, that if you look at the last 500 million years in the history of the Earth, you have a continuous cycle of ice ages, of warming periods, of small ice ages, and the man-made component of climate change is absolutely negligible. It's a big fraud, for example, it's a big business. To sell CO2 omission quotas, is like selling indulgences in the Middle Ages.

Obviously, there are climate changes, and some countries which have low coasts are very much affected, but then you have to adapt to these climate changes with modern technology, and you cannot solve the problem by going to electric cars, or going to decarbonization of the world economy. This is a big fraud, and I am not saying that Trump is saying this for all the right reasons, but the idea to impose measures implied with the "great transformation" Schellnhuber is talking about – I mean these people do not want development.

We have been on this case for the last – as a matter of fact, we, the LaRouche movement, had a conception about the development of the world really starting at the end of the sixties.

I joined Mr. LaRouche because I went to China, Africa, other Asian countries, and I saw the horrible, horrible underdevelopment. So I came back from this trip, and I said, 'I have to become political, because I want to change this.' I could give you a long, long story of the many observations, because I went with a cargo ship, and when you go to these countries with a cargo ship, you get a quite different idea than if you go on a 5-star cruise, and hotels. You see how the poverty affects people in their real lives. And I came back, and I looked at all the political movements, and I saw that LaRouche was the only one who said, 'We have to have Third World development. We have to have technology transfer. We have to alleviate this poverty.'



And we had a positive conception already in the seventies, and therefore, when the Club of Rome appeared, we immediately said, 'This is a fraud.' Because the Club of Rome said, 'There are limits to growth. We have reached equilibrium. Until the year 1972, you could develop, but now, we have reached equilibrium, and we have to have sustainable development. We have to have appropriate technology.' These notions did not exist before, because before, you had the idea of a UN Development Decade, where each decade, you would overcome the underdevelopment by qualitative jumps. And when we recognized this propaganda by the Club of Rome, we immediately said, 'This is a complete fraud,' and the people who wrote the book "Limits to Growth," Meadows and Forrester ...

Q: A followup about the Paris climate summit.

A: I would like to give you written documentation afterwards of the studies that were made by these geologists, which are, without question, the explanation of climate change is not man-made. The anthropogenic aspect of it is so miniscule. Climate change has to do with the position of the solar system in the galaxy, which goes in cycles around a certain axis, and you can see that over 500 million years, the data confirms that you have these wide changes. Greenland is called Greenland, because it was green. There used to be vineyards. You had ice ages which completely covered the Earth, and the reason why I went into this longer history, is to show how the environmentalist movement was created with the attempt to keep development down, and climate change is just another expression of the same effort.

If you look at which firms which are investing in solar parks, in wind parks, who is controlling the CO2 emission trade, you have all the top hedge funds in London and Wall St. I can give you a lot of documentation about it, which does not mean that climate change is not real, because you have the rise of the oceans, and you have climate change, you have extreme weather, but that has been happening for hundreds of millions of years. And, on the other points you raised, obviously, from our standpoint, the cancellation of NAFTA, is a good thing,

because NAFTA did not allow development for Mexico. As a matter of fact, NAFTA is the incarnation of the cheap labor production model of free trade. What you need is – especially countries which are not developed, you need protective tariffs for their own good. They have to develop a domestic market first. The booklet which I emphasized, which you should please read, “Against the Stream,” is one of many, but it is very condensed, and a very good book.

The question is, ‘What is the source of wealth?’ Is the source of wealth cheap labor, to buy cheap raw materials, produce cheaply, and sell expensive? Is that the cause of wealth? No. The only cause of wealth is the increase in the creativity of labor power. And a good government is, therefore, investing the maximum amount into education, into sponsoring the creativity of youth, of labor, and the more people in the labor force, by percentage, are engineers, scientists, the more productive the economy becomes.

And the free trade system, of which NAFTA is just one example, did exactly the opposite. China, which was part of this in the beginning – the reason why China today has so many environmental problems, like smog, like a large amount of groundwater being contaminated, is the result of the fact that China, in the beginning of its industrialization, accepted being a cheap labor production place for the U.S. and for Europe. When I was in China, even in 1971, I visited some factories which were horrible. They were absolutely horrible. The working conditions were terrible, the labor force, which produced electrical devices for radios, it was horrible. They worked for 18 hours. No health system. It was just terrible. And that is how China developed in the first phase.

But then China, with Deng Xiaoping, started to recognize that that is the wrong way. So China is now on a completely different track. They are putting the maximum emphasis on science and technology, the increase of excellence. Last year, they produced 1 million scientists. That’s double of what the U.S. produced. Obviously China is a larger country, but still. What will finally be decisive is the number of people who are

creative. And that is why China, right now, has the best education system, because they have understood that the source of wealth is not raw materials. Is not trade conditions. It is the creativity of their own people. And that it a good thing. If we go to a system where we have a certain amount of protectionism, to protect the development of the domestic market, it is a good thing.

There is no danger of cutting [countries off from one another], because all of these infrastructure projects are connectivity. The world will be more connected than ever before. But this whole myth of free trade is really a very bad thing. It has been coined by the people who profit from it. That's why the world is in the condition it is right now, where the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. The middle class is being destroyed all over the world. And I would really like to communicate with you so that we can deepen this dialogue.

On the Iran thing, I don't think he will break it, but that is my hope. I don't know.

So, I'm not saying he's a – as I said, Baron von Knigge would get a heart attack when he hears Trump's speeches, but the world was in such a grip of evil, satanic evil, that it is a good thing that there is a break, and the unfortunate thing, is that Europe is still in this grip.

You can see it. Von der Leyen, the German Defense Secretary, had the funniest reaction. The day after the election of Trump, she said 'I am deeply shocked,' about this election result, because nobody thought this would happen. Now, this same lady is now parading in Saudi Arabia with Crown Prince Bin Salman Al Saud, and she isn't shocked. So, I don't know what's wrong with her. I think that that would be a good place to be shocked, or not even go there.

So, I have come to the conclusion that a lot of the Europeans who react this way to the defeat of Hillary, are obeying another power in their head, and that power I call The British Empire, which is still in place, and it dominates Europe, and that is why they feel – I was asking myself, how come all of

these politicians are so arrogant towards the new president of the U.S.? Because they were the boot-lickers of Washington until yesterday, and they would immediately do everything Washington would say and do, so I asked myself, 'Where is this sudden self-assertedness coming from?' And the only explanation I came up with, was to say, they must have an idea that there is another power which is more powerful than Trump, otherwise, they wouldn't have this sudden arrogance.

And it is the British, because you will see tomorrow, because tomorrow, there will be a federal press conference in Berlin, where a number of people will present their contribution to the German chairmanship of the G-20, which will take place in July in Hamburg. This will be Joachim Schellnhuber, the head of the WBGU (German Advisory Council on Global Change), this is the scientific advisory organization advising the German government. He put out this paper about 'the great transformation,' which we wrote about. You can look in the archive. He is the head of the idea of a decarbonization of the world economy.

Now, if you decarbonize the world economy, without having fusion, that would be one thing, to have fusion power in place. Then you can talk about getting rid of fossil fuels, but without having fusion, and being against nuclear energy, fission, it means that you will reduce the world's population to 1 billion or less, because there is a direct correlation between the energy-flux-density, and the number of people you can maintain. Schellnhuber said that the carrying capacity of the Earth is maximum 1 billion people. He didn't say that he wants to do with the 6 billion who are already there. If he would be consequent, he should hop away from this planet.

And they will announce a sinister plan, to try to use the fact that many countries have environmental problems, to sneak in their anti-development programs. People should not be naïve, because not everybody thinks that population growth is a good thing. There are many people who think that each human being is a parasite, destroying nature. That is the image of man which many people have. The greenies, for example.

We look at it in a different way. We think that the more people you have, the greater longevity you can have, division of labor, and a modern scientific society needs many people with a long life span. Because if you are in the Third World, and you die, and you have an average life expectancy of 40 years, or less, you cannot have scientists, because the production of a scientist takes 30-35 years, and if people then die right away, then you can't have a modern society.

So the more creative people you have, the better. Each human being is an incredible addition, because we are creative.

Tom Gillesberg: Schellnhuber, for his services, was appointed Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE), and for him, he personally has said, that the highpoint of his existence was that the British Queen, personally, gave him the Order of the British Empire, for his efforts to reduce the possibility for mankind's survival, you could say, so it is connected with what you said.

Q: This is the best speech I have ever heard in my life.

Is this a second American Revolution, and will the Federal Reserve, which is privately owned, be closed down, and will money be created for the benefit of all people, and not just the private Fed?

A: I don't know, because, as I said, there are so many unknowns about Trump, and what he will do, and how it will play out. All I can say is, if Trump does not fulfill his promises, the same people who caused his election, will topple him. Because I don't think that this process, which is now underway, where ordinary people have just had it – If you think about the declaration of Independence, it has this formulation that you will not bring down a government system for light reasons, but, if for a long time, the common good is being violated, I don't know the exact text, then, people have the right and duty to replace this government with a rightful one, and that idea I call natural law.

It's the same idea that Friedrich Schiller had in Wilhelm Tell. This is a play he wrote, which takes place in Switzerland. There, the Hapsburg oligarch is also trampling on

the rights of the Swiss people, then they unite with the Rütli Oath. There is this beautiful formulation which says, 'When the rights of people are trampled upon, they have the right to reach out to the stars, and take from the stars those rights which are eternally embedded in these stars. (I am not saying it as beautifully as Schiller does.)

If you compare these two texts, the Declaration of Independence, and the Rütli Oath from Schiller's play, they are almost identical, and it's very clear that Schiller was inspired by the American Revolution when he wrote that play, because in his plays, there are many ideas which resonate with the American Revolution, and he actually wanted to immigrate, at one point, to America.

So I think that if Trump turns out to be another fraudster, which we don't know yet, I think that this process of revolt will continue, because I only mentioned some elements.

I could mention that there are many countries now in realignment. for example, the Philippines, Duterte. This was supposed to be the playground for the conflict with China in the South China Sea. Now Duterte sent his Defense Secretary, Lorenzana, to Russia and China, to buy weapon systems from Russia and China, and to establish a friendship with China, and he said, 'The Philippines is no longer the colony of the U.S.'

Then you have Japan, which was the junior partner of the U.S. in the Pacific. Abe went to Sochi, meeting with Putin. In three days from now, Putin will go to Japan to have a state visit. They are talking about a peace treaty between Russia and Japan.

All of these are new alignments. There is a shift in the strategic situation, and I don't think that that shift can be reversed.

Q: About Russia hacking the U.S. election. Why doesn't the U.S. have anti-hacking measures? Can you explain that?

A: I cannot explain that, for the same reason that I cannot explain why the NSA is surveilling everyone, all their phones, their communications, worldwide. They can observe all of these

things, but they don't know about terrorism. They don't know about drug trafficking. They don't know about money laundering. Either their system is not so good, or they are looking in the wrong direction. I can't answer your question.

Q: Will the result of the Brexit be positive for Europe, to enable continental Europe to become stronger, and to improve cooperation with the eastern parts of Europe?

A: I think that the EU is not functioning, and I think it is not just the Brexit. The "No" in Italy is a reflection of the same dynamic. Now you have Gentiloni, the new prime minister, and they will probably go for new elections. Right now, in the polls, you have the 5 Star Party leading. If they win, and form the new government, they have already said that they would leave the EU, and leave the Euro, and, in a certain sense, it is not functioning.

The reason I was against the introduction of the Euro from the beginning, was because we said that it cannot function. You cannot have a European currency union in something which is not an optimal economic space. You cannot put advanced industry together with an agrarian country, with completely different tax laws, pension laws, and you don't want a political union, because Europe is not a people. You don't have a European people. I don't know what the Danes are saying. I don't know what is in the Danish newspapers. The people of Slovenia have no inkling of what is happening in Alsace-Lorraine, and so forth, and so on. You don't have a European people. Esperanto doesn't function. You have 28 nations, 28 histories, 28 cultures.

That doesn't mean that you can't work together. I think that the idea of Charles de Gaulle to work together as an alliance between perfectly sovereign fatherlands, that is a correct idea. And all these fatherlands can adopt a joint mission, like to develop Africa, or other things.

I just think that this European Union is not going to stay forever.

Q: (followup) Will it be easier for Germany and France to promote this development, as the leading countries?

A: Everybody says that Germany is the biggest beneficiary of globalization, the EU, and the Euro, but that's not really true, because, if you look at it more closely, then you can say that since the introduction of the Euro, the domestic market of Germany has completely stagnated. And the number of people who became poorer has increased.

Q: (followup) What about regarding the dialogue with Russia.

A: Oh yes, that would be much easier.

I do not think that this EU bureaucracy is capable of reform, because by their self-understanding, they are the local pro-consuls of this empire, and I think that it would be much better if Germany, France, and other countries have individual relations. And I don't think that – this whole idea that you need a European Empire to compete with Russia and China and other emerging countries – The EU, by definition, is an empire. They have said it themselves. Robert Cooper, who has some kind of advisory function [currently serving as EU Special Advisor with regard to Myanmar], he said that the EU is the fastest expanding empire in history. It's a bad idea.

And the Russians for – I noticed this since the beginning of the year 2000, that the Russians did not make a difference anymore between the EU and NATO. They said that it's the same thing. And it is the same thing.

Q: You said that the One Belt, One Road was stripped of commercial interests from the Chinese side, as opposed to the IMF, World Bank. On what basis do you say that it is less interest-driven than the Bretton Woods institutions?

A: Well, because, the question is not that I'm saying that China is perfect. I'm not saying that. But when you look at anything, you have to look at the vector of development, is it going upward, or is it going downward? And from that standpoint, I had the advantage that I was in China in 1971, which was in the middle of the Cultural Revolution. This was so different than China today.

The Cultural Revolution was horrible for the people. The Red Guards would take people out of their homes, put them in jail, send them to the countryside, and people were distraught.



And now, people in China are happy. If you talk to students, or to young people, they are optimistic. They say, 'Oh. I will do this in the future. I have these plans.' I talked to a group of students in Lanzhou two years ago, and they said, 'We will go to Africa. We will develop Africa.' I have never heard a German student say this. Yeah, when I was a student, but that's a long time ago.

I think that it is very worthwhile to read the speeches of Xi Jinping. There is a book, "The Governance of China," but that only has about 60 speeches, and there are many, many more. For example, you should read the speeches he gave when he went to France, to Germany, and to India.

For example, when he went to India, he made a speech which was really incredible, because he said that he loved Indian culture from his early youth, and then he gave so many examples of the high points of Indian culture, the Gupta period, the Upanishads, the Vedic writings, Rabindranath Tagore, many predicates which prove that he really knows what he is talking about. He is not just one of these politicians who have a PR advisor about how to make nice bubbles in your speeches, but you could really see that he means it. And the same for Germany. He came to Germany and he emphasized Schubert and Heine, things which I also appreciate about Germany, and he did the same thing in France.

And I don't think that the Chinese leadership would agree with me when I say this, but I think that they are less communist than Confucians. They probably would not admit that, because they are officially the Communist Party, and that's OK, but, I come from Trier, and Trier is the birthplace of Karl Marx, so I have studied Karl Marx, and I think that they are still socialist, or communist, or whatever, but they always said that they are communist with Chinese characteristics, and these Chinese characteristics are Confucianism.

And the Confucian idea of man is lifelong learning, lifelong perfection, that everyone should be a Jinzi, a wise man, a noble man, and Confucius said, if the government is bad, then the Jinzi, these wise people, should replace the government.

Also the idea that you have to have an harmonious development, starting with the family, continuing in the nation, and then, larger, among the nations.

China is the only country that has not made wars of aggression, colonial wars, in its 5,000 years of history. It was invaded many times, the Opium War, and things like that, but China is not an aggressive nation, at all.

And if you look at what they are doing in practice, the IMF and the World Bank have prevented Third World development, and China is going from one country to the next, building science cities, helping with space cooperation, bringing in developing countries in the most advanced areas of science, in order to not prevent their development. I think this is a completely different approach.

I think that the Chinese have come up with a new model of government, which I have not seen in any place in Europe, the U.S. ever, and it's a model which is overcoming geopolitics, which is, if you say, 'I have a win-win for cooperation. Everybody can join.' Then, if everyone joins, then you have overcome geopolitics.

And geopolitics is the one thing that caused two world wars, and in the age of thermonuclear weapons, we cannot have geopolitics anymore. So I think that these are very important differences.

Sure, China has its own interests. Win-win means that China also has an interest. China has advantages, but, for example, if you ask people from Africa, 'Would you rather have deals where China gets raw materials for long periods of time, but they build infrastructure for Africans.' They like that much better than Europeans who come and say, 'Oh, you should obey democracy,' and do nothing.

Q: Statement about Chinese infrastructure projects in Morocco. Both are winners, as opposed to projects 20 years ago run by other countries. The Chinese there have learned Arabic. The projects have greatly reduced the travel time. They have a different perspective than the French, and Europeans had.

Tom Gillesberg: Do you have final remarks?

A: I would just say that people should not just believe, or not believe, what I am saying, but take an active attitude to try to find out what the truth is, for themselves. Because the world is not helped by replacing one ideology by another. The only way you can be certain, is that you become a truth-seeking person yourself. Because the whole question about what went wrong, is that people forgot what it is to be an honest truth-seeking person, taking the truth not as something you reach finally, but something you always improve.

Schiller had this beautiful writing about universal history, where he said that the philosophical mind is the first one to take his own system apart, to put it together more perfectly again.

I think that that quality – and, also, we had two days ago in Berlin, a very important event, which was also about the dialogue of cultures, and every – we had a very important presentation, which you can soon see on our webpage, where we had a double bass player who spoke about the importance of Wilhelm Furtwängler as a conductor, and he gave some musical examples, and he compared the performances of Furtwängler with some modern conductors, and the difference is so unbelievable. The music of Furtwängler is transparent. It is beautiful. It is absolutely overwhelmingly uplifting, and many of the other conductors are just playing along, with no respect for what the composition is.

And he really described, with many quotes from Furtwängler, that what is needed is this inner quality of truthfulness. That you don't fake it, because if you're not truthful – for example, you cannot recite poetry, if you're not truthful. You cannot sing beautifully, if you're not truthful. Sure, you can sing brilliantly, you can do all kinds of tricks, and it impresses people, but to really produce art, you have to be truthful. You have to try to understand the poetical idea, the musical idea. You have to step back with your ego behind what the composer or the poet wrote. And that's what is wrong with modern theater. In Regietheater, they just say, 'I don't care what Schiller wrote, or what Shakespeare wrote. I just make my

modern interpretation. I put Harley Davidson's into Shakespeare, and it doesn't matter.' And that is not art.

And I think the question is, 'What do you do with your life?' That is really the question. Are you becoming a creative person, devoted to that with your life, you contribute to enable mankind to move on a little step further, and become better.

Or, are you just eating three tons of caviar, and have 3,000 Porsches. And then, when you die, they write on your gravestone, 'He/she ate three tons of caviar, and had 3,000 Porsches,' and that was it.

No, you should try to be an honest person, trying to make human society better with what you do. And, once you do that, you become happy. Then you are free. This inner freedom, is what you should try to find. And that is the only way that we will win that battle. It's not Trump. It is, can we get enough people to be innerly free.

And then we win.

End of discussion

---

**Ingen tid til selvtilfredshed  
– Briternes,  
saudiernes og Obamas  
terrorapparat vil  
fortsætte hæmningsløst,**

# indtil det destrueres

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 11. december, 2016* – ISIS er på flugt fra de syriske og russiske styrker; det ene valg efter det andet (Brexit, Filippinerne, USA, Frankrig, Italien, Sydkorea) viser, at befolkningerne føler afsky for det britisk/amerikanske bankimperiums økonomiske diktatur og forsøget på at indlede krige med Rusland og Kina; Kina og Rusland opbygger partnerskaber med over 100 nationer for at samarbejde om store udviklingsprojekter for at skabe moderne nationer og eliminere fattigdom, som Kina næsten har opnået.

Alt dette giver grund til optimisme. Men, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde i dag, så må vi ikke blive selvtilfredse. Det sårede dyr, som er Det britiske Imperium og dets marionet-neokonservative, der især omfatter Obama, i USA, vil ikke sky noget middel for at ødelægge fremvæksten af dette nye paradigme, især i USA. I takt med, at ISIS er i færd med at blive besejret i Syrien, går de saudiskskabte terrorister bersærk internationalt med morderiske selvmordsangreb, der blot i løbet af de seneste dage har dræbt over hundrede mennesker og såret mange andre, i Egypten, Tyrkiet, Yemen og Nigeria. Obama og fraktioner i CIA kommer med vilde påstande om, at de ikke tabte valget i USA, men at det var Putin, der stjal det! Det får på en måde 1940'ernes og '50'ernes Harry Truman/Joe McCarthy-heksejagt på kommunister til at ligne en barneleg, og Obama har krævet, at James Clapper, direktør for den Nationale Efterretningstjeneste, leder et team, der skal undersøge det såkaldte russiske valg-tyveri til fordel for Trump.

Husk på, at det var Clapper, der for den amerikanske Kongres svor på, at der ikke fandt nogen masseovervågning af amerikanske borgere fra efterretningsvæsenets side sted – en løgn, der var en vigtig årsag til, at Edward Snowden besluttede at afsløre, at det var præcist, hvad de gjorde, og mere til, i hele verden. Set i dette lys var det rigtigt af

Donald Trump at afvise denne fraktion af efterretningssamfundets »latterlige« påstand om russisk indgriben (andre fraktioner tilbageviser løgnet), og at minde os om, at dette var de samme mennesker, der lancerede ødelæggelsen af Mellemosten ved hjælp af den overlagte løgn om Saddam Husseins angivelige masseødelæggelsesvåben, selv, da FN's team i Irak rapporterede, at disse ikke eksisterede.

På den anden side, så må optimisme ikke blive til selvtilfredshed. Trump er en ukendt størrelse. Alt imens han har omgivet sig med ledende generaler, der har udtrykt stærk opposition mod Obamas risikable militæreventyr i Mellemosten og ønsker at samarbejde med Rusland om at knuse terrorist-svøben, og ligeledes, at han har krævet en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, så er Trump samtidig omgivet af Goldman Sachs-folk, der har anført udplyndringen af ikke alene USA, men af en stor del af verden, på vegne af finansimperiet i London og New York. Hvilken politik, der vil lede USA og Vesten i de kommende måneder, vil blive afgjort af den grad af mod og beslutsomhed, som mønstres af den amerikanske og europæiske befolkning, der vil gå videre end til at »smide disse uduelige karle ud« og kræve et ægte, nyt paradigme – som vil erstatte City of Londons og Wall Streets herrevælde med Glass-Steagall og Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love samtidig med et krav om, at USA og Europa går med i den Nye Silkevej og samarbejder *med* Kina og Rusland, snarere end at true med krig *mod* dem.

(Se LaRouchePAC-video om LaRouches Fire Love, med fuldt dansk udskrift)

☒ Spørgsmålet om et potentielt Nyt Paradigme, baseret på udvikling snarere end geopolitik, var på programmet i denne uge i Shanghai ved et forum, der var sponsoreret af Shanghai Institut for Internationale Studier og Forskningsinstituttet for Dialog mellem Civilisationer (DOC), hvor man forbereder samarbejde mellem den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union (EAEU), der er lanceret af Rusland, og Bælt-og-Vej-initiativet, lanceret af Kina. Som stifter af DOC, dr. Vladimir Yakunin, formulerede

det som et spørgsmål, der skal løses: »Hvordan sikrer vi os, at den samtidige udvikling af disse forskellige vækstcentre fører til synergi, og ikke konflikt? Det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte og den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union kunne blive det, der viser vejen.«

*Foto: Syrisk militæroperation for at befri de sydlige distrikter af det østlige Aleppo. (30. nov.) (twitter.com/AlalamChannel)*

---

## **Video: En ny æra for USA: LaRouches Fire Love**

10. december, 2016 – Lyndon LaRouches kortfattede 2014-dokument for den politiske strategi, med titlen, »Fire Nye Love for USA's omgående redning: Ikke en valgmulighed, men en uopsættelig nødvendighed!«, skitserer grundlaget for, at menneskeheden uophørligt kan gøre fremskridt. Ikke flere økonomiske recessioner! Denne video dækker LaRouches 'Fire Love', der har rødder i Alexander Hamiltons originale, økonomiske principper, der skulle lede USA: Glass-Steagall, Stats-bankpraksis (gennem en Nationalbank), udstedelsen af statskredit til forbedring af produktiviteten samt et forceret program for fusionskraft. De betydningsfulde, politiske forandringer, der finder sted i hele verden, inklusive valget af Donald Trump i USA, reflekterer et internationalt skifte, bort fra det transatlantiske områdes nedbrudte og rådne system, og hen imod det spændende, nye paradigme, der kommer fra Kina og Rusland, med økonomisk og videnskabeligt fremskridt. Lyndon LaRouches politik med de »Fire Love« er midlet til at vende det økonomiske forfald omkring, som har fundet sted under Bush' og Obamas præsidentskaber, og slutte

os til Rusland og Kina for at udvikle et helt nyt paradigme med samarbejde mellem nationer. Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC Videnskabsteam (også kaldet The Basement) diskuterer, hvordan vi kan gennemføre LaRouches ideer i USA i dag.

[Se fuld dansk tekst her.](#)

*LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, December 9, 2016*

## **A NEW ERA FOR THE UNITED STATES: LaROUCHE'S FOUR LAWS**

– Preface –

The election of Donald Trump was a resounding defeat of the legacy of the past four Presidential terms; and it was no surprise to anyone watching the planet as a whole. It was part of a broader, worldwide repudiation of the prevailing trans-Atlantic paradigm of the US and NATO, in favor of the New Paradigm now taking hold, a New Paradigm being led by China and Russia. Consider the storm of election results worldwide that the US was a part of: Think of the Brexit vote in the UK, think of the votes for President in the Philippines and France, the referendum in Italy, the elections in Bulgaria. The only reason to be shocked by the Trump election, would be by ignoring the perspective of Lyndon LaRouche that Russia – and in another respect – China, have become the dominant force on the planet.

The truth of the matter is that in spite of Obama's assertions that he has organized the "greatest economic recovery in modern history," most people's personal experience tells them otherwise. We see increases in suicides and drug overdoses,



stagnant or falling wages, exploding costs for medical care. People also fail to see the advantage of picking a fight with nuclear-armed Russia in order to support and arm alleged "moderate" Syrian rebels in order to overthrow that nation's President.

What Americans want, is a true economic recovery, a real future, and an end to the state of perpetual war. Like all people, we would like to see a world in which our children and grandchildren are better educated, live longer, and are happier than ourselves. We want to have a {mission}; a sense of contributing to something thrillingly important and new for mankind as a whole. In that sense, we need a huge leap in productivity, and a renewed sense of the best meaning of that term.

"There's a problem in the United States as such and the world as such also; and the problem here is, we've got to increase the productivity per capita of the human population. It's not enough to get increased employment; you've got to increase the productivity per capita of the citizen. Without that, you cannot win."

This short video presentation is about how to accomplish exactly that, and how to think about it. We will present Lyndon LaRouche's economic policy for the nation, what he calls "Four New Laws to Save the USA Now"; and we'll discuss how you can help make it happen.

– Introduction –

What you think you know about economics is probably wrong, and what US "experts" on economics think is {definitely}

wrong.

Economy is not about money, about making money. That we humans have an economy in the first place comes from the fact that our minds are capable of discovering principles of nature by which we increase our power to achieve new things in the world. The first great invention of mankind – it wasn't money – it was fire. The use of fire is what separates our species absolutely from all the animals, and it is the basis of the Greek creation story of Prometheus, who, in giving fire to human beings, {created} the human species as being the intelligent, creative, changing species.

Thinking in broad strokes, new types of fire have allowed us to fundamentally change our relationship to the physical world.

In one way, this has been by changing the kinds of materials available and useful to us. Charcoal fires allow us to make metals from ores. In a second way, the power liberated from the chemical bonds of hydrocarbon fuels created the steam engines of the past, and the internal combustion engines of the present. The potential of nuclear power, with fuel one million times more efficient and energy dense than chemical power, beckons us into the future; allowing for a re-configuration of our relationship to our material surroundings and our access to space. With a plasma torch, powered by nuclear fusion, we would achieve 100% recycling, and we could mine our landfills for resources. At a higher magnitude of power availability, manufacturing reaches

a new level. And with plentiful energy, new solutions to water supply become possible. To learn more about these topics, see our videos on the plasma torch and on the fusion economy.

Thinking on such a long-term scale, the factors that truly transform human productivity come into sharper relief. What are we doing today to achieve the next levels of knowledge and physical power? Are we intensely working to achieve nuclear fusion; or are we reverting to the Middle Ages and building windmills? What course are we setting for ourselves? Where are we going? Will we look back in a century, and point to this period as setting the stage for the major breakthroughs that will have defined that coming future world?

At present, there are two main systems in the world: (1) the relatively dying, money-based, depressing trans-Atlantic world of the Americas and Europe; and (2) the thrilling potential of a New Paradigm launching off from China's Belt and Road Initiative. The 21st Century Maritime Silk Road links the sea routes throughout Eurasia and Africa in a new integrated development. On land, the Silk Road Economic Belt presently features six economic corridors, bringing a new high-tech infrastructure platform across the Eurasian continent. Together, the full Belt and Road Initiative is bringing dozens and dozens of nations into the largest development program the world has ever seen. And it's

being led by a nation – China – that has concrete plans to {entirely} eliminate poverty within its borders by 2020. This is already rapidly expanding – further agreements with the BRICS nations and other nations throughout the world are bringing this closer and closer to the World Land-Bridge proposal made by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, and which has been promoted for decades.

This concept reaches beyond this planet, up to space, and to the Moon. Again, China leads the way, with the first ever landing on the far side of the Moon planned for the near future, and permanent lunar manned bases coming after.

{This} is the future of mankind that the US must join; and here's the policy to make that happen:

-The Four Laws –

In June 2014, Lyndon LaRouche authored a document, "Four New Laws to Save the USA Now: Not an Option, an Immediate Necessity!" He wrote:

"The economy of the United States of America, and also that of the trans-Atlantic political-economic regions of the planet, are now under the immediate, mortal danger of a general, physical-economic, chain-reaction breakdown-crisis of that region of this planet as a whole."

To address this collapse of the financial system, as seen in today's banking crises, as with Deutsche Bank, the moneyed

interests of Wall Street and London proposed a system of bail-in, of looting and theft; to steal from the economy to support the financial system, creating the effect of further destroying the physical economy and causing an accelerating rate of death. Take as example the situation in Greece, where during this decade, GDP has fallen nearly in half, and unemployment has doubled. Every EUR100Euro the IMF succeeds in cutting from Greek expenses to a 150Euro decline in income. Such are the results of following the economic advice of the trans-Atlantic economic order.

So what do we do? LaRouche points to the needed remedies:

"The only location for the immediately necessary action which could prevent such an immediate genocide throughout the trans-Atlantic sector of the planet, requires the U.S. Government's now-immediate decision to institute four specific, cardinal measures. Measures which must be fully consistent with the specific intent of the original U.S. Federal Constitution, as had been specified by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton while he remained in office:

(1) Immediate re-enactment of the Glass-Steagall law instituted by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without modification, as to principle of action.

(2) A return to a system of top-down, and thoroughly defined, National Banking.

(3) The purpose of the use of a Federal credit-system, is to

generate high-productivity trends in improvements of employment;  
with the accompanying intention, to increase the physical-economic productivity, and the standard of living of the persons and households of the United States.

(4) "Adopt a Fusion-Driver 'Crash Program'." The essential distinction of man from all lower forms of life is that it presents the means for the perfection of the specifically affirmative aims and needs of human individual and social life."

We'll cover these Four Laws, these four aspects, and provide you with the means to make it happen!

## 1. Glass-Steagall

Despite chronic lying by Rep. "Bailout Barney" Frank and Barack Obama himself, the repeal of Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall Act created the conditions for the crash of 2008, then; and the imminent crash of the entire trans-Atlantic system today.

For the 66 years it was in force, from 1933-1999 – especially up until the 1990s weakening of it – Glass-Steagall kept our financial system stable and laid the basis for physical economic growth unseen by any other nation in the history of mankind. Think of the economic accomplishments by the United States over that period, particularly from 1933 through the 1969 Moon landing.

Glass-Steagall created the ability increase the physical

wealth of the nation by strictly separating commercial banking from investment banking and insurance. Under Glass-Steagall, commercial banks took deposits and made loans, thereby allowing

idle money to be used by others in the community to engage in productive activity. Under Glass-Steagall, your bank didn't gamble with your paycheck, invest it in securities, lose everything, and then turn to the government demanding a bail-out;

leaving the people high and dry.

Since the repeal of Glass-Steagall, we haven't seen any

growth of the productive economy, but rather the growth of swindles – of stealing – at the expense of the population. The industrial capacity of our nation, our moral outlook, our commitment to future, have all dwindled to a faint glimmer of their former selves since Glass-Steagall's repeal.

Without the separation between commercial activity and investment activity, banks have transformed into parasites; rather than functioning as Alexander Hamilton intended, when he

wrote that "The introduction of Banks â€¦ has a powerful tendency

to extend the active Capital of a Country. Experience of the Utility of these Institutions is multiplying them in the United

States. It is probable that they will be established wherever they can exist with advantage."

For example, despite Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

Chairwoman Sheila Bair's testimony that approximately \$15 trillion in bail-outs, loan guarantees, and other government and

Federal Reserve assistance was made available to major banks from

2007-2011, their lending into the real economy kept falling through 2012. That government assistance was used for

securities'

speculation, and never left the banking sector to benefit the physical economy.

We must get Glass-Steagall restored immediately. The so-called Too-Big-To-Fail banks are larger now than they were in 2008. They're destined to blow any week. If they blow out now in an uncontrolled way, the destruction to the physical conditions of life for Americans, in terms of jobs lost, houses lost, retirement funds lost, the chaotic breakdown of the financial system, will far exceed the crash of 2008, and the image of 1929.

The system {has} to be put under control. Restoring Glass-Steagall today forces Wall Street to reconcile their huge debts on their own (bankrupting most investment banks, in a controlled and orderly way), and it will free up commercial banks to act as banks again. {We don't need Wall Street gambling!}

## 2. National banking

Alexander Hamilton stated in his "Report to the Congress on National Banking": "A National Bank is an institution of primary importance to the prosperous administration of the finances [of the United States], and would be of the greatest utility in the operations connected with the support of the public credit." Secretary of the Treasury Hamilton reorganized the post-Revolutionary War debt of the United States; developing a means of funding it through a series of new taxes. He then set up



the Bank of the United States, using the now-stable debt as its primary asset. The bank was able to stabilize the money supply, reduce speculation, and make the needed loans to finance the build-up of the newly unified economy.

After that first national bank was allowed to lapse in 1811, a successful fight was waged to charter the Second Bank of the United States, which functioned from 1816-36, during the presidency of John Quincy Adams; who oversaw extensive investment in canals and transportation, made possible by the national top-down approach. Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt also both applied the principles of national banking. Lincoln, through the issuance of "United States Notes" or "greenbacks" as they were called, and through a series of banking acts, reasserted the authority of the federal Treasury over all the numerous banks in the various states; requiring "all banks to purchase United States [Treasury] stocks to hold as securities for their circulating notes." In this way, Lincoln set up a national banking system, even though he was unable to establish a national bank.

Later, Franklin Roosevelt utilized his own approximation of the National Bank principle, when he converted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, created under the preceding Herbert Hoover Presidency as a means of intervening into financial markets. Roosevelt converted it into an institution for physical economic

development. Roosevelt's RFC issued the equivalent of \$500 billion (in today's dollars) of credit directed towards specific

employment programs and infrastructure and other development projects. This credit was repaid both directly, and indirectly:

The increased tax revenue resulting from the tremendous productivity increase brought about by the RFC, would itself have

paid for many of its programs. National banking – this approach

– allows investments whose returns are not made simply through user fees, but through improvement in the nation's overall productive powers.

By making the goal the improvement of national productivity,

rather than turning an immediate profit, the national banking approach allows investments that would otherwise not be made; and

it is absolutely essential today. The need for infrastructure financing today is an order of magnitude beyond what the RFC financed in Roosevelt's time. In addition to our own national resources, the involvements of the extensive credit facilities of

China, as well as its currency holdings (and those of Japan, for

example) will be essential for the needed US recovery.

### 3. Credit for higher EFD

What makes a loan worthwhile? We are {so} far behind, that,

for example, a national effort to build high-speed rail would founder for lack of basic building supplies, such as steel.

Investments must be directed to where they would be most useful.

As a metric for this, consider energy-flux density, an

economic

indicator used by LaRouche. It is a measure of the intensity of energy flow through the economy, considered at the point of application. For example, contrast the energy required to cut a material with a dull blade versus a sharp one. It actually takes more energy, more effort, to use the dull blade, while the energy concentration in the sharp blade, delivered over a smaller area, is more effective and requires less overall effort. In this way, we should measure not simply energy used per se, but the density of the applied energy in an economy. By increasing this, we are able to achieve more with less effort, and, of course, achieve new feats that were otherwise impossible.

A priority must be given to these economic activities; those that tend to increase the energy-flux density of the economy as a whole. By investing in higher platforms of infrastructure, such as efficient nuclear power, high speed rail, and water management systems, in this way we increase the potential of every local area of the economy. Just as shipping and canals made more areas able to trade, and as the railroads opened up the interior regions for development and an opportunity to transport goods efficiently, increasing the productive potential of the nation as a whole, the next generations of infrastructure increase the value and opportunity all along the development zones they

create. And by improving the means of production itself, as through up-shifts in the design of machine tools, the apex of the productive and manufacturing process, the increased powers of labor shape the entire created world.

Alexander Hamilton writes in his "Report on Manufactures" of the effect of increasing the power of labor: "The annual produce of the land and labour of a country can only be increased, in two ways – by some improvement in the productive powers of the useful labor; or by some increase in the quantity of such labor. With regard to the first, the labor of Artificers [manufacturers in today's language] is susceptible, in a proportionally greater degree, of improvement in its productive powers, whether to be derived from an accession of Skill, or from the application of ingenious machinery.

"The employment of Machinery forms an item of great importance in the general mass of national industry. 'Tis an artificial force brought in aid of the natural force of man; and, to all the purposes of labor, is an increase of hands; an accession of strength!..."

Today, we must focus the increasing of energy flux density in the infrastructure/public works platform, in machine-tooling, and on science itself – the key to making all other developments possible. Improving the economy of labor is accomplished through technological progress in an energy-intensive, capital-intensive mode of investment in basic economic infrastructure,

agriculture,  
and manufacturing. And even occupations that don't directly  
change still have their effects improved. The produce of a  
farmer, maybe produced in the same way, is now going to the  
dinner table of a fusion scientist. The mechanic's work on a  
car  
is now allowing a machine-tool operative to reliably drive to  
work, creating parts for a nuclear power plant. The trash  
collector brings this week's refuse to a regional plasma torch  
facility, recovering as much rare earth metals as would be  
gathered from a mine. Everything changes together;  
productivity  
is about the whole.

#### 4. Fusion

It is an outrageous crime that we don't yet have  
fusion  
power, and that existing fission power – both uranium and  
thorium – has seen relatively so little utilization. The next  
stage in our journey of higher forms of fire and control over  
the  
physical world, lies in the tiny world of the atomic nucleus.  
If  
the nucleus were the size of a basketball, an atom itself  
would  
be a kilometer in radius. Yet the forces in the tiny area of  
the  
nucleus are of a power density 100,000 to 1 million times  
greater  
than the chemical forces holding together atoms in molecules.  
A  
molecule is about 100,000 times larger than a nucleus; and yet  
the nucleus has 100,000 times more power. Put that together  
and  
you're talking about a thousand million or a million million  
times more power density in the nucleus. It's almost

incomprehensible how large that number is. It's like comparing the mass of our solar system to the entire Milky Way galaxy! That's the power of the nucleus. It's an absolutely phenomenal aspect of nature. So, don't research solar panels; unlock this almost {incomprehensibly} greater potential!

Through a greater mastery of the nucleus, we'll open the potential for dramatically increasing our energy supply to transform our relationship to physical materials through new types of ore processing, our relationship to water as through desalination, and the ability to rapidly reach any part of the Solar System; such as to deflect a deadly asteroid headed our way. You can't do that with a wind turbine! This is an essential component of becoming a truly space-faring species.

So why hasn't it happened yet? Why don't we have nuclear fusion power today? Check out this chart. It shows a 1976 estimate of when various funding levels would be expected to achieve commercial fusion. At a maximal level of funding, fusion was expected by 1990. You'll see at the bottom a line labelled "Fusion Never." That was the level of funding expected to keep programs alive, but without ever making the needed breakthrough.

The black line {below that} is actual funding for fusion research in the United States. A decision was made and remade, and remade, {not} to make this breakthrough; {not} to reach the next stage of "fire" that would transform our civilization far more profoundly than did the development of the steam engine. Our growing reach into space – made possible by fusion engines – will enable the

next level of scientific breakthroughs; requiring the export from space back to Earth of that great, man-made resource: knowledge.

But instead, we saved pennies while sacrificing the potential to advance on the grandest of scales.

Imagine living in a society committed to achieving fusion, and to implementing its benefits. How would being a part of that

society shape its citizens' self-conception? A human life has consequences and meaning that last far beyond physical death – at least in potential. Adopting a mission to achieve fusion is putting into practice a goal of Hamilton, who wrote that "To cherish and stimulate the activity of the human mind, by multiplying the objects of enterprise, is not among the least considerable of the expedients, by which the wealth of a nation

may be promoted. Even things in themselves not positively advantageous, sometimes become so, by their tendency to provoke

exertion. Every new scene, which is opened to the busy nature of

man to rouse and exert itself, is the addition of a new energy to

the general stock of effort." – Make It Happen! –

We need to make this happen! You only get to vote for President one day every 4 years. What about the other 1,460 days?

The LaRouche PAC is active {every day}. For decades, Lyndon and

Helga LaRouche and their collaborators have been relentless organizing for the new economic paradigm coming into being now.

Decades of conferences, studies, reports, meetings, fundraising,

videos, election campaigns, and collaboration are now coming to fruition. The outlook of the Belt and Road Initiative put forward as official policy by Chinese President Xi Jinping in 2013, is something the United States can adopt as well, rather than opposing. We can join this effort, we can rebuild our economy; we can have something fundamentally useful to offer the world.

Work with us! Join our Manhattan Project of political, intellectual, and musical activity in our nation's center of New York. Work with the leadership of LaRouche and his decades-long record as the conscience of America. From our website, you can sign up at our action center to get more involved. There is so much you can do, from setting up meetings in Congress to attending and organizing events in your area, from letters to the editor, studying economics, and raising contributions for the LaRouche PAC. Help to:

- \* Force Congress to immediately vote up the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall as the first of LaRouche's "Four Economic Laws";
- \* Educate yourself on fusion and forms of "fire";
- \* Join or start up a reading group to master the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, our nation's first Treasury Secretary;
- \* Study the World Land-Bridge proposal, and create events in your area. Discuss how the US can join this outlook. Inspire others with what is already happening, and with what could happen.

{You} can learn economics. {You} can be a political leader.



Do it, {be that leadership the US needs.} It's up to us; let's work together.

---

## Har Obama efterladt 'en ny, stor recession' til Trump?

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 8. december, 2016* – Alt imens det aktuelle, afgørende spørgsmål er, om den tiltrædende Trump-administration virkelig vil begrave »krigsdoktrinen for regimeskifte« og forfølge produktivt, økonomisk samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, så blev vi i dag mindet om den anden, triste arv fra Barack Obama: økonomien. Det amerikanske Konkurrenceråd har udgivet en rapport om USA's produktivitet med titlen, »Ingen økonomisk genrejsning«, og i *USA Today* lød overskriften meget passende, »Obamas økonomiske genrejsning var alligevel ingen genrejsning«. Og det Nationale Center for Sundhedsstatistik udgav en grummere undersøgelse, der fandt, at den forventede levealder for alle amerikanere faktisk er faldende, og at dødsfald som følge af alle de mest almindelige sygdomme er stigende, og det samme er spædbarnsdødeligheden. En af undersøgelsens forskere sagde: »Der er simpelt hen dette fænomen med, at tingene ikke står så godt til i USA, over hele linjen.«

På trods af »markedets« kortvarige eufori over valget af Trump, så forudsiger mange økonomer, at Obama har efterladt ham »en ny, stor recession«; og faktisk, et snarligt finanssammenbrud på grund af Dodd/Frank-lovens åbenbare manglende evne til at kontrollere og undertvinge Wall Street. Mange af de mest aktive og interesserede amerikanere er også

meget bekymrede over dette.

Det ovenfor nævnte «største spørgsmål» vil fundamentalt afgøre det; amerikansk velstand vil vende tilbage gennem at samarbejde omkring »Den Nye Silkevej« om store infrastrukturprojekter, gennem fælles gennembrud inden for teknologier for fusionskraft; og inden for kernekraft og afsaltning af havvand ved hjælp af kernekraft.

Som Rachel Brinkley, fra LaRouchePAC National Policy Committee, udtrykte det i en udtalelse om den mislykkede Dodd/Frank-lov: »For det første, så er der ... forøgelsen af reel velstand som resultat af forøgede rater af fysisk produktivitet. Kinas politik for den Nye Silkevej har en positiv effekt på 70 lande og 4,4 mia. mennesker, ved at fokusere på byggeriet af nye transportruter og udvikling af energi, inklusive byggeriet af højhastighedsjernbaner og mere effektive havne, at bringe elektricitet til landdistrikterne, og ved at indgå partnerskaber for avanceret, videnskabeligt samarbejde med andre lande. Dette er en aktuel, levende demonstration af, hvordan man påvirker nettorater af fysisk vækst i positiv retning. Monetære processer må altid være underordnet dette ... «

#### ✘ LaRouches Fire Love

Men, vi må omgående have en reorganisering af bankerne gennem indførelse af Glass-Steagall – i modsat fald, med stigende rentesatser, der nu rammer kolossale gældsbobler, vil Wall Street og City of London atter kollapse og ødelægge udsigterne til fremskridt. Trump har sagt, at han vil have Glass-Steagall genindført; mange kendte økonomer siger, at Kongressen og hans Wall Street-rådgivere ikke vil tillade det.

De undervurderer det tilbageholdte krav fra millioner af informerede amerikanere, om at få retfærdighed gennem **Glass-Steagall** og få »lukket Wall Street-kasinoet ned«. Dernæst kan en politik for statslig kredit og produktivitet, i Franklin

Roosevelts tradition, løfte nationen ud af det langvarige, økonomiske kollaps, i hvilket Bush og Obama har efterladt den.

*Foto: Nyvalgte præsident Donald Trump har forpligtet sig til, at USA skal ophøre med at føre en politik for regimeskifte ...*

---

# **Syrien står umiddelbart foran befrielse – Vil Det britiske Imperiums terrorist-instrument blive ødelagt for altid?**

✘ Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt holder Pearl Harbor-talen den 8. december, 1941, til en særlig indkaldt Kongressamling.

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 7. december, 2016 – På 75-års dagen den 7. dec., 1941 – »en dag, som vil blive husket som en skændselsdag«, som FDR erklærede – breder et lignende chok sig i De forenede Stater, og i verden, med Det britiske Imperium, der står over for sin mulige, endelige død. Politisk, økonomisk og strategisk vakler Imperiet, med Olympens bjerg, der smuldrer under dets fødder.*

På den politiske side har den italienske befolknings

overvældende afvisning af den EU-dikterede folkeafstemning, der skulle overgive magten til Bruxelles-bureaukraterne, som handler på vegne af bankerne i City of London, føjet yderligere et slag til Brexit, Trumps valgsejr, Fillons valgsejr i Frankrig, Dutertes valgsejr i Filippinerne og den allesteds nærværende fornemmelse af, at den britiske »globalisering« af hele verden under bankierernes kontrol er ved at være forbi.

På den økonomiske side bliver det i stigende grad erkendt, at den hektiske bestræbelse for at holde de europæiske banker oven vande gennem mere kvantitativ lempelse ('pengetrykning'), mere bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindsud) og mere bail-out (statslig bankredning) – de samme, mislykkede bestræbelser, som Bush og Obama har brugt i USA – skal dække over ødelæggelsen af folks levebrød, hvor produktiv beskæftigelse og selve produktiviteten bliver lukket ned for at redde spekulanterne. Og så virker det ikke engang, for at redde bankerne!

På den strategiske side, så er krigene for »regimeskifte«, som Bush, Blair, Cameron og Obama har ført i hele Mellemøsten, og som har overgivet land efter land til bestialske terroristbander, ved at blive nedkæmpet på Syriens slagmarker. Aleppo er næsten blevet befriet fra al-Qaeda og ISIS, disse, de britiske og saudiske monarkiers skabelser. Som oberst Pat Lang (pens.) bemærkede på sin blog, *Sic Semper Tyrannis*:<sup>[1]</sup> »Det, der er sket i borgerkrigens heksekedel, er, at en ny magt er opstået i Levanten. En ny, syrisk, arabisk hær eksisterer nu, takket være russisk uddannelse, udstyr og rådgivning.«

Som en yderligere konsolidering af denne afvisning af britisk imperiepolitik, erklærede Donald Trump i går aftes i North Carolina med sin hidtil stærkeste formulering:

*»Vi vil ophøre med at fare rundt for at vælte udenlandske regimer, som vi intet ved om; som vi ikke bør være indblandet*

*i. Denne destruktive cyklus med intervention og kaos må omsider være slut ... Vi søger harmoni og god vilje mellem verdens nationer.»*

✘ EIR's rapport 'Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen' på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk

Grundlaget for denne harmoni er blevet fremlagt i detaljer i EIR's Specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, som nu cirkulerer i hele verden på engelsk, kinesisk og arabisk. I løbet af den forgangne uge fortalte to politiske ledere fra Kina, Patrick Ho, tidligere Hong Kong-indenrigssekretær, og viceudenrigsminister Fu Ying fra Beijing, et amerikansk publikum i Washington og New York, at den nyvalgte præsident Trump har mulighed for at bringe Kina og USA sammen omkring global opbygning af nationer, ved at tilslutte sig Xi Jinpings Silkevejsprojekter, Bælt-og-Vej-programmet, og ved at tage imod det stående tilbud fra præsident Xi om samarbejde, som Obama havde afvist til fordel for militær konfrontation med både Kina og Rusland.

Trump har gjort det ekstremt klart, at han vil arbejde sammen med præsident Putin omkring bekæmpelse af terrorisme, samt inden for andre, endnu ikke afgjorte områder. I dag foretog han endnu en positiv gestus over for Beijing ved at udnævne guvernøren for Iowa, Terry Branstad, som den næste ambassadør til Kina. Branstad er en nær, personlig ven til præsident Xi Jinping, et venskab, der stammer fra Xis mange besøg til Iowa i årenes løb.

✘ LaRouches Fire Love

For virkelig at bringe Amerika ind i en samarbejdsrelation med Rusland og Kina, må det transatlantiske banksystems bankerot løses, helst før der indtræffer en ukontrollabel

sammenbrudskrise. Dette kræver den omgående genindførelse af Franklin Roosevelts **Glass/Steagall-lov** og afskrivning af boblen med værdiløse derivater, der er i færd med at drive realøkonomien ad Helvede til. I dag er aktivist-teams fra hele USA's østkyst i Washington, hvor de giver de sædvanligvis totalt idéforladte kongresmedlemmer deres marchordrer om at tilslutte sig den nu på globalt plan gærende revolution, der er i færd med at bringe en afslutning på Det britiske Imperiums finansdiktatur gennem Glass-Steagall og statslig kredit, der, efter Hamiltons principper, dirigeres til opbygning af industri, landbrug, infrastruktur og satsning på fusionskraft og udforskning af rummet. Magten til og muligheden for at gøre dette ligger i dette øjeblik i vore hænder, et øjeblik, der ligeledes vil »huskes som en skændsel«, hvis vi mislykkes. Som i 1941, har alle patrioter i deres respektive nationer, og alle borgere i verden, muligheden for at ændre historiens gang til det bedre, ved at tilslutte sig denne historiske, internationale kamp for at skabe en civilisation, der er i overensstemmelse med alle menneskers værdighed.

*Foto: SAA Tigerstyrker og civile i Aleppo, Syrien, 7. december, 2016.*

---

[1] Sic semper tyrannis er latin og betyder 'således altid for tyranner'. Det blev foreslået af George Manson ved Virginia Konventionen i 1776 og henviste til Marcus Junius Brutus' udtalelse ved mordet på Julius Cæsar. Det bliver undertiden fejltolket som »Død over tyranner«. (wiki)

---

# **Ved et uafgjort øjeblik i historien er den personlige faktor endnu vigtigere: Gør det Nye Paradigme til virkelighed!**


*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 6. december, 2016* – Den formelle overgang til USA's næste præsidentskab – der er 45 dage til Indvielsesdagen for Donald Trump – får uophørlig opmærksomhed i USA og i andre medier, men, den historisk vigtige overgang i verden som helhed er det følgende: hvor hurtigt og vist vil USA og Europa opgive det geopolitiske, kasino-økonomiske system og gå med i det nye, globale win-win-paradigme? Udfordringen består i at mobilisere folk til at være med til at få dette til at ske. Dette omfatter, at de foretager en personlig ændring og bliver aktive, og ikke længere blot ser passivt og afventende til. Der gives øjeblikke i historien, hvor den subjektive faktor er altafgørende. Vi befinder os ved et sådant øjeblik.

Omstændighederne er dramatiske. Yderligere initiativer for fred og udvikling kommer i denne uge fra Rusland og Kina.

I dag var premierminister Dmitri Medvedev vært for mange møder i Moskva med den tyrkiske premierminister Binali Yildirim, inkl. møder med præsident Vladimir Putin. Sammen med afgørende, økonomiske engagementer, såsom byggeri af kernekraftværker og gasledningen Turkish Stream, bekræftede lederne det, som Yildirim kaldte behovet for en ny, international sikkerhedsarkitektur for at besejre terrorisme, og en ny dialog med vestlige magter på dette grundlag.

I Tokyo fremlagde en kinesisk embedsmand fra den magtfulde Nationale Udviklings- og Reformkommission (NDRC) i går et tilbud om at opkoble Bælt-og-Vej-programmet til Japans og Sydkoreas økonomiske »arbejdsplaner«. Hr. Cao Wenlian, generaldirektør for NDRC's Internationale Samarbejdscenter, talte om at styrke komplementariteten i de tre nationers økonomiske aktiviteter, der tilsammen allerede udgør 36 procent af verdens BNP. Cao talte i anledning af det Første Forum for Samarbejde om Industrikapacitet mellem de tre lande. Dette fremstød med det kinesiske tilbud tilsidesætter Japans mangeårige underdanighed under transatlantisk, økonomisk og militær, tvivlsom og aggressiv manipulation.

Selv Henry Kissinger – hvis personlige historie kan siges at indbefatte særdeles uønskede paradigmer – taler offentligt til fordel for samarbejde mellem USA og Kina. Kissinger mødtes den 2. dec. med præsident Xi Jinping i Beijing. I dag mødtes han med Donald Trump i New York City. I går aftes under et Manhattan-arrangement svarede Kissinger på et spørgsmål, der var stillet af LaRouchePAC's Daniel Burke, som spurgte: »Hr. LaRouche deler stærkt Deres mening om, at USA og Kina må samarbejde. Og han understreger, at USA og Kina kan samarbejde omkring politikken med Ét bælte, én vej; at dette ville være en indlysende vej til at genopbygge USA's kollapsende økonomi ... « Kissinger svarede: »Jeg mener, at konceptet med Én vej, ét bælte [sic] er et vigtigt spørgsmål. Jeg mener, at Kina kan og bør finde en måde at tale om det. Det er et af de spørgsmål, hvor samarbejde sandsynligvis er muligt ... «

I denne uge vil LaRouchePAC-aktivister fra flere  østkyststater anføre angrebet på Capitol Hill i Washington, D.C., for at lægge pres på virkeligheden og politikken med det formål at få USA til at gå med i det nye paradigmes æra, med start i en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, der følges op af gennemførelse af de handlinger, der fremlægges i LaRouches *Fire Love*.

Ved et arrangement i går i Washington, D.C., talte både



vicepræsident Joe Biden og Thomas Hoenig, vicepræsident for den amerikanske Statslige Indskudsgarantifond, FDIC, offentligt til fordel for Glass/Steagall-loven. Biden fordømte sin egen stemme til fordel for en ophævelse af Glass-Steagall i 1999 (Gramm-Leach-Bliley-loven) som »den værste stemme, jeg nogensinde har afgivet i hele min tid i USA's Senat«. Men så vendte han rundt og sagde, det er derfor, vi nu »ikke kan tillade en ophævelse af Dodd-Frank«, fordi vi har brug for »en opmand i marken«.

Hoenig udtalte imidlertid støtte til genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og forklarede, at ophævelsen af denne lov førte til de risikable omstændigheder, der skabte krisen i 2008.

»Man gav de kommercielle banker, der har et statsgaranteret sikkerhedsnet, lov til« at engagere sig i alle former for aktiviteter, og man »forsynede dem endda med udvidet statsstøtte til at handle ... « Hoenig er en potentiel Trump-udnævnelse til viceformand for banktilsynet i Federal Reserve (USA's centralbank).

Hvis man træder et skridt tilbage og betragter historien, ser man, at visse øjeblikke træder frem som tidspunkter, hvor en afgørende, personlig ændring finder sted. I denne uge tænker vi med alvor tilbage på den 7. december, 1941, Pearl Harbor Day, hvor amerikanske borgere, som nation, gennemgik en ændring over en nat.

Vi skal i dag forstå, at vi alle er kaldede til aktivt at intervenere for at være med til at afgøre det historiske udfald.

---

# Italien: Har Putin gjort det igen?

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 5. december, 2016* – I modsætning til det hysteri, der stadig fortsætter i USA, så er der ingen, der påstår, at Rusland riggede stemmeboksene til Italiens overvældende sejr i en folkeafstemning, der ellers ville have overgivet deres love, domstole og lovgivende magt til den Europæiske Union. Men den, der promoverede en sådan folkeafstemning, den italienske premierminister Renzi, blev alligevel grundigt slået og træder nu tilbage.

Som den russiske præsident Putin samme dag bemærkede i et interview til Tv, »Vi lever nu i en anden tid ... Den globale balance er gradvist i færd med at skifte.« Obama har igen tabt; endnu en leder, som han havde overøst med ros, har erkendt sit nederlag til det »nye paradigme«.

Dette nye paradigme afviser det gamle – der sluttelig drejede sig om britisk finansimperialisme – som var det paradigme, Obama har tjent: Det drejede sig om at ofre økonomier til globale finansmarkeder og globale finansinstitutioner; om at ofre industrier for traktater om »frihandel«; om at fjerne uønskede, »diktatoriske« regeringer gennem permanent krigsførelse. Ironisk nok var det de britiske vælgere, der startede den til alle lande nu spredende afvisning af dette »globaliseringsparadigme«.

Som eksempel for dette nye paradigme står de næsten 70 nye, store infrastrukturprojekter, hvor Kina er involveret i finansieringen og opførelsen, i Eurasiens, Afrikas og Sydamerikas nationer – og, potentielt set, også i Nordamerika, når Obama først er af vejen.

Dette nye paradigme kunne meget snart komme til udtryk gennem den måde, hvorpå Putin er i færd med at gennemtvinge en

løsning på forsøget på at gennemtvinge regimeskift i Syrien; og gennem Kinas fremstød for udvikling med den Nye Silkevej, der også forlænges ind i Mellempøsten. Selve den Europæiske Union har bøjet sig for denne »skiftende balance« og fremlagde i dag en Plan B, hvor det vil være med til at finansiere genopbygningen af Syrien og opgive kravet om Bashar al-Assads tilbagetræden.

Valget af Donald Trump udgør en åbning i kampen for dette nye paradigme i USA – han blev valgt gennem en afvisning af den gamle globaliseringspolitik, og har visse mål til fælles med det nye paradigme. ✘

Men håbet om dette nye paradigme, der besjæler hele Amerika og Europa, ligger i kampagnen for Lyndon LaRouches »Fire Økonomiske Love til USA's redning«, som diskuteres i LaRouchePAC National Policy Committee fra 5. dec. Følg diskussionen her:  
<https://larouchepac.com/20161205/larouchepac-policy-committee-show>

---

**Det nye paradigme er den dominerende dynamik i verden i øjeblikket;  
Italien leverer et bragende nederlag til EU-oligarkiet**


*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 4. december, 2016 – Den 9. november, 2016, morgenen efter det dramatiske præsidentvalg i USA – hvor Trumps valgsejr efterlod de fleste analytikere hjemme og i*

udlandet enten vrøvlende nonsens af sig, eller også i målløs tavshed – udtalte Lyndon LaRouche klart, at Trumps valgsejr var en del af en global, og ikke en lokal eller national proces, hvor hele konstruktionen med globalisering og frihandel er i færd med at smuldre. LaRouche sagde, at intet endnu er afgjort, og at processen styres af præsidenterne Putin fra Rusland og Xi fra Kina, og gennem det globale alternativ, som de præsenterer – et alternativ, der er baseret på en politik, som Lyndon og Helga LaRouche længe har været forkæmpere for.

I dag fortsætter denne globale proces med at udspille sig i en accelererende rate, i en grad, hvor det nye paradigme er den dominerende dynamik i verden i dag. I Italien leverede landet et slående, 60 % mod 40 %, nederlag til Storbritanniens EU-diktatur. Søndagens folkeafstemning – i kølvandet på Brexit og Trumps valgsejr – kunne meget vel vise sig at blive det endelige knockout-stød mod hele eurosystemet.

Samtidig med, at det transatlantiske systems gamle paradigme imploderer, tilbyder den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping aktivt hele verden at få adgang til den »udviklingsdrøm«, der på så slående vis fungerer i Kina. Som *Xinhua* skriver i en ledende artikel: »Den kinesiske drøm er en drøm for alle.« Og, ligesom sin partner Putin, fortsætter Xi med at udvide tilbuddet om produktivt samarbejde med USA til nyvalgte præsident Trump. Potentialer er enormt – men endnu ikke realiseret.

I mellemtiden fortsætter de afdankede repræsentanter for det gamle paradigme at handle, som om der ikke har fundet et skifte sted i USA's præsidentskab, og som om det nye paradigme slet ikke eksisterer. De fortsætter med at puffe verden i retning af atomkrig, med deres outrerede og farlige provokationer imod Rusland og Kina.

Hvad vi foretager os i denne globale proces, understregede  LaRouche tilbage den 9. nov., og igen denne weekend under diskussion med sine medarbejdere på begge sider af Atlanten,

er absolut afgørende. Vi må blive ved med at presse på for at få **LaRouches Fire Love** vedtaget og bruge det faktum, at der nu er en større åbenhed over for diskussioner af dristige ideer, som man så det tidligere på ugen i forbindelse med LaRouchePAC's organisering på Capitol Hill. Mange mennesker var for første gang villige til at diskutere fusionskraft, rumpolitik og endda Einsteins og Krafft Ehrickes ideer.

Vi må fremlægge for folk behovet få at vedtage Glass-Steagall og indføre et kreditsystem efter Hamiltons principper, der skal erstatte nutidens bankerotte system, og vi må vise dem, hvordan det vil virke. Og vi må frem for alt tilslibe menneskets centrale karakteristika, som muliggør en sådan uafbrudt udvikling: menneskets kreativitet.

Vi må absolut fokusere på skabelsen af en bedre kvalitet af det menneskelige intellekt, understregede LaRouche; vi kan ikke udelade behovet for at skabe og generere genier, som Einsteins eksempel udtrykkeligt demonstrerer. Dette er den standard, der må anvendes. Vi må opgradere den måde, hvorpå vi fungerer som organisatorer, sagde han, og udsøge mennesker, som i det mindste er i besiddelse af spiren til denne kvalitet af geni, og som er villige til at bygge et nyt samfund og skabe en fremtid for menneskeheden.

Vi kan ikke gå på kompromis med udviklingen af geni. Dette kræver, at vi stræber efter at udvikle den form for kvalitet, som i det mindste må have en forsmag af geni, for vi ønsker, at befolkningen skal følge denne kurs.

Denne idé om at appellere til folk, der i det mindste har en anelse om, hvad det vil sige at bringe menneskeheden fremad, udtalte Helga Zepp-LaRouche, er også af afgørende betydning for rekrutteringen. Vi må tænde gnisten i sådanne personer for at tilslutte sig denne nye revolution, der er i gang over hele verden.

## Supplerende materiale:

### Bragende nederlag for EU-Oligarkiet i italiensk folkeafstemning

4. dec., 2016 – Et jordskælv, denne gang af politisk art, kom søndag aften fra Italien, hvor vælgerne – iflg. de tidlige resultater – afviste den EU-dikterede forfatningsreform med et overvældende flertal på 60 % mod 40 %.

Efter Brexit og den anti-Obama/Hillary Clinton valgsejr i USA, er dette det tredje chok, der rammer, og det har implikationer for hele Europa og verden.

En turbulent fase er nu indledt. Premierminister Matteo Renzi forventes at træde tilbage, og mandag vil et spekulativt angreb, der var annonceret på forhånd, blive udløst mod italienske værdipapirer. Dette kan udløse en bankkrise, der hurtigt kan sprede sin smitte til hele finanssystemet.

Italien står nu umiddelbart over for at træffe et valg: enten at gennemtvinge finansiell fascisme, eller forlade euroen og vedtage nationale nødrets-love. Der vil muligvis blive afholdt nyvalg snarest på baggrund af denne krise.


*Foto: Premierminister Matteo Renzi tabte stort i søndagens folkeafstemning i Italien.*

---


**USA har brug for en**

# massebevægelse for udvikling NU!

## LaRouchePAC Internationale Webcast, 2. december, 2016; Leder

Matthew Ogden: Både Diane Sare og Kesha Rogers har skrevet  en artikel i denne uges *The Hamiltonian*; jeg mener, deres artikler meget fint tjener til at skabe en ramme omkring aftenens diskussion. Diane Sares artikel hedder "President Putin's Purloined Letter; the Poetic Principle in Political Affairs" (Præsident Putins stjålne brev; det poetiske princip i politiske affærer) – jeg kan godt lide bogstavrimet her. Kesha Rogers skrev en artikel, "Mankind Is Taking a Leap! You Should Ask 'How High?'" (Menneskeheden foretager et spring! Man bør spørge, 'Hvor højt?'"")

Begge disse artikler tjener virkelig til at definere det, som hr. LaRouche pointerede mht. den nødvendige tankegang, når vi går frem i den nuværende situation i verden. Man må ikke blive fanget i lokal tankegang; man bør ikke tænke ud fra den laveste fællesnævner, eller tænke på alle de forskellige politiske taktikker, der plaskes ud over forsiden af *New York Times* eller *Washington Post* og de forskellige nyhedsmedier. Man må i stedet tænke som en leder; og man må tænke ud fra standpunktet om, hvad der er drivkraften bag den hastigt skiftende dynamik i globale anliggender.

Ganske kort: vi så dette meget direkte i denne uge fra et  par forskellige standpunkter. For det første, så var der en aktionsdag fra LaRouchePAC-aktivister i Washington, D.C. i onsdags. Jeg havde den store glæde at deltage. Vi havde aktivister, der kom fra hele østkysten, inkl. fra 'Manhattan-

projektet' i New York City; og vi var dér for at sætte hr. LaRouches principper, i form af de **Fire Økonomiske Love**, på dagsordenen. At der ikke er noget alternativ til en omgående genindførelse af Glass-Steagall og en omgående renæssance af Alexander Hamiltons principper. Disse er: et nationalbanksystem; direkte kredit til forøget energigennemstrømningstæthed og produktivitet i arbejdsstyrken; og princippet om videnskab som [økonomisk] drivkraft, som Kesha Rogers diskuterer i sin artikel i *The Hamiltonian*. Et aggressivt program for udforskning og udvikling af rummet, og for at opnå fusionskraft og en højere energigennemstrømningstæthed i produktionsprocessen.

Og jeg mener, dette kan ses meget klart ud fra det, der finder sted internationalt, og som hovedsagligt kommer fra Rusland og Kina. Der var for det første et meget vigtigt dokument, som netop er blevet offentliggjort, fra Kina, som vi kan diskutere lidt mere omkring. Dette dokument hedder »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«. Denne hvidbog erklærer, at udvikling er den fundamentale, uomstøttelige rettighed. Og for det andet, så er der nu en ny, strategisk doktrin fra Rusland, som blev annonceret i summarisk form af den russiske præsident Putin i sin årlige 'Tale til nationen', hvor han sagde, at verdensdynamikken nu er forandret. Vi er nu villige til at samarbejde med USA som ligeværdige partnere omkring fælles interesser – inklusive endelig at besejre de falske, konstruerede fjender, som vi har hørt om fra Obama-administrationen gennem de seneste otte år.

Så med denne form for geometrisk strategi har vi et meget rigt felt, vi kan intervenere i, og en meget rig mulighed.

Så der er mange detaljer, som jeg gerne vil have, vi kommer ind på under diskussionen af alle disse spørgsmål. Lad det være nok som introduktion, og lad os høre Kesha og Diane.

*(Herefter følger udskrift af diskussionen på engelsk.)*



DIANE SARE: OK, I'll just go ahead. I'm really glad with what you said, Matt; because there really is a transformation, and I think we tend to miss it. Or you catch a glimmer of it like the real joy that I certainly felt watching all the vote totals come in; and these poor silly reporters not having a clue what had hit them. But then, you get bombarded with the real fake news, which is what comes from the so-called mainstream news media; which has absolutely zero about developments in the world which are being created by billions of people. So, you have the most extraordinary, most gigantic Earth-changing events occurring under the leadership of Vladimir Putin, under the leadership of Xi Jinping, and their collaboration with leaders in South America, leaders in Africa. Not one word of it here, and then we're treated to some miniscule detail of a misplaced wart that a politician has somewhere or whatever. I think we would do well to bear in mind a little bit of what I tried to capture in that article. There is a poetic principle; there is a world revolution underway. These things are not separate, discrete events. The Brexit vote – contrary to the stupid media spin – was not a bunch of white racists who hate immigrants. Maybe there are some of those, but the real factor was that the whole euro system is bankrupt. It didn't work and it wasn't designed to work; and people were rejecting it. Similarly, you had these recent votes: the winner in the French Republican Party nominations, François Fillon, who does not want a war with

Russia. I think most people on the planet actually recognize that a nuclear war between superpowers is not a desirable policy or outcome; and it's not necessary because what President Putin is doing is leading a fight to eradicate terrorism. He has been very direct about this; especially after September of 2015, at his speech at the United Nations. He's reiterating again the call for a coalition to wipe out this terrorist scourge. So what you see in this election process here in the United States, is we have a potential now to join with the New Paradigm.

Therefore, the most significant aspect of what we know about the incoming administration perhaps, are the two phone calls that Trump had with Xi Jinping and with President Vladimir Putin; and this is absolutely not missed by people of the world. I just wanted to give a little bit of a report on an event last night at New York University with this extraordinary woman, who is the second only I think woman in history to be the chairwoman of the Foreign Relations committee in the Chinese national assembly. Her name is Madame Fu Ying; she is extraordinarily dignified, calm and very confident. She began her remarks at this forum at New York University by referring to the phone call between Xi Jinping and Trump. She made a point of saying the Chinese are always being accused of not contributing to good in the world, of not working with the world. So, we figured when we started the Belt and Road and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank,

that

the United States – which is always accusing us of not wanting to work with anyone else – would have been the first in line to

join. Instead, our invitation to participate in these extraordinary projects was rejected. Now, clearly there is a potential for this opportunity to be taken.

This is really very big. Similarly, the decision that Trump

has made to have retired General Michael Flynn as one of his advisors; who has called for collaboration with Russia in Syria.

And Trump's reiterations of the necessity of that kind of collaboration – these things are very important. And the fact that Flynn has come out calling for a Marshall Plan for the region; which is similar to the Chinese; Xi Jinping made a tour

of several of those nations not so long ago. The only way you are going to secure peace is through economic development – not

on a low level, not on repairing the decrepit, aging, out-of-date

infrastructure we have; but by leaping into a new domain. So, I

think I'll stop there for a minute; because I think Kesha probably has a lot to add in that regard.

KESHA ROGERS: Yes. Just taking from that, we really have

to advance mankind; we really have to have a leap forward for mankind. This is what Mr. LaRouche is committed to; this is what

you see Russia and China committed to. I was greatly inspired by

the discussion and some of the developments that came out of the

President of Russia; President Putin's State of the Union

address. The leap for mankind really requires putting the commitment to the future. This was really expressed very beautifully in his remarks, which captured in essence the conception that the responsibility of the nation is to foster creativity in science, and foster creativity in the youth of your nation. The best expression to doing this, in terms of scientific and technological development. In his speech he says, "Our schools must promote creativity, but children must learn to think independently, work both on their own and as part of a team, address usual tasks and formulate and achieve goals; which will help them have an interesting and prosperous life. You must promote the culture of research and engineering work. The number of cutting edge science parks for children will increase to 40 within two years; they will serve as the basis for development of a network of technical project groups across the country. Companies, universities, and research institutes would contribute to this, so our children will see clearly that all of them have equal opportunity and an equal start in life. That Russia needs their ideas and knowledge and they can prove their mettle in Russian companies and laboratories..." And he goes to say, "Our education system must be based on the principle that all children and teenagers are gifted and can succeed in science, in creative areas, in sports, in career, and in life."

That should be the model for every single nation.

That is the model for our space program, and it really starts with the question of what is human nature? If we're going to advance mankind and have leaps forward? As a part of this paper that Matt mentioned, from China they're expressing the same expression for their nation; and for mankind as a whole. It's not just "our nation is better than yours, and we're going to have our people pulled out of poverty and your people can stay in poverty. They're not thinking like imperialists or wanting to keep nations backwards; they want nations to move forward. So, China has pulled 700 million people out of poverty; you can't do that by taking baby steps and going with a few infrastructure projects. You have to have creative leaps. This has really been expressed for their Silk Road development offer of win-win cooperation and their commitment to space and space as the potential for opening for mankind across the planet and across the galaxy.

I think if people look at the very exciting developments that we're seeing coming from Russia and China, that has to be the model. We have that potential right now, because I think what Diane pointed out – that when President-elect Trump was elected, this was a mandate. This was a repudiation of the Bush/Obama destruction of this type of potential for a future; a repudiation of Hillary Clinton's commitment to continuing war. The American people said, we're not going to condone this any longer.

The question is, what is the positive aspect that you're

going to fight for? We've put that on the table with LaRouche's Four Laws and our commitment to a future perspective for mankind, based on this very identity that has been clearly laid out by what we could be doing if we decide to make the commitment and collaborate on the basis that Russia and China have laid out.

OGDEN: Yeah, China really is an inspiration in that regard.

Let me just read a very quick quote from that paper that you referenced, Kesha. The title of this white paper, again, is "The

Right to Development: China's Philosophy, Practice and Contribution"; and they start by saying, "The right to development must be enjoyed and shared by all peoples.

Realizing the right to development is the responsibility of all countries

and also the obligation of the international community." If you

just juxtapose that to the Malthusian philosophy of the British

Royal Family and others in the so-called "West" today, where they

say, "Well, no, you know, the right to development – it's not a

right. All peoples do not have an equal right to the same living

standard, and, plus, if we were to pursue that – as Obama said when he went to Africa – 'the planet would boil over.'" I mean,

give me a break!

So, China's white paper is laying out the *opposite* philosophy, view, of man. I think, in accordance with what Putin

said in that State of the Union, that, yes, every human being

is

a creative human being. That is the fundamental right of every human being – is to develop that creativity and to contribute it

to his or her nation and to the future of mankind.

In the China white paper, they go on to state some really

stunning statistics. You, Kesha, cited the lifting 700 million people out of poverty; which is just an incredible achievement in

and of itself. Now only a little bit under 6%, 5.7% of the population of China, are officially under the poverty line. And

in the white paper they were very proud to point out that China

was actually the first to achieve this UN Millennium goal – which is a goal to lift such and such a percentage of people out

of poverty. But they refuse to stop there! They say, "That's not

enough. We have a goal, that we are going to eliminate poverty altogether!"

The statistics are amazing. If you compare China in 1949 to

China in 2015, only a 70-year difference, the average longevity

in China in 1949 was 35 years. Today it's 76 years. The enrollment of school-age children in school in 1949 was 20%.

Today it's almost 100%; 99.8% of all school-age children are enrolled in schools in China. The difference between 1978 and

2015: the GDP was at RMB767 billion in 1978. Today their GDP is

RMB68,000 billion! So, that growth is unbelievable. And then there's, obviously, much less tangible things that you can

measure, but which are clear to see, including the spread of art,

classical culture, classical musical training among the

children

of China. So this is really a model for the rest of the world,

an inspiration. As Xi Jinping has said, "We invite the United States, we invite the West to become a part of the New Silk Road,

and to become a part of the One Belt, One Road initiative."

One event that was happening in Washington, D.C., simultaneously with this Day of Action that the LaRouche PAC activists had on Capitol Hill, was really an unprecedented event

that was sponsored by the Asia Society. It was an all-day event

that was hosted by a scholar named Dr. Patrick Ho, who's the Secretary General of the China Energy Fund Committee. One of my

colleagues who was there, said about the event that "This was one

of those days in Washington, D.C. when all of the principles that

you've been talking about as a LaRouche PAC activist for years and years and years, all of a sudden are being echoed by the person standing at the podium." We've had those experiences periodically, but this *entire* event was about the right to development, the One Belt, One Road Initiative, the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the World Land-Bridge, the New Paradigm, win-win cooperation, the United States joining the Silk Road – quite literally, in those terms.

Dr. Ho actually laid out five points of advice to the new

incoming [Trump] administration on how to integrate the United States into the One Belt, One Road program. His five steps are as

follows:

1) Consider One Belt, One Road a platform to spearhead initiatives and programs to bring closer cooperation between the



United States and China;

2) Realign trade agreements with Asia-Pacific nations to accommodate the One Belt, One Road;

3) Adjust the U.S. posture towards the international development banks – that's the AIIB, the New Silk Road Fund, the New Development Bank of the BRICS, and so forth – and promote their capacity to assist in support for infrastructure development;

4) Help secure security along the One Belt, One Road;

5) Get the international institutions to work with the One Belt, One Road.

So, I think that's actually a very clearly stated way to, as we say in this pamphlet that we've published from LaRouche PAC, have the United States join this new Silk Road.

These ideas, as Diane was saying, this is an active principle, this is the dynamic {elsewhere}, and our responsibility is to ensure that {this} is the dynamic shaping policy in the United States.

SARE: Along these lines – because I know there's discussion and there's an article about Sen. Schumer saying he will work with Trump on a \$1 trillion infrastructure package (something like that) – I think the idea of Hamilton and the ideas of people like Krafft Ehrlicke and what China is doing, really need to be understood by our activists, so that people can reflect. For example, there's discussion about one of the things that was promoted in the *New York Times* for Trump to do with his infrastructures, that there should be a tunnel under the Hudson

River, from New Jersey to New York. Right now I think the trains go, I don't know, every 90 seconds, or every three minutes, or something like that. There's an enormous amount of traffic. The Port Authority Bus Terminal is very old and decrepit. It's going to have to be rebuilt and relocated. The tunnels are very old. So, this is something that has needed to be done for a long time. As everyone might imagine, there's an absolutely enormous amount of traffic between Manhattan and New Jersey across the Hudson River. So, you say, "What's wrong with a new tunnel between New Jersey and New York?" Well, in a sense, if you were to do that, it would be a sin of omission. Obviously we need a tunnel, but if the idea were to connect this tunnel to a tunnel under the Bering Strait, so that you could travel from Manhattan to Moscow, that would be a completely different idea. And I think what...

OGDEN: [cross talk] ...Manhattan to Jersey City; that's for sure! [both laugh]

SARE: Yeah! Or even, you know, for people who don't want to go to Moscow, for whatever reason. They could go to Paris, but they could travel through Siberia. All kinds of exotic, really wonderful places. It would be quite a ride. Although, I suppose, if we get the magnetically-levitated vacuum trains, you wouldn't

really get to see much. On the other hand, you'd arrive at your destination *before you left*, by the clock.

Anyway, all of these things would *completely* transform the way we think of *everything*. If you could take a train from New Jersey to San Francisco. Supposing even that it wasn't three hours – it was a normal high-speed train – so you got there in a day-and-a-half, that's a completely different phenomenon. It changes the United States: what you can ship; whom you can work with; the exchange of ideas; the exchange of goods. The ability for people to find the very most brilliant individual, whether they're in China or Somalia or India, who has expertise in a particular area, and you want to bring them in to collaborate with a team of scientists in your local laboratory. All these things become thinkable.

So, when Mr. LaRouche a few years ago had made the point that he doesn't like the term "infrastructure" anymore, because it doesn't really get at what is actually necessary; which is the question of how do you increase the productivity of every person. And that requires thinking in terms of a *platform*. The difference between not having electricity, for example, and having electricity, is not simply night and day. You just can't even compare it. It's *incommensurate*. Therefore, I think we have to be both open-minded, but we also have to set {really high} standards for what we think we should be doing. It would be absolutely criminal, even if it did employ millions of people, to fill in every pothole in every major city in the United

States.

That would not lift the standard of living or the productivity of the nation as a whole; whereas a high-speed rail link that went from Manhattan to Moscow would actually have a completely transformative effect.

OGDEN: Yeah, it's these {leaps} in progress that are unquantifiable, because it's a completely different measuring rod, from one leap to the next. Last week on the webcast here on Friday night, Ben Deniston gave an excellent presentation on what's necessary for a real space colonization and exploration program. I thought one example that he used during that presentation, was really interesting. Just think about what's the difference between Lewis and Clark's Expedition to explore the Louisiana Purchase Territory and to cross the continental United States vs. what we were able to do with the trans-continental railroad. That's a different universe vs. what we would be able to do with what you're talking about, Diane, with a magnetically-levitated train that goes from New York, to Los Angeles, all the way up to Anchorage, Alaska, and across the Bering Strait, into the Eurasian landmass. Those are just quantifiably and qualitatively different modes of action. And so, yes, it's "setting the bar" incredibly high.

Kesha, in your article, you said, "You should ask: How high? We should leap, we should jump. Mankind should take a leap. How high?" It's these kinds of insights that Krafft Ehrlicke, and others, were able to discuss from the terms that now Mr. LaRouche

has {scientifically} defined, in terms of energy-flux density, how much more productivity are you able to achieve, with less effort, with less energy applied, because of these qualitative leaps in technology and in the principle that you're employing.

Before we get into a little bit more of that, I do want to bring up, though, because you mentioned it, Diane, this article, this interview with Sen. Chuck Schumer. Mr. LaRouche was told about this earlier today when we had a discussion with him. He placed some importance on it and said, "You know, Chuck Schumer does play a significant role in the Democratic Party." He is now Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, and, very significantly, led the fight against Obama's veto of the JASTA bill; very publicly broke with the Obama administration, in favor of the 9/11 families, in overturning the Obama veto of the JASTA bill. I'd like to say something about that later.

This article is an interview that's published on [syracuse.com](http://syracuse.com). It starts by saying, "U.S. Senator Chuck Schumer said Wednesday that he's optimistic Congress will strike a deal with President-elect Donald Trump, to pass a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill within the first 100 days of the administration." However, he warned, "the bill cannot rely on what he called 'gimmicks' or tax breaks." He said "any infrastructure bill must be paid for through substantial and direct federal funding." He said, "The bill needs to be stronger and bolder than ever before. Simple tax credits will not work." He also said that the so-called public-private partnership that

Trump's infrastructure plan and other incentives to build projects that would be privately owned, would not function. He said that he had personally told Trump in a private meeting, that such a plan would lead to investment only in the most profitable projects – people who are just trying to make a buck; and could lead to significantly higher tolls on privately owned roads and bridges. Instead, Schumer said, "The \$1 trillion could flow into the U.S. Treasury to be used for rebuilding the nation's infrastructure." So, this is a direct Federal financing, not a scheme, not a gimmick, not tax breaks, not PPPs [public-private partnerships]. That is a significant development.

I do not think it is a coincidence that that interview comes directly in the wake of a two-week mobilization by LaRouche PAC activists on Capitol Hill to force the issue of Hamiltonian national banking, direct Federal credit. I know that there were countless meetings from activists; there were several dozen meetings that Paul Gallagher personally had with staffers and Congress people on Capitol Hill to discuss the details of what Hamiltonian economics and Hamiltonian national banking actually means. If you haven't seen it yet, I would highly recommend going back and listening to the recorded Fireside Chat that Paul Gallagher did last night; that was on this question of what Hamiltonian national banking really means.

So this is significant; but, indeed, we have to have the

view that {we} are setting the agenda. This nation and the leadership of the country need a very intensive course in what Hamiltonian economics really means.

ROGERS: Yes, and I think that the title of our publication which we are continuing to get out *en masse*, *The Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance* is absolutely imperative to be understood as just that. We're not just talking about developing infrastructure or increasing manufacturing; because that's not what Hamilton understood in the increasing of the productivity of society. It was starting with advancing the creative powers of mankind; and Lyndon LaRouche has taken that to a very high level and conception, as you said. His work over the past 40-50 years looking at this conception of leaps in productivity of society based on this conception of the potential for mankind to advance in ways that had not been thought of before; to advance in ways where the creative leaps in mankind take the development scientifically and technologically to higher and higher states. Mr. LaRouche's understanding of this and Krafft Ehrlicke's were very synonymous; they worked hand-in-hand together. The German space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – the rejection of his ideas by the "limits to growth" imperialist budget-cutters, who didn't want to see mankind advance in this way, was as direct as the opposition to Lyndon LaRouche. If Mr. LaRouche's policies had been put through – along with Krafft Ehrlicke's – on the development of LaRouche's perspective in the '80s for a vibrant space program, setting the agenda of the space program to heights that had not been thought of up until that

point, and continuing what John F Kennedy had laid out as a national mission for advancing not just in the moment for space development; but looking far into the future. It's interesting to go back and look at what the vision was at that time, and how far we have been set back because we've had people who decided that it's not the place of human beings to develop.

Krafft Ehrlicke, as Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche have continued to say, represented a quality of genius. It wasn't just that he understood aeronautics and was one of the best in terms of field of technology. He was a real philosopher; his conception of space development started from the standpoint of the development of mankind as a whole. That we on this planet, have a responsibility for the development of each and every human being on the planet; but the way we're going to achieve is – as he said on many occasions – that you have to leave the confines of one small planet. The idea that there are only limited resources here for a limited number of people is not true. There's a very beautiful conception of that drawn out by Krafft Ehrlicke in a very short writing that he wrote called "The Extra-Terrestrial Imperative; Growth and Life"; that's the model that he worked on. I just want to read something quickly from that, because I think it's very indicative of what we're talking about here. People have to get these ideas in a very advanced understanding of it when we're going into Congress right now. It's not just about getting them to pass a piece of legislation. It has to be,



and

we're seeing, a total shift in the thinking of the population. He says:

"There was a time when the human mind was slow to accept growing evidence that Earth is not a flat center of the universe.

Now the concept of a closed, isolated world must be overcome. Viewing our Earth from space should make it obvious that the world into which we now can grow is no longer closed. By ignoring this new reality, current predictive world dynamic models fail. Adhering to an obsolete, closed worldview, they despair of the future growth prospects. The extra-terrestrial imperative enjoins us to grow and live through open world development which contains all the futures the human mind can hold."

So, that's what we're talking about. How far can the human mind advance? How far can the human mind see into the future? That's what we're talking about right now, and we have a potential to really bring that perspective into focus if we have a revolutionary change in the way we think about society, and we think about the responsibility of the growth in society which we have to now bring on, because it's long overdue. LaRouche's solutions really put forth exactly how we bring that into being.

OGDEN: This the moment of opportunity. If you look at, as Diane covered in the beginning of our discussion, this wave of unexpected and completely dramatic electoral results and otherwise; from Brexit to the Presidential election. We've got the Italian referendum coming up this weekend; we could see

some  
very dramatic results out of there. Hollande has now declared  
that he will not be running for President of France. This is  
a  
very dramatic and uncharted period; and the potential is  
there,  
the doors are wide open. I think we have repeatedly gone back  
to  
this point, but I think we should return to it again. It  
should  
have been seen that this was not business as usual at the  
point  
that the entirety of the United States Senate and a vast  
majority  
of the U.S. House – not along party lines – rejected Obama's  
treasonous veto of the JASTA bill. That was in no small part  
the  
result of the activation and the leadership of the LaRouche  
Political Action Committee in the United States. I think we  
who  
are on this discussion right now, can say that we know  
directly  
that the role that LaRouche PAC played was central and primary  
in  
leading that fight for years. Direct collaboration with the  
9/11  
Families; direct collaboration with the members of the U.S.  
House  
and Senate in forcing this through. That was not something  
that  
Obama – despite all of his bluster – and the Saudi government  
– despite all of their millions of dollars; they just could  
not  
handle that. That was something that overcame everything that  
they tried to throw up against it.

Now you have a pathetic effort by McCain and by  
Lindsey

Graham to try and gut the JASTA bill in the last days of the lame duck session; but this is not going anywhere. There was a very good statement put out by Terry Strada and the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, where they said in their press release, "We wish to state our firm opposition to the proposed legislative language offered by U.S. Senators Lindsey Graham and John McCain that would effectively gut the JASTA bill; which was overwhelmingly passed by Congress in September." Later they say, "Notably, Graham's and McCain's efforts come in the wake of a massive lobbying campaign by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which is now employing roughly a dozen lobbying firms at a cost of more than \$1.3 million per month." And then Terry Strada herself is quoted saying "In April of this year, Senator Graham met with 9/11 family members and told them that he supported our cause 100%. Senator Graham is now stabbing the 9/11 Families in the back. He and Senator McCain are seeking to torpedo JASTA by imposing changes demanded by Saudi Arabia's lobbyists. We have reviewed the language, and it is an absolute betrayal." She says, "We, the 9/11 Families, are fortunate to have Senators John Cornyn and Chuck Schumer to block this action in the Senate." I can tell you that Senator Schumer told me personally on Wednesday night that this effort is going nowhere; this thing is not going to fly. So, they are holding the line very firmly. But really, they have no choice; because this victory on the JASTA bill and then everything that has come since then, including this Presidential election, was a statement

that

this is not business as usual among the American people anymore.

There is a mood of revolt among the American people.

I just want to read one very short excerpt from an article

in *The Hill* which I think excellently gets to that very point and I think is more generally applicable. The article was titled, "Note to Allies: Don't Underestimate Overwhelming Popular

Support for JASTA." The author, Alexander Nicholson, says in this article, "[O]n this particular issue..., no amount of money or insider Washington connections will be able to overturn the overwhelming will of the American people. Indeed," he says,

"the

highly unexpected but highly populist-inspired election of Donald

Trump to the White House should serve as an indicator that no amount of inside-the-beltway inside baseball can achieve results

when it comes to certain issues at certain times. And this, too,

is one of those issues and times." And then he concludes the article, "The current arguments are as ineffective as the synthetic inside-the-beltway strategy it has thus far employed.

But the new era of empowerment of the American electorate is not

to be underestimated." So, I think that is absolutely the case;

and people should take heart to that. This is, indeed, a new political era for the United States; it's the "empowerment of the

American electorate."

Now's the time to take that empowerment and just keep the

momentum going; but it has to be from the standpoint of

educating  
ourselves, as Kesha said, on the principles of Alexander  
Hamilton  
and the principles of the science of physical economy, and  
saying, "We now are committing ourselves to what the Chinese  
have  
called 'the inalienable right to development'; and we will not  
let go of our demand for that inalienable right."

SARE: Just on that, I think on the one hand it's sort  
of  
obvious; although I guess it shouldn't be, because we've  
tolerated such criminality for the last 16 years since 9/11  
occurred. Droning people, torture, and so on. The NSA spying  
on  
every detail of everything of everyone. But there's a certain  
limit where people just said, "No, we're not intimidated." We  
saw that particularly strongly in Manhattan among first  
responders and others who died, who are still dying as  
after-effects, or who had loved ones who died, or colleagues  
who  
died. There's a certain sort of sacred commitment that "We  
are  
not going back on this," and they're not afraid. The  
challenge  
now again is to raise the standard; in other words, can we  
fight  
with the same fearless passion for those things that are  
necessary for mankind to progress? Could we get a situation  
where the population just says, "Absolutely not! We're not  
shutting down our nuclear power plants. Are you crazy? This  
is  
unacceptable. You're saying we're not going to go back to the  
Moon and build the means to get onto Mars from the Moon? This  
is  
crazy!" Where no one even gives it a second thought that it's  
so

obvious. I think that is where the two areas which Einstein excelled in both: the music – his violin as a certain source of inspiration and thought; and the science come together. When one is conscious of what it means to be truly human and creative, then anything on a lower standard than that, is the same kind of affront as the Saudi Foreign Minister traipsing through the halls of Congress in his robes lined with money. You just say, "Oh, this is beneath us." We saw that effect here when the Schiller Institute Community Chorus participated in this series of performances of the Mozart *Requiem*; and there's more music coming up – again sponsored by the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture – on December 17th in Brooklyn. A unity concert with the conception of, what does it mean: to be human? Because human beings are not animals, no matter how many environmentalist barbarians want to try and impose that on us. When you've located your identity in a realm which is truly beautiful, then a lot of these things that seem so difficult now – like the difficulty of these politicians standing up to Wall Street on Glass-Steagall. Why are they afraid? Why do they find that difficult? Because their own identities are right now on too low of a level; but if they began to look at the world from a higher standpoint – which is I'm convinced where people like this woman from China, the Vice Foreign Minister Fu Ying – you just get a sense among some of these people that where they're coming from is a much higher level and that such a thing would be beneath them. I imagine this was the effect of someone like

President Abraham Lincoln, who was described when he was seen visiting the soldiers; because his identity was placed in a different location in a higher realm. Therefore, it wasn't just that he was fighting against fear; there wasn't fear because there was such a firm commitment to what is right.

So, I think the next phase in this process is to have a similar, almost ease; a soaring quality of mankind, even in the United States, to get ourselves into the realm where we actually should be living.

ROGERS: Diane, you keep getting them to sing; bringing more inspiration and optimism. So, we can get more singing and get more space development, then we can really succeed.

OGDEN: President Modi of India called it a mass movement for development; and I know Helga LaRouche has echoed that call repeatedly since he said that. And we really do see a mass movement for development among some of these Eurasian countries especially, but also with them reaching out to African and South and Central American countries, you have a majority of the world's population now getting in on this mass movement for development. But that's what we need demanded from the American people right now; and I think we can turn this new era of empowerment of the American electorate into a mass movement for development. But we have to do it from the standpoint of a Hamiltonian renaissance in the United States. We have the

materials for that, as we've said before. The new book, *Hamilton's Vision* is available on Amazon; and people can read those four reports that he wrote to the United States Congress as Treasury Security. We also have the Four Laws from Mr. LaRouche which are available on the LaRouche PAC website, and the related pamphlet, "The United States Joins the New Silk Road."

So, I implore people to become as active as you can. If you haven't yet become an activist with the LaRouche PAC, now is the time to take that step. Support us in every way you can, and make yourself into a world historical individual by acting on this current, very brief window of opportunity for mankind. You can sign up on the LaRouche PAC website; you can subscribe to our YouTube channel; you can become an activist through the LaRouche PAC Action Center; and you can share this video as widely as you possibly can. Let's make this a mass movement for development!

Thank you very much for joining us here today. Thank you to both Kesha and to Diane. And please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com).

---



# At komme op af kviksandet

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 1. december, 2016* – Kinas Xi Jinping og Ruslands Vladimir Putin fortsætter med at komme med tilbud efter tilbud til USA – og andre nationer, der stadig sidder fast i det transatlantiske systems dødbringende kviksand – om at gå med i opbygningen af det nye, globale paradigme, der er i færd med at erstatte geopolitiske krige og fascistiske nulsumsspil-økonomier, med den Nye Silkevejspolitikks win-win-resultater.

Den kinesiske regering har netop udgivet en hvidbog, »Retten til udvikling: Kinas filosofi, praksis og bidrag«, som dokumenterer det forbløffende fremskridt, Kina har præsteret i løbet af de seneste årtier inden for områderne fattigdomsreduktion, levetid, uddannelse og så videre, og dernæst fortsætter med at forklare, at deres Bælt-og-Vej-initiativ har til formål at hjælpe andre nationer med at opnå lignende resultater. Retten til udvikling, proklamerer hvidbogen, er hele menneskehedens *umistelige rettighed*.

Den russiske præsident Putin gentog i sin »Tale til nationen« for den russiske Duma, det føderale parlament, at han var indstillet på at samarbejde med den tiltrædende Trump-administration i USA for at »sikre international stabilitet og sikkerhed«. Putin gjorde det ligeledes til fulde klart, at Ruslands fremtid ligger i at nære kreativitet, videnskab og evnen til at løse problemer hos den unge generation: »Vore skoler må fremme kreativitet ... Vore børn vil klart se, at Rusland har brug for deres ideer og viden.«

Dette er præcis den form for tankegang, som engang dominerede Franklin Roosevelts, og endda John Kennedys, USA, men det er blevet næsten uforståeligt for de fleste amerikanere i dag, i et USA, der er blevet transformeret af de seneste 16 års mareridt med Bush og Obama.

Og dog, så er genopvækkelsen af denne ånd selve nøglen til en strategisk sejr imod det døende, Britiske Imperium. For at opnå dette kræver det, at vi lever op til udfordringen med at få den amerikanske befolkning, og dens repræsentanter i Washington, til at tænke på det højere niveau, som er det sande potentiale, der er fremlagt for os, og ikke på niveauet for de kontrollerede 'trivielle selskabslege', som karakteriserer politikken i Washington og i lokale anliggender.

I en diskussion tidligere på dagen med medlemmer af LPAC's Politiske Komite og Videnskabsteam, samt Helga Zepp-LaRouche, understregede Lyndon LaRouche den afgørende rolle, som et fornyet rumprogram spiller for atter at tænde gnisten for optimisme og inspiration omkring spørgsmålet om, hvad menneskets formål i universet er. Den store, tyske rumforsker Krafft Ehrlicke er en vigtig prøvesten i denne bestræbelse, sagde LaRouche, for kampen for at bringe fremskridt inden for videnskab, kultur og økonomi tilbage, som en forenet, indbyrdes forbundet præstation.

»Hele formålet er at forstå, hvad fremtiden bringer, eller *kan* bringe, og fastholde udviklingen på denne basis«, sagde LaRouche. »Det er ligesom hele tiden at holde trit; hele tiden forsøge at gøre noget, der er vigtigere, at opnå det, og dernæst nyde det ... Der må være et element af overraskelse, et element af denne form for udtryk. Det er det, der får det til at virke. Det er ikke noget tomt; det er noget, man skal *få til* at virke.«


LaRouche fortsatte: »Vi lever i vort intellekt. Hvis vi kan tænke kvalificeret, så opererer vi i rummet. Vi bør håbe, at vi vil frigøre os og således bringe menneskeheden til et nyt niveau af præstationer.«

*Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping mødes med Ruslands præsident Putin, Chiles præsident Bachelet, Indiens præsident Modi og Kasahkstans præsident Nazarbayev i sine bestræbelser*

*på at rekruttere nationer til den Nye Silkevejs økonomiske politik.*

---

# **Skiftet til det nye paradigme er virkeligheden – Propaganda for lokale interesser er farligt**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 30. november, 2016* – I denne uge kom  delegationer fra Manhattan og flere stater i det østlige USA til Washington, D.C., for personligt at inddrage kongresmedlemmer i nødvendigheden af at tage skridt til at genindføre Glass-Steagall og gennemføre **LaRouches »Fire Love«**, for at håndtere den aktuelle, strategiske krise. Dette politiske initiativ – sammen med pres på kongressen over hele landet – kommer på et tidspunkt med nonstop mediefiksering på nyvalgte præsident Donald Trumps seneste og eventuelle udnævnelser til regeringsposter. 'Hvem er de?... Hvor dårlige er de?', osv. Mediernes spærreild, og selv selve udnævnelserne, tjener til at forvirre og demobilisere enhver, der lytter.

Det er vigtigt at modstå alle sådanne, »bottom-up« karakteriseringer, der fremhæver lokale interesser, af det, der foregår. Der er intet lokalt her: »Trump«-valgoverraskelser finder sted i hele verden, og flere vil finde sted i de kommende uger. Vælgere over hele verden afviser nu hele »globaliseringsæraen« til fordel for et nyt paradigme, der fortsat er under udformning. *EIR's* stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, understregede dagen efter præsidentvalgene, at valget af Trump ikke var en »lokal«

begivenhed. Afvisningen af Hillary Clinton gik længere end til et spørgsmål om selve personen; den var en del af et globalt, dynamisk skifte. LaRouche manede i dag til forsigtighed: »Det er farligt at gøre det muligt for dette [forvirringen som følge af lokalt fokus] at opstå. Man må frigøre sig fra det. Det ødelægger ens evne til at tænke og løse problemer.«

Undgå derfor vrede over enkeltpersoner; tænk på det mulige.

Dette er virkeligheden. Der er en dynamik i gang på internationalt plan, for et nyt paradigme for hele menneskeheden, og som er legemliggjort i den eurasiske Nye Silkevej. Præsident Vladimir Putin og præsident Xi Jinping leverer et stærkt lederskab for vejen frem, en vej, som i årtier er blevet fremlagt af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

I dag holdt Putin en tale i Moskva fra dette udsigtspunkt. Han talte om den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union, »der sammenkobles med Kinas projekt for det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, som vil gøre det muligt for os at bygge et eurasisk partnerskab«. Han talte i anledning af det andet, årlige »Primakov Readings International Forum« i Moskva, for at mindes eftermælet af Jevgenij Primakovs lederskab. Putin sagde: »Hr. Primakov var ligeledes af den mening, at det ville være meget vanskeligt at håndtere nutidens store udfordringer på tilfredsstillende vis uden et seriøst partnerskab mellem Rusland og USA. Ulykkeligvis er de russisk-amerikanske relationer blevet meget forværret i løbet af de seneste år, men dette er ikke vores skyld. Nu, hvor valgkampen er ovre i USA, og en ny præsident snart vil indtage Det Hvide Hus, håber vi, at dette vil skabe en mulighed for at forbedre disse relationer, der er så vigtige, ikke alene for vore to folkeslag, men også for at sikre international stabilitet og sikkerhed ... «

Ideen om nye relationer runger over hele Latinamerika, efter Xis seks dages rundrejse i forbindelse med APEC-topmødet tidligere på måneden. Den mexicanske seniordiplomat Sergio Ley har krævet, at Mexico nu »diversificerer« sine relationer

inden for udenrigshandel og ikke længere har 80 % af sin handel, der finder sted med USA. Han sagde, at der nu finder »en ekstraordinær dialog på højeste niveau« sted mellem Mexico og Kina.

I opposition til dette aktive, nye paradigme for internationale, gensidigt gavnlige relationer, kommer de sidste, fortvivlede bestræbelser fra geopolitikkens afdankede repræsentanter, på at forårsage mere skade og død. Især Frankrig, Storbritannien og Obama-administrationen mobiliserer imod Rusland over Syrien. I dag meddelte Frankrig, at det vil være vært for et møde den 10. december, som vil omfatte ledere fra UK, USA, Tyskland, Italien, Saudi-Arabien og andre, om, hvordan man skal modsætte sig »den totale krigs tankegang«, som de hævder, Rusland og Syrien forfølger.

Virkeligheden er den, at den syriske regering i Aleppo med held driver terroristerne tilbage; og Rusland er i færd med at mobilisere støtte og nødhjælpsforsyninger – inklusive felthospitaler – til de tusinder af mennesker, der nu er befriet og nødlidende.

*Foto: Udsigt over Capitol fra toppen af Washington-monumentet.*

---

## **Ligesom Knud den Store kan oligarkerne heller ikke standse tidevandet**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 29. november, 2016* – De revolutionære forandringer, der fejer hen over de vestlige nationer, fremprovokerer hysteri blandt de afdankede, miskrediterede nationale ledere i Europa og USA. Brexit, valgnederlaget for

Obamas og Hillarys plan for krig med Rusland og Kina, Filippinernes oprør mod Obama, og den ene europæiske nation efter den anden, der afviser de anti-russiske sanktioner og dæmoniseringen af Putin – disse ting og mere endnu repræsenterer en erkendelse i hele Vesten af, at deres lederskab har været kontrolleret af finansoligarker og krigsgale neokonservative, som ikke længere kan tolereres. Imperiet er i færd med at smuldre – men 'the Lords' vil gå til yderligheder, selv til atomkrig, for at redde Imperiet, med mindre de erstattes, før det kommer dertil.

Det kommer ikke som nogen overraskelse, at briterne rejser sig til forsvar for Imperiet på den mest åbenlyse og frastødende facon. Tony Blair har, efter at Englands egen Chilcot-undersøgelse har afsløret hans ulovlige aggressionskrig i Irak, baseret på løgne, meddelt, at han vender tilbage til politik for at redde sin døende race. En amerikansk officer, der skriver på oberst Pat Langs Sic Semper Tyrannus-blog, indfanger måske ironien bedst: »Jeg bemærker også, at, i UK har Tony Blair lettet på sit kistelåg og hjemsøger atter Londons gader med den hensigt at omstøde Brexit. Ser vi et mønster her? Internationale eliter, der ikke er tilfredse med bønder på begge sider af Atlanten, der gør oprør?«

På onsdag vil det britiske parlament debattere Tony Blairs forbrydelser, en debat, som har gjort Blair-tilhængere i Labour-partiet hektiske over den yderligere afsløring af deres medskyldighed i ødelæggelsen af Sydvestasien og Europa.

Ligeledes fra UK ser tidligere, konservative regeringsminister Ken Clark hen til den ynkværdige Angela Merkel som det sidste 'store hvide håb' for Det britiske Imperium: Merkel er, skriver han, nu, da USA er blevet »tabt« til Trump, »den eneste politiker, for hvem det lykkes at holde traditionen med vestligt, liberalt demokrati i live«. Hvis det, der er sket med Vesten, skal være »vestligt, liberalt demokrati«, så er folk tydeligvis parat til at dumpe det.

Dette hysteri går så langt som til den uddøende races respons på det nederlag for terrorisme, der finder sted i Aleppo. I takt med, at Rusland og Syrien tilsammen demonstrerer, at terrorisme rent faktisk kan besejres og befolkningen befries fra barbari, reagerer de vestlige medier med rædsel og insisterer på, at Rusland og Syrien er problemet, og ikke terroristerne. Frankrig har, under det til undergang dømte Hollande-regime, endda indkaldt til et hastemøde i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, for at fordømme Syrien.

Men tidevandet kan ikke standses. Bag bølgen af fornuftig tankegang i Vesten ligger der en voksende erkendelse af, at Rusland og Kina har indført et nyt paradigme, baseret på win-win-samarbejde omkring den fysiske udvikling af nationer og områder i hele verden. På alle kontinenter afholdes der konferencer om den Nye Silkevej, som Xi Jinping har igangsat, og som analyserer den eksisterende og potentielle infrastrukturudvikling, der forbinder nationer gennem fælles fremskridt og gennem at udveksle og være fælles om de bedste og mest kreative traditioner i deres respektive kulturer.

LaRouche-organisationen har initieret og ført kampagne for disse ideer i et halvt århundrede. Nogle mennesker godtager det pessimistiske og løgagtige synspunkt, at en relativt lille organisation ikke kan have været ansvarlig for sådanne globale forandringer – men disse mennesker forstår ikke den kraft til at ændre historiens gang, som ideer er i besiddelse af, og som er langt større end »forbindelser« til folk ved magten.[1] Sandheden afsløres gennem historiens lange buer, og verden oplever nu den tordnende lyd fra en historisk tidevandsbølge. Hvilken retning, den efterfølgende opvågning vil tage, afhænger af kraften i kreativiteten og den klassiske kultur, som verdens befolkning, og især USA's befolkning, vedtager.

Som Friedrich Schiller, frihedens digter, skrev: »Menneskeværdet er i dine hænder lagt; dets vogter vær. Med dig det synker, med dig det løftes.«

»Knud irettesætter sine hoffolk ved bølgerne«, af Alphonse-Marie-Adolphe de Neuville.

---

[1] »Lad alle mænd vide, hvor tom og værdiløs kongers magt er. For der er ingen anden, der er navnet værdigt, end Gud, som himmel, jord og hav adlyder.«

Således skal ifølge legenden Knud den Store have sagt, da han, for at modbevise sine smigrende hofmænds udtalelse om, at han var »så mægtig, at han kunne befale havets bølger at trække sig tilbage«, fik sin trone båret ud til havets kyst og siddende på den befalede bølgerne at trække sig tilbage, da tidevandet kom ind. Hvad de naturligvis ikke gjorde.

---

## **Det franske valg ødelægger yderligere briternes og Obamas krigspolitik**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 28. november, 2016* – François Fillons overvældende valgsejr i søndagens franske primærvalg, til at være præsidentkandidat for Frankrigs Republikanske Parti, er et yderligere bevis på, at den menneskelige race ikke vil tolerere Barack Obamas fremstød for krig med Rusland. Ligesom Hillary Clinton førte Fillons modstander en kampagne mod Rusland, mens Fillon førte en kampagne for at arbejde sammen med Rusland om at nedkæmpe terroristerne i Syrien, om at afslutte de anti-russiske sanktioner og udvide det økonomiske samarbejde, og han vandt næsten to tredjedele af stemmerne.

Hillary Clinton, der kørte sin kampagne som en fortsættelse af



Obamas krigshyl mod Rusland, forsøger nu desperat at give Putin skylden for sit nederlag! Det vanvittige i hendes påstand om, at Putin brugte at udsende »falske nyheder« og bedrive computerhacking for at stjæle det amerikanske valg, og som nu skaber overskrifter over hele USA, siger intet om Putin, men alt om tilstanden af mentalt sammenbrud hos krigspartiet i USA – de neokonservative i både det Republikanske og Demokratiske Parti, der samledes bag Hillary og blev slået af vælgerne, især af arbejdsstyrken på landet og i byerne.

I realiteten bidrog Putin faktisk til Obama/Hillary-krigspartiets nederlag, men ikke hemmeligt eller under dække. Hans vedvarende krav om, at USA holder op med at sponsorere terrorister under dække af at bevæbne den »moderate opposition« i Syrien med henblik på at vælte den legitime regering, og hans opfordring til samarbejde om krigen mod terror, var med til at afsløre Obama og Hillary for det, de er.

På lignende vis blev Xi Jinpings gentagne opfordringer til USA om at tilslutte sig den Nye Silkevejsproces med global nationsopbygning afvist af både Obama og Hillary til fordel for militær konfrontation med Kina og afslørede således deres imperiesyn over for en befolkning, der i stigende grad beundrer den utrolige udviklingsproces, som Kina har igangsat, både internt i landet og internationalt.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der tidligere har stillet op til kanslerposten i Tyskland, sagde i dag, at, på trods af Fillons økonomiske politik i Thatcher-traditionen, så demonstrerer valget af ham den voksende afsky i Europa for det anti-russiske hysteri og faren for krig. Trumps åbne erklæring om, at han vil arbejde med Putin for at besejre terrorisme, fik taberen Obama til i denne måned at forsøge at salve Tysklands Angela Merkel til sin efterfølger, som »leder for den frie verden« i en kampagne imod Rusland. Men Merkel er nu lige så isoleret, som Obama var – ligesom Olympens falske guder, der

udråber deres krav over verden, mens Olympens bjerg smuldrer under deres fødder.

Samme dag som det franske valg vandt schweizerne en solid sejr i en folkeafstemning, der var lanceret af den 'grønne' bevægelse mod kernekraft, for at lukke nationens kernekraftværker ned. Igen er budskabet til verden det, at den »nye, mørke tidsalders« mentalitet med afindustrialisering og permanente krige, ikke længere kan tolereres af menneskeslægten. Det er især et budskab til Merkel, der er imod kernekraft, om, at hendes tid er forbi.

Den vestlige verden oplever for tiden en revolutionær transformation. LaRouche-bevægelsen har i årevis tvunget befolkningen i USA og Europa, ofte imod dens vilje, til at se på det nye paradigmes nye lederskab, som kommer fra Rusland og Kina, og til at sammenligne det med den politik, der dikteres af London og Wall Street, og som økonomisk og kulturelt har ødelagt de transatlantiske nationer. Denne sandhed kan ikke længere undertrykkes. Lyndon LaRouche sagde i dag til sine medarbejdere: »Vi indtager en ledende position netop nu. Vi er ovenpå. Vi ved, hvad det er, vi gør, så lad os få en sejr.«

*Foto: Daværende franske premierminister, hr. François Fillon, møder IAEA-generaldirektør Yukiya Amano & Chef de Cabinet, hr. Rafael Grossi, 2011. (Foto: IAEA Imagebank CC-SA)*

---

## **Peruvianske økonomers kongres offentliggør konklusion:**

# »Vi deler Helga Zepp-LaRouches perspektiv for global udvikling«

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 25. nov., 2016* – I et dokument, der opsummerer resultaterne af Sammenslutningen af peruvianske økonomers 23. nationalkongres 17.-19. nov., skrev Roberto Vela Tinedo, dekanen for Sammenslutningen af økonomer i Ucayali (der var vært for begivenheden):

»Vi økonomer i Peru, der forsamledes i byen Pucallpa, vil informere den nationale og internationale offentlige mening om vores holdning mht. den nuværende situation i landet og i verden, og erklærer følgende:

1. At efter en analyse af hovedtalen, som dr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche holdt, er vi enige i det perspektiv om global udvikling, som hendes budskab præsenterer, og som kan ses på følgende link: <http://financiardesarrollo.blogspot.pe/2016/11/la-ferrovia-transcontinental-brasil.html> Efter at have understreget dette punkt, fortsatte Vela med sit budskab – der blev sendt til alle 24 regionale økonomsammenslutninger i Peru, med i alt henved 20.000 medlemmer – med at skrive:

6) For at overvinde denne krise, har BRIKS-landene (Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina og Sydafrika), under ledelse af Kina og Rusland, foreslået og initieret byggeriet af en ny, finansiel arkitektur, der har til formål at udvikle nationers fysiske økonomi, i en suveræn relation, hvor alle vinder ('win-win-strategien [original på engelsk]), der knuser det gamle regimes nulsumsspil, under hvilket nogle vinder og andre taber ... Peru må tilslutte sig denne proces for at kunne opnå vækst.

7) Vi må omstrukturere statens økonomiske politik og erstatte

den neoliberale model med en model for udvikling af produktiv transformation med egenkapital ...

8) Vi må anvende videnskab, teknologi og innovation i vores økonomiske udvikling som basis for at være konkurrencedygtige ...

11) Vi må skabe et Ministerium for Strategisk Planlægning, der skal formulere en vision for det land, vi ønsker at være ... og have et nyt Ministerium for Teknologi og Produktion ...

16) Det første, store skridt på vejen til industriel udvikling og promovering af videnskabelige og teknologiske evner, er, at Peru, som et paradigmatiske eksempel på denne nye, suveræne relation, hvor alle vinder ('win-win-strategien'), bør vedtage forslaget fra den Kinesiske Folkerepublik om at bygge en transkontinental jernbaneforbindelse langs den nordlige rute, der ville forbinde havnene Santos i Brasilien og Bayovar i Peru og lægge vægt på udviklingen af hundreder af komplementære projekter, såsom landbrug, agroindustri, varefremstilling, fiskeri, havne, kernekraft, petrokemikalier, videnskabelig og teknologisk innovation, vejinfrastruktur, skabelsen af nye intelligente byer og skabelsen af tusinder af jobs, etc.

Efter fire dages overvejelser har vi aftalt at kræve, at centralregeringen [i Peru] vedtager og promoverer byggeriet af dette storprojekt, i betragtning af, at det i øjeblikket er det eneste, der fokuserer på kontinental integration, og som allerede har et underskrevet Forståelsesmemorandum mellem Kinas, Brasiliens og Perus regeringer.«

*Foto: Helga Zepp-LaRouche under en spørgesession på Schiller Instituttets konference i Essen, Tyskland.*

---

# Ingen tid at spille: Vedtag Glass-Steagall, og tag til Månen


## LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 25. november, 2016


Jason Ross: Diskussionen i aften finder sted to en halv uge efter præsidentvalget i USA den 8. nov. Siden da har vi set en hvirvelvind af spekulationer over udnævnelser til regeringsposter, inkl. nogle udnævnelser til poster i Trump-administrationen. Vi har også set betydningsfulde, internationale nyheder, såsom APEC-topmødet, der fandt sted i sidste weekend; topmødet i Asien-Stillehavsområdets Økonomiske Samarbejde (APEC), der meget betydningsfuldt inkluderede den filippinske præsident Duterte og den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping blandt de mange tilstedeværende ledere. På denne konference understregede Duterte igen, at Filippinerne ikke længere anser sig selv for at være en amerikansk koloni; og landet forfølger en uafhængig politik, rent økonomisk, med Kina, der således er et modtræk til at skabe konflikt i f.eks. det Sydkinesiske Hav. Præsident Xi var på rundrejse i Mellem- og Sydamerika samtidig med, at han rejste til APEC-topmødet. Så ved siden af Peru – som var værtsland for topmødet – besøgte han også Chile og Ecuador, hvor han blandt andet talte om den bi-oceaniske korridor, en plan for en jernbaneforbindelse mellem Sydamerikas to omkringliggende have, Stillehavet og Atlanterhavet, og om at etablere videnskabsbyer. Han blev hyldet af præsident Correa i Ecuador, der betragtede Xi Jinpings besøg som den mest betydningsfulde begivenhed, der nogen sinde havde fundet sted i Ecuadors historie, baseret på det potentiale, som dette tilbød denne

nation.

Dette Nye Paradigme, der i øjeblikket ledes politisk og økonomisk af Rusland og Kina, kommer som et resultat af LaRouche-bevægelsens og Lyndon og Helga LaRouches årtier lange organisering; der er således nu et Nyt Paradigme, der fører en stadig større del af verden i en meget positiv retning. Vores job i øjeblikket er ikke at få de hotteste nyheder om, hvad Trumps udnævnelser bliver, osv. Det er at forme amerikanske politik, som vi med held gjorde det med at gennemtvinge en underkendelse af Obamas veto af Loven om Juridisk Retfærdighed mod Sponsorer af Terrorisme (JASTA). Og som vi nu står klar til at gøre, med at få Kongressen – under denne overgangsperiode, 'lamme and'-perioden – til at gennemføre Glass-Steagall, det nødvendige første skridt for en økonomisk genrejsning. Glass-Steagall er den lov, som Franklin Roosevelt fik vedtaget, og som skabte 60+ år med stabil, kedelig, stabil, produktiv bankvirksomhed i USA; snarere end den form for spillevirksomhed, vi nu ser.

Lad med vise dette kort [Fig. 1] for blot at vise lidt at den succes, som vi har set med det kinesiske program.

Programmet med nationerne i Ét bælte, én vej [OBOR], der  inkluderer både – der er to komponenter i Kinas projekt i denne henseende; det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, med nationerne vist i blå farve, og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej i orange farve. Tilsammen refererer Kina til dette på kinesisk som initiativet med »Ét bælte, én vej«; på engelsk ofte blot kaldt initiativet for Bæltet og Vejen. Med hensyn til det potentiale, som dette har, er her blot nogle af tallene: 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer i Kina, alle bygget inden for det seneste årti – mere end i resten af verden tilsammen; et titals milliarder af dollars i direkte investering i nationerne i området; en forøgelse af kontrakter om tjenesteydelser på over 33 % i løbet af blot ét år langs Bæltet og Vejen; Kinas Eksport/Importbank har udestående engagementer i flere end 1000 projekter og har for ganske

nylig underskrevet aftaler om omkring 500 nye projekter i nationerne langs Bæltet og Vejen. Kina er i færd med at  udbygge 150.000 stipendier, som tilbyder uddannelse til 500.000 eksperter til uddannelse i Kina; har etableret 500 Konfucius-institutter i hele verden; har initieret flere end et dusin økonomiske samarbejdszoner; frihandelsaftaler, og er i øjeblikket engageret i flere end 40 energiprojekter – inklusive omkring 20, der lige er blevet etableret i år i Bæltet og Vejens nationer.

Hvordan kan vi så blive en del af dette? I magasinet *Chronicles* udgave fra 21. nov. er der et forslag fra Edward Lozansky og Jim Jatrus. Lozansky er præsident for det Amerikanske Universitet i Moskva. De skrev en artikel med titlen, »The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for

Security, Prosperity, and Peace« (De tre store: Amerika, Rusland og Kina må gå sammen om sikkerhed, velstand og fred). To uddrag: De indleder deres artikel, »Med Donald Trumps sejr over Hillary Clinton får vi måske aldrig at vide, hvor tæt Amerika og hele menneskeheden kom på atomkrig«. Med en beskrivelse af verdenssituationen afslutter de med et forslag: »Præsident Donald Trump kan rette tidligere amerikanske præsidenters fejl. Snarere end modstandere kan Rusland og Kina blive Amerikas vigtigste partnere, og som er, er vi overbevist om, rede til at respondere positivt. Tiden er inde for Trump og Amerika til at tage initiativet til samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland og Kina hen imod en tryk, fremgangsrig og fredelig fremtid. Et Trump-Putin-Xi 'Store Tre-topmøde' bør være en prioritet for den nye, amerikanske præsidents første 100 dage.«

Jeg vil nu bede Jeff Steinberg om at fylde verdensbilledet ud og forklare vore seere, hvilke flanker, hvilke håndtag, hvilke vægtstænger vi har for at ændre USA's politik på dette tidspunkt?

**Jeffrey Steinberg (efterretningsredaktør, EIR):** Det er

indledningsvist meget vigtigt at indse, at vi befinder os i en periode med forandring. Vi ved visse ting om konsekvenserne af det amerikanske præsidentvalg og andre nationale valg den 8. nov. Jeg mener, at Lozansky og Jatrus gjorde en fundamental pointe meget klart: Der forelå en meget alvorlig fare, baseret på Hillary Clintons kampagneretorik, baseret på politikker, der blev stadigt mere aggressivt forfulgt af præsident Barack Obama mod slutningen af hans otte år i embedet; at vi havde kurs mod den værste krise mellem USA og Rusland, som vi nogen sinde har oplevet – måske endda værre end Cubakrisen i 1962. Så Hillary Clintons nederlag er virkelig afslutningen af præsidentskaberne Bush' og Obamas 16 år lange tyranni. Hvor hurtigt, vi kan vende politikken omkring under det nye Trump-præsidentskab, og i hvilken retning, udnævnelserne til hans administration vil gå, er alt sammen ukendte faktorer; vi har ingen vished om dem.

Det, vi ved, er, at især i kølvandet på APEC-topmødet, der netop er afsluttet i sidste uge i Lima, Peru, og som dernæst efterfulgtes af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings statsbesøg til Peru og dernæst til Chile, og forud for topmødet var han i Ecuador; og vi ved, at der er en enorm mulighed derude for USA, under et Trump-præsidentskab, for netop at gå med i det, der altid har ligget på bordet som en åben invitation til USA; nemlig, at USA kan tilslutte sig projektet om Verdenslandbroen. For, uden et USA er det meget vanskeligt at opfatte dette som en Verdenslandbro, hvilket er det, verden virkelig har brug for lige nu. Der har været meget indledende telefondiskussioner mellem nyvalgte præsident Trump og den russiske præsident Putin; de synes at være blevet enige om at have et personligt topmøde hurtigt efter tiltrædelsen – som finder sted den 20. januar. Det er ligeledes tanken, at præsident Trump, efter tiltrædelsen, også ret hurtigt skal mødes med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping. Jeg mener, at Lozansky-Jatrus-ideen om et trilateralt møde ville være ekstraordinært værdifuldt. Det er vigtigt at huske på, at, i 1944, var det præsident Franklin Roosevelts kurs i sine



handlinger for at etablere De forenede Nationer – hvilket skete i 1945 – at inkludere både Sovjetunionen og Kina i FN's Sikkerhedsråds fem permanente nationer. Husk på, at Roosevelt forstod, at der var imperiepolitikker, der stadig var kernen i Det britiske Imperium med Churchill, og på lignende måde med Frankrig. Så ideen med at have Rusland – dengang Sovjetunionen – og Kina i dette permanente Sikkerhedsråds kernegruppe, reflekterede den kendsgerning, at Roosevelt dengang så udsigten til denne form for et alliancesystem hen over Eurasien. Jeg mener, at der er en historisk baggrund, for netop denne form for russisk-kinesiske samarbejde, at se hen til her. I de seneste 15 år har det været en hjørnesteen i Lyndon LaRouches globale politik med et USA-Rusland-Kina-Indien-samarbejde, især omkring videnskabelige programmer; især udforskning af rummet, som basis for global fred og udvikling. Så disse ideer er fremlagt.

Den 20. november sagde general Michael Flynn, kort tid efter, at han var blevet udnævnt af nyvalgte præsident Trump som national sikkerhedsrådgiver, i et interview med Fareed Zakhari på CNN, at, efter hans mening, var den eneste måde at håndtere problemerne med den jihadistiske terrortrussel i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika på længere sigt at have et globalt samarbejde omkring en Marshallplan – han brugte udtrykkeligt dette udtryk. Han sagde, hvis man ser på, hvad Europa var i stand til at præstere i kølvandet på Anden Verdenskrigs ødelæggelser, og den rolle, som Marshallplanen spillede; det var ikke det hele, men det var et vigtigt element i den økonomiske genrejsning efter krigen. Et perspektiv af denne art er virkelig den vindende strategi for at håndtere befolkningstilvæksten og spredningen af den saudisksponsorerede jihadisme i hele Mellemøsten/Nordafrika-området. Det går også ind i Sydvestasien.

Der findes altså enorme potentialer; de er i vid udstrækning foreløbigt ikke realiseret med hensyn til den forandring, der kommer med den ny administration. Men, som du sagde, Jason

[Ross], så er der ingen grund til at vente til januar. Den nyvalgte præsident Trump krævede udtrykkeligt, i en tale i Charlotte, North Carolina, en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall. Det er i begge de to store politiske partiers valgplatform for dette års valg; både Demokraterne og Republikanerne har vedtaget det. Det var en Trump-delegeret til GOP [Grand Old Party – det Republikanske Parti] komiteen for politisk strategi, der introducerede Glass-Steagall. Der er senatorerne Elizabeth Warren, og vigtigere endnu, Bernie Sanders, som siger, at de er villige til at række over midtergangen og arbejde sammen med Donald Trump, hvis samarbejdsspørgsmålene inkluderer og virkelig begynder med Glass-Steagall. Så dette er noget, der ikke behøver at vente til januar og tiltrædelsen og den nye Kongres. Der er fremstillet lovforslag for Glass-Steagall i både Repræsentanternes Hus og Senatet. Et af forslagene i Huset har en ordlyd, der er identisk med Senatsforslaget. Som vi så det med vedtagelsen af underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet, hvis lederskabet i Kongressen giver grønt lys, kan Glass-Steagall bringes til debat i begge huse og vedtages inden for få timer. Underkendelsen af JASTA-vetoet tog to timer om morgenen i USA's Senat, og to en halv time eller så om eftermiddagen i Huset. Det opnåede man på en enkelt dag i Kongressen. Så der er ingen som helst grund til, at vi ikke omgående kan gennemføre det – i bogstavelig forstand i næste uge, når Kongressen atter samles efter Thanksgiving-ferien; og den vil sidde i de næste fire uger. Der er intet til hinder for, at vi kan få Glass-Steagall tilbage som landets lov før juleferien, så vi har det på plads til den nye administration; og tiden er rent ud sagt af afgørende betydning. Vi ved ikke, i betragtning af situationen med Deutsche Bank, med Royal Bank of Scotland, med de største, amerikanske for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-banker, der sidder på derivater til \$252 billion. Det er 30 % mere end det var på tidspunktet for krakket i 2008. Det sidder på toppen af et meget tvivlsomt kapitalgrundlag på \$14 billion; i virkeligheden er det sandsynligvis meget mindre end det, for nogle af de værdipapirer, som bliver talt med som

kapitalreserver, er grundlæggende set illikvide og kan ikke – selv i nødstilfælde – gøres likvide.

Så vi kunne altså vågne i morgen, eller mandag morgen, eller midt i næste uge, og finde, at hele det transatlantiske banksystem er nedsmeltet. Så Glass-Steagall er altså et presserende hastespørgsmål; og det forudsætter dernæst de andre hovedelementer i LaRouches Fire Love. Det er et kreditsystem; investering i store infrastrukturprojekter; og en genoplivning af de mest avancerede, videnskabelige programmer, inklusive en storstilet tilbagevenden til rummet og det internationale arbejde for endelig at opnå det fulde gennembrud inden for fusion. Alle disse ting er på bordet, men igen, så er der ingen garantier; intet er blot tilnærmelsesvis sikkert mht., hvad det næste, der vil ske, bliver. Vi kan ånde lidt op, fordi faren for krig med Rusland og Kina er blevet meget reduceret; og der er en masse potentiale. Der er en masse af den form for overgang som fra Jimmy Carter til Ronald Reagan i luften som et potentiale; men intet af det er endnu fuldt ud realiseret. Folk må indse, at dette er et tidspunkt med store muligheder. Det vil blive et krav fra befolkningen under det rette lederskab, der er orienteret mod de rette politikker, der virkelig kan gribe muligheden. Hvis vi venter til januar eller februar næste år, hvem ved så, hvilke slags sabotageoperationer, man vil køre?

Man kan gå ind på Craigs Liste og finde dækgrupper for George Soros, såsom MoveOn.org og blacklivesmatter.org, der tilbyder \$1500 om ugen for, at folk render rundt som idioter og protesterer imod resultatet af valget. Der er en hel del usikkerhed med hensyn til, hvad der foregår, samtidig med, at der er store muligheder. Vi må sikre os, at vi tager lederskabet mht. at gribe øjeblikket.

*Ovenstående er første del af det Internationale Webcast; det engelske udskrift af hele webcastet følger her:*

**MAKE THE MOST OF THE OPENNESS IN POLICY NOW,**

**TO INSURE A NEW PARADIGM FOR THE UNITED STATES  
BEFORE THE INAUGURATION**

**LaRouche PAC International Webcast, Saturday, November 26,  
2016**

JASON ROSS: Hi there! Today is November 25, 2016;  
and  
you're joining us for our regular webcast here from  
larouchepac.com. My name is Jason Ross; I'll be the host  
today.

I'm joined in the studio by Ben Deniston, my colleague here at  
LaRouche PAC; and via video by Jeff Steinberg of *Executive  
Intelligence Review*.

This discussion is taking place 2.5 weeks after the  
November  
8, 2016 Presidential election in the United States. Since  
then,  
we've seen a whirlwind of speculation about Cabinet  
appointments,  
including some Cabinet appointments for the Trump  
administration.  
We've also seen some significant international news, such as  
the  
APEC summit which occurred last weekend; the Asia-Pacific  
Economic Cooperation summit that included very significantly  
new  
Philippines' President Duterte and Chinese Xi Jinping among  
the  
many leaders who were there. At this conference, Duterte  
again  
emphasized that the Philippines no longer considers itself to  
be  
a US colony; and is pursuing an independent policy  
economically  
with China, countering the attempts to create conflict, for  
example, in the South China Sea. President Xi Jinping went on  
a

tour of Latin America while he was at the APEC summit. So in addition to Peru – which hosted the event – he also visited Chile and Ecuador; where he spoke, among other things, about the bioceanic corridor, a plan for a rail link between the Pacific and Atlantic sides of South America; about setting up science cities. He was greeted by President Correa in Ecuador, who considered Xi Jinping's trip the most significant event to occur in Ecuador's history; based on the potential that it offered that nation.

So, this New Paradigm, being led politically and economically at present by Russia and by China, comes as a result of decades of organizing by the LaRouche Movement, by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche; such that there is now a New Paradigm taking an increasingly larger portion of the world in a very positive direction. Our job at present isn't to get the hottest news on what Trump's appointments will be, etc. It is to shape US policy; as we successfully did in forcing an override against Obama's veto of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act. And as we stand poised to do now with getting the Congress – during this lame duck session – to implement Glass-Steagall, the necessary first step for an economic recovery. Glass-Steagall is the law that Franklin Roosevelt had put in place that created 60+ years of stable, boring, stable productive banking in the United States; rather than the kind of gambling that we see now.

Let me pull up this chart [Fig. 1] just to show a bit of

this success that we've seen along the Chinese economic program.

Along the One Belt, One Road nations which includes both the – there's two components to China's project on this; the Silk Road

economic belt, which you see the nations in blue, and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road in orange. Together, China refers to

this in Chinese as the "One Belt, One Road" initiative; in English, often just the Belt and Road initiative. As far as the

potential that this holds, these are just some of the figures: 20,000 km of high-speed rail in China, all built within the last

decade – more than the rest of the world combined; tens of billions of dollars of direct investment into nations of the region; an increase in services contracts of over 33% in just one

year along the One Belt, One Road; the Export/Import Bank of China has outstanding involvement in over 1000 projects, and just

recently has signed up about 500 new projects along the Belt and

Road nations. China is extending 150,000 scholarships offering

training for 500,000 for professionals for training in China; has

set up 500 Confucius institutes around the world, has initiated

over a dozen economic cooperation zones; free trade agreements,

and is engaged currently in over 40 energy projects – including

about 20 that were just set up this year among One Belt, One Road

nations.

So, how can we become a part of this? Well, a

proposal was made in the November 21st issue of {Chronicles} magazine by Edward Lozansky and Jim Jatrus. Lozansky is the President of the American University in Moscow. They wrote an article called, "The Big Three: America, Russia, and China Must Join Hands for Security, Prosperity, and Peace". Two excerpts. They open their article, "With the defeat of Hillary Clinton by Donald Trump, we may never know how close America and all mankind came to nuclear war." In describing the world situation, they end with a proposal: "President Donald Trump can correct the mistakes of past U.S. presidents. Rather than adversaries Russia and China can become America's essential partners and are, we are convinced, ready to respond positively. It's time for Trump and America to take the initiative for U.S.-Russia-China cooperation towards a secure, prosperous, and peaceful future. A Trump-Putin-Xi 'Big Three Summit' should be a priority for the new U.S. President's first 100 days."

So, I'd like to ask Jeff Steinberg to fill out the world picture, and detail for our viewers what are the flanks, what are the handles, the levers that we have for shifting US policy at this time?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. For starters, it's very important to realize that we're in a period of significant flux.

There are certain things that we know about the consequences of the US Presidential elections and other Federal elections on November 8th. And I think Lozansky and Jatrus made one very

fundamental point quite clearly: That there was a very grave danger based on the campaign rhetoric of Hillary Clinton, based on the policies that were pursued even ever more aggressively towards the end of his eight years in office by President Barack Obama; that we were headed for the worst crisis between the United States and Russia that we ever experienced – worse perhaps even than the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. So, the defeat of Hillary Clinton really is the end of the 16-year tyranny of the Bush and Obama Presidencies. How rapidly we can turn the policies around under the new Trump Presidency, where the Cabinet appointments are going to go, these are all unknowns; they're not certain to us.

So, we do know that particularly in the aftermath of the APEC summit meeting that just concluded last week in Lima, Peru, which was then followed by state visits by Chinese President Xi Jinping to Peru and then to Chile afterwards; and prior to the summit, he was in Ecuador. We know that there's a tremendous opportunity out there for the United States, under a Trump Presidency, to precisely join in what has always been on the table as an open invitation to the United States; namely, for the United States to join in the World Land-Bridge project. Because without the United States, it's very difficult to conceive of this as a World Land-Bridge; which is really what the world requires right now. There have been very preliminary phone discussions between President-elect Trump and Russian President Putin; they seem to have reached an agreement that they will have



a face-to-face summit meeting soon after the inauguration – which is January 20th. The idea, similarly, is for President Trump, once he's inaugurated, to also meet quite soon with Chinese President Xi Jinping. I think the Lozansky-Jatrus idea of a trilateral meeting would be extraordinarily valuable. I think it's important to remember that in 1944, the orientation of President Franklin Roosevelt in the move to establish the United Nations – which happened in 1945 – was to include both the Soviet Union and China among the permanent five nations of the UN Security Council. Remember, Roosevelt understood that there were imperial policies that were still at the core of the British Empire with Churchill, and similarly with France. So, the idea of having Russia – the Soviet Union at the time – and China in this permanent Security Council core grouping, reflected the fact that Roosevelt at that time saw the prospect of that kind of an alliance system across Eurasia. So, I think that's there's an historical basis to look to here for exactly this kind of Russia-China cooperation. For the last 15 years, a cornerstone of Lyndon LaRouche's of global policy has been a US-Russia-China-India cooperation, particularly on scientific programs; especially space exploration, as the basis for global peace and development. So, those ideas are out there.

On November 20th, soon after he was named by President-elect Trump to be the National Security Advisor, General Michael Flynn, in an interview with Fareed Zakhari on CNN, said that in his

view, the only way to deal with the long-term problem of the jihadist, terrorist threat in the Middle East and North Africa, was for there to be a global cooperation on a Marshall Plan – he used that term explicitly. He said, if you look at what Europe was able to accomplish in the aftermath of the devastation of World War II, and the role that the Marshall Plan played; it was not the whole thing, but it was an important element of the postwar recovery. That kind of perspective is really the winning strategy for dealing with the population growth and this spread of Saudi-sponsored jihadism throughout the Middle East-North Africa region. It extends into Southeast Asia as well.

So, there are great potentialities; they are largely as yet unrealized in terms of the change coming with the new administration. But I think, Jason, as you correctly said, there is no reason to wait for January. President-elect Trump, in a major campaign speech in Charlotte, North Carolina, explicitly called for reinstating Glass-Steagall. It's in the platforms of both major political parties from this year's elections; the Democrats and the Republicans both adopted it. It was a Trump delegate to the policy committee of the GOP who introduced the Glass-Steagall. You've got Senators Elizabeth Warren, and more importantly, Senator Bernie Sanders, saying that they're prepared to reach across the aisle and work with Donald Trump if the issues for collaboration include and really start with Glass-Steagall. So, this is something that does not have to wait

for January and the inauguration and the new Congress. There are Glass-Steagall bills in both the House and the Senate. One of the House bills has the identical language as the Senate bill. As we saw with the JASTA veto override vote, if the Congressional leadership gives the green lights, then Glass-Steagall can be brought to the floor of both houses and can be debated and voted within a matter of hours. The override of JASTA took two hours in the morning for the US Senate, and two and a half or so hours in the afternoon for the House. It was accomplished in one legislative day. So, there's no reason whatsoever that we can't move immediately – literally next week when Congress is back in session after Thanksgiving; and they're there for three weeks. There's no reason that we should not have Glass-Steagall back as the law of the land before the Christmas recess. So that we hit the ground running with the new administration; and frankly, time is of the essence. We don't know, given the situation with Deutsche Bank, with Royal Bank of Scotland, the largest US too-big-to-fail banks are sitting on \$252 trillion in derivatives. That's 30% more than it was at the time of the 2008 crash. That's on top of a very questionable capital base of \$14 trillion; the reality is that it's probably much less than that, because some of the assets that are allowed to be counted as the capital reserves, are basically illiquid and can't be – even

on

an emergency basis – made liquid.

So, we could wake up tomorrow morning, or Monday morning, or

the middle of next week, and find that the entire trans-Atlantic

banking system has blown out. So, Glass-Steagall is an urgent,

immediate issue; and it then begs the other three key elements of

LaRouche's Four Cardinal Laws. Which is a credit system;

investment in major infrastructure projects; and a revival of the

most advanced scientific programs, including a major return to space and the work internationally to finally achieve the full breakthrough on fusion. All of these things are on the table, but again, there are no guarantees, there's nothing that's even

remotely certain about what's going to come next. We can breathe

a little easier because danger of war with Russia, with China is

greatly reduced; and there's a lot of potentiality. There's a lot of the kind of transition from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan

in the air as a potential; but none of it is fully realized yet.

So, people are going to have to realize this is a moment of great

opportunity. It's going to be an outpouring of the population under the right kind of leadership, directed at the right policies, that can really seize the opportunity. If we wait until January of February of next year, who knows what kind of sabotage operations are going to be run?

You can go on Craig's List and find George Soros front groups, like MoveOn.org and blacklivesmatter.org, offering \$1500

a week for people to run around like idiots, protesting against the outcome of the election. There's a great deal of uncertainty, in terms of what's going on, at the same time that there's great opportunity. We've got to make sure that we take the lead in seizing the moment.

ROSS: Great! Thanks! In terms of the long-term outlook of where we're going to go, what our policy should be, a major aspect of this goes beyond legislation that affects us only here on Earth.

A major component, in fact the fourth component of the Four Laws of Mr. LaRouche, the last one being the fusion driver crash program, is connected with our existence beyond the planet, also out in space. Ben wrote an article that's going to be in the upcoming issue of the *Hamiltonian* about what a U.S. space policy ought to be, and about the really long-term goals that we have to have, and why this is important and essential. So, could you tell us about that, Ben?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Gladly! As viewers are aware, this has been an ongoing subject of discussion. Mr. LaRouche, as Jason is saying, has put a major, major focus on, as a critical part of the needed recovery program and the future of mankind. In this article we tried to elevate people's thinking about space, especially in the context of so many years and administrations and decades of just zero-growth policies.

One thing that's being discussed now, which is interesting and useful, is how much NASA has been hijacked for this global warming crap. A lot of NASA's budget has been redirected to "Earth sciences." Not all Earth sciences are bad. There's a lot of interesting science to learn about the Earth. But Earth sciences is often a front to push this fraud of some man-made global warming crisis. So, there's some discussion about NASA being redirected away from wasting their time on this phony, phony, fake crisis, which is not something we need to be concerned about, and redirecting back to exploration. Surprise, surprise. The Moon has come back now as a central subject of the discussion. Anybody who had any sense would realize that once Obama was out, this crazy asteroid mission [The Asteroid Impact and Deflection Assessment (AIDA) mission] would likely be tossed aside. Anybody who is serious would recognize that the Moon is the next place to get back to.

As Jeff was referencing, there's a lot of discussion, a lot of openness. From our work and discussions with Mr. LaRouche, I think it's critical to really raise the level of discussion to the right basis. We can have exciting missions, we can have inspiring missions, but the question to ask is: are we going to have a program where the investments are going to be the basis for creating a whole new level of activity, that will allow us to do orders of magnitude more than we were able to do prior to that investment? Is this going to create what Mr. LaRouche had once defined as a "physical-economic platform?" Is this going

to

create an entirely new platform of activity, of potential – of infrastructure, of energy-flux density of technologies – which comes together to support a qualitatively new level of potential

activity for mankind?

That is the issue we want to put on the table right now.

This goes directly to the vision of Krafft Ehrlicke, the early space pioneer who worked very closely with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the '80s, who was one of the leading space visionaries, who had outlined in great detail the initial basis

of mankind expanding to really becoming a Solar System species.

I'm going to get back to his work in a minute. Mr. LaRouche's concept of the "platform" is really critical. He introduced this,

I think it was around the year 2010, 2009, something like that.

He was coming up against a real lack of understanding of the significance of what "infrastructure" really means, in its true

scientific sense. Unfortunately, this has become somewhat of a buzzword that a lot of people throw out there. "We need to rebuild our infrastructure" has become a kind of a hot campaign-trail word to use to get some support.

The real understanding of what qualitative revolutions in

infrastructure systems mean for mankind's continual creative progress is not connected to the way most people use that term.

Mr. LaRouche defined the very profound and critical assessment of

looking at the development of human civilization in these stages

of platforms. He said, go back to thousands of years ago, when

the dominant cultures were trans-oceanic maritime cultures.

What

you began to see, with the development of inland waterways, inland river systems – he had put a big point on what Charlemagne was doing during his reign in central Europe in developing these canal systems and river systems – was a qualitative revolution above what had existed prior, with these

trans-oceanic civilizations: the development of these inland waterways. That defined a new platform of activity that supported

a qualitative leap in what civilization was able to accomplish.

The next leap came with the development of rail systems,

railroads, especially trans-continental railroads, typified by what Lincoln had spearheaded with the trans-continental railroad

across America. With these rail systems, with the new technologies of steam engines powering these rail systems, the higher energy-flux density of coal-powered steam engines, this enabled mankind to begin to develop the interior regions of the

continent, in completely new ways, and defined a totally new relationship of mankind, of civilization, to the environment around him. It defined a qualitative increase in mankind's "potential relative population density," as LaRouche had developed that metric for understanding the science of economic

growth. It made things that were at one point incredibly expensive or challenging or risky, become just day-to-day regular activities.

I think back to the early phases of these frontier explorations of the American Continent. You go back to the Lewis

and Clark Expeditions, where to travel from the east coast



across

the entire mainland of the continent to the west coast required

someone like the leading skilled frontiersmen, and a very dangerous, very challenging mission, which was a very brave undertaking for a handful of people to actually be able to accomplish that. Some decades later, with the rail system, with

the infrastructure of this railroad platform, any family could do

this. With your young children, you could hop on the rail line and get across the country. Any entrepreneur could come out and

take advantage of the development of new territories that were completely inaccessible before. It was a complete transformation

in our most fundamental ability to exist on the planet in these

different territories.

Now what does this have to do with space? This is how we

should be thinking about space exploration, space development—things that we view today as incredibly expensive, difficult, dangerous missions. We should be thinking now what kind of investments can we make to ensure that those then become

regular, day-to-day even, activities that we can support very easily. What will it take to create a Solar System physical-economic platform that will enable mankind to do much more, much easier, than we can today? That's the metric we want

to set. That's the measuring rod we want to utilize, to determine

what kind of space program, what kind of policy we need today.

In breaking this down, this might not include everything,

but in some of our work in the Basement with our discussions

on

this subject, I think we can really, very usefully look at three

categories of activity – three categories of infrastructure and

technologies – which define the basis, you could say the pillars, of a Solar System platform, of an ability to qualitatively expand mankind's ability to access the Solar System

in completely new ways, to make things we currently view as singular flagship missions, [into] just regular, easy activities

that we can do, orders of magnitude more of than we can now.

What we want to look at are these three categories of activity:

(1) Access to space. What's our ability to get from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit? Initial basic access to space.

(2) Travelling in space. Getting around the Solar System. Getting from one planetary body to the next.

(3) Developing resources. Developing the capabilities to utilize

the resources available to us throughout the Solar System, not having to take everything with us everywhere we go, but be able

to develop the wealth that's available out there; to utilize it

on site and transport it around, even bringing stuff back to Earth that we can't necessarily get from Earth.

If you look at these three pillars, these three categories

together, and if you make qualitative breakthroughs in each of these together, this really comes together to define a new

platform of activity, a new standard that will enable the kind of leap that will transition us from viewing space as a Lewis and Clark style expedition, to a trans-continental railroad style relationship to the Solar System.

I just want to take a couple minutes and go through just some sense of what areas we can see breakthroughs in each of these categories. Go to the first slide we have displayed. [Fig. 1] It has been said that getting from Earth's surface to low Earth orbit, is half-way to anywhere in the Solar System. In a certain sense that's very true. If you have a sense of the scales, that might sound very, very strange, because, just in terms of distance, low Earth orbit [begins] about 160 km, about 100 miles, up above your head. If you want to travel to the Moon, you're talking about hundreds of thousands of miles. If you want to travel to another planet, you're talking about millions of miles.

It's a little funny to think that the first 100 miles, compared to hundreds of thousands or millions, is actually half of the trip. But if you look at the energy requirements and what it takes to actually start from just being on the Earth's surface and getting into orbit, that is the case. It is a tremendous amount of energy requirement to get from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit.

The graphic here displays this, in terms of travel from Earth's surface to different planetary bodies, measured in the standard terms used for Solar System travel, which is your

change

in speed. To get into Earth orbit requires not just going up 100

miles, but actually changing your speed, from your current velocity sitting here on the Earth, to something that will allow

you to stay in orbit. If you want to change orbits, or travel around, you can measure that, in terms of changes in velocity. So that happens to be the metric here; but you can see the lowest

dark blue bar on each of these graphics shows that literally far

more than half of the requirement is just getting from Earth's surface to Earth orbit.

ROSS: So, this is half of the speed that you're getting;

this doesn't mean half of the energy, or half of the fuel, or anything like that.

DENISTON: Yeah. Once you start to include that, it would

be even more energy requirements; because you've got to lift your

fuel that you're going to use for the different travels into orbit with you. It definitely gets a little more detailed if you

want to get into it, but this is literally the change in speed requirements to get into Earth orbit and then to leave Earth orbit is very significant.

So, there's improvements being made in rocket systems to get

up more efficiently, but there are new technologies that are just

sitting there on the horizon; they've been sitting there for decades, frankly, that would dramatically lower the cost, lower

the requirements, and the point is, dramatically increase the accessibility of space to mankind. One technology that has been discussed for a long time is space planes. Here in the graphic you can see a relatively recent article covering studies in China on interest in China to develop what some people call single-stage-to-orbit space planes. So, you can get on a plane on a runway – it's probably going to be a little bit longer than your standard runway for airplane travel – and you can ride a single space plane from the runway all the way up into Earth orbit. A lot of this depends upon much more advanced engine designs that can utilize the oxygen in the atmosphere at higher speeds and at higher altitudes to continue to provide thrust. But these things could dramatically lower the cost, the energy requirements of getting people and payloads up into Earth orbit; far more than a lot of the discussion about these reusable rockets and some of the developments going on in improving rocket systems to get from Earth's surface into Earth orbit.

ROSS: This is a technology that was in LaRouche's "Woman on Mars" video from the 1980s, right? It talked about beginning with an airplane, and then turning into a rocket. The big benefit being that you can use the oxygen in the atmosphere instead of carrying it with you, is that right? Is that what makes this more effective?

DENISTON: Yeah, absolutely. These rocket systems have to carry the oxygen as part of the rocket to combust to provide

the thrust. These are more innovative engine designs – air-breathing engines that can use the oxygen in the atmosphere.

As you said, this has been researched in the United States with different scramjet designs. Yeah, Mr. LaRouche featured some of this, which he had developed I think in some close discussion with some Italian colleagues at the time in his collaboration with the Fusion Energy Foundation; and had made it a major part of his "Woman on Mars" mission.

But this is being developed; this is live. Again, you're seeing clear interest in China; there's interest in the United States; there's a company in the United Kingdom that's developing very interesting engine designs that can utilize these capabilities. If you want to take it a step further, another thing that's been discussed is using vacuum tube maglev technologies to launch from Earth orbit into space. This might be a little more frontier and not quite as around the corner as these space planes; but this is the kind of stuff that we should be thinking about. Again, the point is, completely revolutionizing mankind's access to low-Earth orbit and then to the Solar System. So, this is the first major hurdle. If you get some solid infrastructure developments that can enable mankind to overcome this hurdle more easily, you're creating the basis for a much broader expansion of mankind's activity.

The next pillar, the next category is travel in space. And

again, this is an issue that Mr. LaRouche has been campaigning on for decades. Space travel requires nuclear reactions; chemical fuel just doesn't have the energy density to provide quick and efficient access to the Solar System. We can get to the Moon; that's OK. It probably would be nice to get there a little bit quicker, but that's our next door neighbor in terms of the Solar System. If you want to get to Mars, you want to get around to other places in the Solar System, you've got to get to nuclear reactions. The heart of this is the fact that the energy density, the energy per mass of nuclear reactions is, on average, on the order of a million times greater than the energy per mass in chemical reactions; even as broad categories, setting aside the particular fuel you use in either case.

A million times is just a big number, but for one quick comparison, you take the fuel used for the Space Shuttle launch – those two solid rocket boosters on either side, the large tank in the middle filled with liquid fuel. You take the weight of all that fuel together, some of the most advanced chemical reactions we have for fuel for space launch; how much weight of nuclear fuel would it take to contain the same amount of energy? You're talking about 10 pounds! One suitcase full of nuclear fuel contains the same amount of energy as all three fuel tanks of the Space Shuttle. To be fair, you couldn't necessarily use that fuel the same way to launch the Space Shuttle; you have

to  
have systems that can actually combust it and get thrust out  
of  
it. It's not just the energy content as the only issue, but  
that  
is the defining characteristic that makes nuclear reactions  
key  
to getting around the Solar System; enabling things like  
travelling at constant acceleration. Instead of just  
initially  
firing your thruster and basically floating on an orbit to get  
to  
different planetary bodies – which is what's often proposed  
for  
getting people to Mars; which would take on the order of six,  
seven, eight months to do. If you had nuclear reactions –  
especially fusion reactions – you can be accelerating for half  
the trip, and decelerating the second half of the trip; you  
can  
cut that time down to weeks or even days.

We were all excited that New Horizons got to Pluto.  
Unfortunately, it didn't have the fuel in it and the engines  
to  
slow down when it got there; which is too bad, because it  
spent  
ten years getting there, and even just passing by in the  
course  
of a couple of weeks, found amazing things. Imagine if it  
actually got to stop and stay? If you had nuclear reactions,  
that the type of stuff you could be doing. If you had  
one-gravity acceleration, so you're constantly accelerating,  
providing the thrust that creates the equivalent of one Earth  
gravity for the crew on the space ship, it would literally  
take  
16 days to get to Pluto. Compared to New Horizons taking ten  
years to get there; that's when the orbits are closest, but  
maybe



a few more days in sub-optimal conditions.

You're talking about a complete revolution in our ability to efficiently get around the Solar System; travel to different planetary bodies; visit multiple locations. If you want to send people to Mars, this is the way to do it. If you want to send people out to other places, this is the way to do it. Even robotic missions; you want to get around and do way more exploration. There's so much we don't know about all these planets, about their moons; there's just so much to figure out.

These are the kinds of systems that are going to create vast improvements in our ability to do it.

And again, the third category is developing the resources in space; developing the ability to utilize what's available to us on the Moon, on Mars, on different asteroids. This is something we don't really do at all, yet. So, you have to bring basically everything with you through that very costly energy-intensive first hurdle of getting from Earth's surface up into Earth orbit, through travelling the vast distances of space. This is just this very early pioneer style mode of activity. Whereas, if we're going to be serious about this, we need to develop the capabilities to utilize the resources that are there; and eventually look to serious industrialization and development of advanced systems out in space, on-site at different planetary bodies. One critical driver to this whole thing that we've put a major focus on is the development of helium-3 from the Moon. Helium-3 being an absolutely unique, excellent fusion fuel; which

is basically absent on Earth, but relatively abundant all over the lunar surface, and could be an excellent fuel for fusion propulsion in space and also to provide electricity energy back here on Earth. There's been years of serious study and designs and investigations of how to go to the Moon, develop the systems to process the regala[ph], extract the helium-3; and initiate real industrial-style processes; developments on the lunar surface. That's just one example. You want to get oxygen, hydrogen, metals; asteroids are also potentially very useful places to develop the resources. So, as a third category, the general idea of developing advanced capabilities to utilize and create what we need in different regions of the Solar System.

If you put this together and look at these things synergistically as integrated technologies, infrastructure systems, levels of energy flux density; as a whole they define for mankind a completely different relationship to the Solar System. The question is, are we making investments that are bringing us to that level? Can we say that the investments we're going to make in this next administration are going to be taking mankind in that direction, to be able to support these qualitatively higher levels of activity to the point where we can honestly look back in a couple of generations and see the space activity going on now as equivalent to Lewis and Clark style explorations of the West; and have mankind have the capabilities to regularly visit many planetary bodies and do all we want around the Solar System? That's the vision that we need.

We were talking about this with Mr. LaRouche earlier today,

and he again said, "Your starting point is Krafft Ehrlicke."  
And  
Krafft Ehrlicke's industrialization of the Moon really I think  
is  
the critical driver program that can get a lot of this going.  
As  
I said, we have helium-3 on the Moon; that puts fusion  
directly  
right there on the table. You're talking about developing  
industrial capabilities and mining capabilities on the Moon.  
If  
you're serious about doing this, you want to increase our  
access  
to space from the Earth's surface. So, it is excellent that  
we're seeing a lot of discussion about the Moon coming on the  
table again; but I think the issue is, are we going to pursue  
this Krafft Ehrlicke vision for a real industrial development?  
Although he might have used different terms in discussing it,  
he  
had exactly the same conception that Mr. LaRouche has: That  
this  
is the basis for mankind's much broader expanse. Really the  
essential nature of the type of qualitative changes that  
mankind  
goes through in his natural growth and development as a very  
unique species on this Earth and hopefully tomorrow in the  
Solar  
System.

As Jason mentioned, some of this is discussed in an  
article  
that's going to be released in the next issue of the  
*Hamiltonian*. This is an ongoing subject of discussion, but  
with the openness now, I really think it's critical we set the  
level of discussion on that basis.

ROSS: Mhmm; that's aiming pretty high, that's good.  
I

think that's a really apt description that you got about comparing Lewis and Clark. It used to be a really difficult thing to cross the continent; now it isn't. Or think about the Silk Road. The ancient Silk Road. If you're trying to develop that region of the planet with camel caravans, and you contrast that with what China is able to do now with building rail networks and helping build them and road networks in these neighboring countries; you totally transform the relationship to that area. The old development of human settlements along coasts, along oceans or along rivers; and then by the chemical revolution, by the ability to have steam power – also canals earlier, but still connected to water; but with steam power, it made it possible to open up the interior of the continents. And with the potential for nuclear power, then the Solar System becomes something that's accessible to us in a meaningful or more regular way than an exotic, years-long, life-threatening trip.

The other aspect, which you talked about is, if you look at what's going on with the New Paradigm in the world; what China's doing, with the way things are being reshaped politically also around Russia. And then you look at the scientific advancements that are being made, where China's got a very top-line in the world super-conducting tokamak for fusion research. The major breakthroughs in terms of lunar exploration – that's China right now; China's going to be landing on the far side of the Moon; China had the first soft landing on the Moon in decades. This is

really a potential. With their far side of the Moon landing, China will be able to take the first photographs of our universe

in the very low radio range; it's never been done before.

We'll

have access to a whole new sense of sight about the universe around us.

So, I think it's very exciting. It's definitely much more

thrilling than most of the discussion that takes place about this

policy or that policy, when you think big like that.

DENISTON: Mr. LaRouche's platform concept is so key. People just don't have the idea of this type of qualitative leaps that

are natural for mankind. People are so accustomed at this point

to just slow, incremental progress if there's any progress at all. It's going to be a fight to get people to think on this level again.

ROSS: Yes! So much of what is considered to be progressive

or useful is only nudging people toward being better savers or something; compared to the kinds of huge changes that are going

to be needed. I think that's a very good image that we've given

people. Let's end it with that. I think the thing to take from

this also is that we have got a lot that we need to do; a lot of

policies to put into place; and a wide open opportunity to make

it happen right now. Including, as Jeff was emphasizing, Glass-Steagall is absolutely doable during this session of


Congress; even before the inauguration of the next President and the next Congress in January. This is something we can do right now, next week, in this period.

The ability to understand this concept of the platforms, of the history of economic development of the United States, a real major aspect of economic science, comes through studying Alexander Hamilton. So, if you have not been working through Alexander Hamilton's reports, I urge you to get in touch with — if you're near one of our offices, one of our locations, to join us for these readings. Get a copy of these reports yourself. The book, *Alexander Hamilton's Vision* contains all four of the reports, along with Mr. LaRouche's Four New Laws to Save the USA Now. And you don't have to get into a fistfight at a Walmart parking lot to pick it up, either.

Let's end it with that. Please sign up through our website if you haven't already, to find out how to get involved with us. Get our daily email, join us via the action center; let's be in touch, and let's make this happen right now. There is nothing to wait for; the situation is open. So, thank you for joining us; thank you to Ben and Jeff. Thank you for all the work that you have done and that you will do in the period immediately ahead.

---

# Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love for produktivitet

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 24. november, 2016 – **LaRouches Fire Love**  udgør én samlet politik, der tilsigter en forøgelse af menneskelig produktivitet.

Tag for eksempel i betragtning den umiddelbare fremtids samlede, internationale rumprogram, hvor et genoplivet NASA vil integrere sine bestræbelser med Kinas ledende rolle; med et genoplivet russisk program, baseret på den nødvendige genoplivelse af russisk videnskab; med Europa; og med mange andre lande, der netop nu begynder at kaste deres blik ud i rummet. Og snart vil dette globale rumprogram udvides til at inkorporere industrialiseringen af Månen, som den store Kraft Ehrlicke har forudsagt. Snart vil videnskabelige, tekniske og industrielle aktiviteter på Månen tilsammen udgøre en uerstattelig del af hele rumprogrammet – ikke længere blot et globalt rumprogram, men ét, der allerede inkorporerer det umiddelbart omkringliggende rum.

Ikke alene det: det forcerede program for fusionskraft, som er LaRouches Fjerde Lov, vil i sig selv blive integreret i det globale rumprogram. Menneskets udforskning af Solsystemet kræver fusionskraft, hvilket igen betyder, at fusionskraft må indarbejdes i hele indsatsen lige fra begyndelsen – tænk f.eks. på, hvordan alle trækkene ved det nu forældede rumfartssystem, som vi hidtil har benyttet os af, alle er blevet formet af trækkene ved det kemiske system for

fremdrift, vi har brugt.

En undersøgelse af det 20. århundredes tyske, russiske og amerikanske ballistiske missilprogrammer, der gik forud for og lagde fundamentet til de efterfølgende rumprogrammer, viser os historiens mest storstilede, vertikale og horisontale integration af mange tusinde menneskers bestræbelser inden for talrige videnskabelige, tekniske og industrielle discipliner og områder. Og dette glidende, integrerede design, den tekniske udarbejdelse, produktion og afprøvning, blev alle fundamentalt baseret på nye, fysiske principper. De kulminerede alle i et unikt system – aldrig før set – utroligt komplekst, bestående af tusinder af dele, og som alligevel ikke tolererer selv én eneste fiasko.

Da missilprogrammet gik over i rumprogrammet – da menneskeheden tog det første skridt ud i rummet, begyndende med Sovjetunionens opsendelse af Sputnik i 1957 – udvidedes den fornødne skala og kompleksitet, der kræves i den samlede rumindsats, uden sammenligning, selv, når man sammenligner med den forudgående revolution med de ballistiske missiler. For eksempel skrev Boris Chertok, i sin fire binds store, banebrydende førstehåndsberetning om det sovjetiske rumprogram: »Jeg vil påstå, at Koroljov [S.P. Koroljov, den største leder af det sovjetiske program] nok var den første, der forstod, at rumteknologi krævede en ny organisation ... For Koroljov, hans stedfortrædere og nære medarbejdere blev dette gigantiske, nye system til pga. et bredt syn på rumteknologi, ved at kombinere grundforskning, anvendt videnskab, specifikt design, produktion, opsendelse, flyvning og flykontrol, snarere end ud fra et specifikt rumfartøj. Dette enkeltkredsløbsarrangement begyndte at operere i 1959 og 1960. Hundreder og senere mange tusinder videnskabsfolks og specialisters beherskelse af dette kredsløb gjorde det muligt for menneskeheden at indlede Rumalderen i det 20. århundrede.«

Man kunne se topingeniører og designere i intens diskussion med maskinarbejdere i mange af værkstederne; disse tekniske



arbejdere rådslog igen jævnligt i komiteer, og i mere intime sammenhænge, med de mest berømmede ledere af teoretisk videnskab. Den horisontale integration gennem dusinvis af institutioner og fabrikker var lige så intens. Det er forbløffende, at dette overhovedet kunne finde sted under Sovjetunionens system med centralplanlægning – som Anden Verdenskrigs hårde skole havde nødvendiggjort – men det er en anden historie. Men det begyndte alt sammen at falde fra hinanden efter en stor, tragisk ulykke i 1960, og dernæst raserede Det britiske Imperiums agenter for Thatcher-politikken alt, hvad der var tilbage af sovjetisk videnskab i 1990'erne.

Det, der behøves for den umiddelbare fremtids rumprogram, er LaRouches kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, centreret omkring og dirigeret af en Nationalbank, som er et fleksibelt, almengældende system, der støtter alle dele af denne massivt komplekse produktionskæde, fra top til bund og fra den ene ende til den anden, og som i sig inkorporerer det, som afdøde Charles de Gaulle kaldte »indikativ planlægning«. Og vi taler naturligvis ikke kun om rumfart her, men om forøget, menneskelig produktivitet af enhver form og farve. Vores seneste oplevelse af dette er de midler, hvorved Franklin Roosevelts anvendelse af Hamiltons kreditsystem gjorde USA til et demokratiets arsenal for Anden Verdenskrig, og til langt den største, økonomiske magt, verden nogen sinde havde set. Med øjeblikkelige lån med lav rente til kontrakter om produktion til forsvaret, fra øverst til nederst i hierarkiet, gjorde Roosevelts system det muligt for denne massive struktur at 'vende på en tallerken'. At 'vende på en tallerken' imod helt nye, netop introducerede højere niveauer af videnskab og teknologi. Det er præcis, hvad vi nu har brug for – og hvad vi må opnå gennem LaRouches Fire Love.

*Foto: 14. maj, 2010 – Et af NASA's sidste rumflyvninger, rumfærgen Atlantis besøger den Internationale Rumstation for vedligeholdelse og montage.*

---

# En Hyldest: Mozarts Rekviem

*24. november, 2016 – Glædelig Thanksgiving Fra LaRouchePAC.* Mens vi fejrer denne, den mest amerikanske helligdag, har vi ønsket at give jer en gave til at klare hjernen og være med til at forme vejen fremad. Som I ved, så anser vi de seneste valgresultater i hele verden som et signal til fødslen af en potentielt dybtgående, ny, menneskelig æra i menneskehedens historie – som afviser det patentmiddel, som har været evindelige krige, Malthus-økonomi og brutalt folkemord mod både nationale og udenlandske befolkninger, og som har karakteriseret arven efter Obama og Bush. Koblet til det dristige, økonomiske og videnskabelige udviklingsperspektiv, som Kina har foreslået, er der et reelt potentiale for stor og vidunderlig forandring.

Den 18. januar 2014, nøjagtig 50 år efter dagen, hvor Mozarts Rekviem blev opført, blot få måneder efter mordet på præsident John F. Kennedy, i Holy Cross katedralen i Boston, Massachusetts, mindedes medlemmer af LaRouches politiske bevægelse dagen med en opførelse af Mozarts Rekviem i samme katedral. Messen blev indledt med udvalgte citater fra John F. Kennedy, der udfordrede den amerikanske befolkning til at realisere sin sande, menneskelige natur gennem at bygge store, økonomiske udviklingsprojekter og kolonisere rummet.

Vi håber, I finder tid til at lytte til denne opførelse i løbet af helligdagen og dele oplevelsen med jeres venner. Ligesom mordet på Kennedy for vores befolkning markerede en nedstigen til de helvedesagtige vilkår, der har karakteriseret vores umiddelbare fortid, således vil, hvis vi omfavner den

mentale tilstand, som både selve Mozarts messe og de intellektuelle udfordringer stillet af vores tidligere præsident, fremkalder, en langt bedre fremtid vise sig inden for vores rækkevidde, lige over horisonten.

---

## **Bush' og Obamas krigsforbrydelser afsløret – Trump bør erklære sig enig**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 22. november, 2016* – Den følgende erklæring fra den republikanske senator Richard H. Black, Virginias Senat, kom som respons til en advarsel fra kongresmedlem Ted Lieu (D-CA) om, at USA's støtte til og samarbejde med Saudi-Arabien i den kriminelle krig mod Yemen udsatte amerikansk militærpersonale for en risiko for at blive retsforfulgt for krigsforbrydelser. Senator Black er tidligere chef for Afdeling for Kriminallov ved Pentagons militære strafferet.

»Jeg er enig i kongresmedlem Lieus juridiske analyse. Jeg mener imidlertid, at denne sags mere praktiske aspekt er den juridiske afsløring af vore mest højtplacerede embedsfolk, der styrede vore militærfolks handlinger. Ifølge den præcedens, der blev sat af den Amerikanske Krigsforbryderdomstol i sagen mod den japanske general [Tomoyuki] Yamashita efter Anden Verdenskrig, kan den øverstkommanderende retsforfølges for generelle, kriminelle handlinger, begået af den øverstkommanderendes underordnede. Dette gælder for handlinger, som han kendte til, eller burde have kendt til.

Amerika har i vid udstrækning ladet hånt om internationale normer for opførsel i sine aggressionskrige imod Serbien,

Irak, Libyen, Syrien og nu Yemen. Visse handlinger fremstår som forbrydelser iht. international sædvanelov – såsom vores afvisning af at acceptere oberst Gaddafis overgivelse, da han tilbød at forlade Libyen. USA, Storbritannien og Frankrig skal have ført rådslagning, før de besluttede at ignorere hans tilbud om at abdicere, og fremmede i stedet mordet på ham.

Ved at lade hånt om fastlagte normer for opførsel i krigstid har USA i alvorlig grad undermineret sin moralske autoritet og formindsket sin magt over hele planeten. Alt imens jeg er tilhænger af et robust forsvar, så opnår vi intet ved at udkæmpe krige for at fremme globalisering – især ikke, når sådanne krige krænker Lov om Krig på Land.«

Præsident Donald Trump indikerer i stigende grad, at han er enig. Hans udnævnelse af general Michael Flynn (pens.) er en sådan indikation – general Flynn advarede som bekendt, da han var chef for Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste, Obama om, at hans tvivlsomme eventyr i Syrien, og også i Libyen, støttede etableringen af et »kalifat«, bestående af de mest ekstreme, saudiskstøttede, islamiske terrorister. General Flynn latterliggjorde også Obamas massive program for dronemord, der er så frydefuldt for dræber-præsidenten, som rent militært værende værre end unyttigt, idet hvert eneste drab »blot gjorde dem til martyrer og blot skabte en ny årsag til at bekæmpe os endnu hårdere«. Ligesom Trump er general Flynn fortæller for at arbejde sammen med Rusland for at forsvare den syriske stat og verden imod terrorister.

Mandag mødtes Trump også med kongresmedlem Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI), med indikationer om, at hun kommer i betragtning som USA's ambassadør til FN. Gabbard, der er veteran fra Irakkrigen, har været en offentlig kritiker af Obamas evindelige krige og hans fiasko i bekæmpelse af terrorisme, til fordel for »regimeskift« imod sekulære regeringer. Sæt dette i modsætning til Obamas FN-ambassadør Samantha Power, der har tilsluttet sig de brølende dinosaurer ved i dag i FN at levere en tirade om, at hun ville »stille for retten« de

syriske øverstbefalende, der har anført kontraterror-operationerne i deres land.

Verden befinder sig i en revolutionerende overgangsperiode. De europæiske ledere, der fulgte Obama og briternes diktater om at gennemføre sanktioner mod Rusland og forberede til krig, falder som fluer. Valget af François Fillon, en pro-russisk kandidat, i det franske Republikanske Partis primærvalg i denne uge, følger i kølvandet på valget af pro-russiske præsidenter i Bulgarien og Moldova i sidste uge. Samtidig hænger de europæiske banker, med Deutsche Bank og Royal Bank of Scotland i spidsen, i en tynd tråd og kunne bringe hele det vestlige banksystem til fald, hvad dag, det skal være – med mindre USA's Kongres kommer til fornuft og gennemfører Glass-Steagall nu, uden at vente til den nye, amerikanske regering tiltræder i januar.

Endnu mere afgørende er kampen for at genoprette kreativ tænkning i de vestlige nationer, efter årtiers intellektuel gift fra Hollywoods og rock-narko-sex-modkulturens vold og perversion. For tre år siden, på 50-års dagen for mordet på John F. Kennedy, præsenterede Schiller Instituttet, stiftet af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche, en mindekoncert for JFK med en opførelse af Mozarts Rekviem-messe i D-mol i Washington-området, som efterfulgtes af en gentagelse af koncerten i Holy Cross katedralen i Boston, hvor, 50 år tidligere, Richard Cardinal Cushing holdt en mindehøjtidelighed for JFK med en højtidelig pavemesse, missa solemnis rekviem, hvor det samme, intense udtryk for klassisk skønhed var blevet præsenteret og fulgt på fjernsyn i hele verden. Det er netop skønhedens identifikation med sandhed, der er gået tabt i Vesten, og som må genoprettes for at bringe verden sammen for fred gennem fælles og samarbejdende udvikling.

*Foto: Præsident Obama og førstedame Michelle Obama i Saudi-Arabien, 27. januar, 2015.*

---

# Kun globale løsninger baseret på nye principper kan virke

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 21. november, 2016* – Enhver oprigtig vurdering af den globale situation på nuværende tidspunkt må begynde med en klar erkendelse af, at hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er håbløst bankerot og må erstattes af en helt ny arkitektur. Alle for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-bankerne er døde, begyndende med Deutsche Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland, samt alle Wall Street TBTF-institutionerne. Wall Streets bankholdingselskaber sidder med \$252 billion i eksponering til derivater, med kun \$14 billion i tvivlsom kapital som opbakning til disse flygtige spilleindsatser. De italienske banker styres af et kriminelt oligarki, mens den italienske befolkning er hårdt ramt af morderiske nedskæringer. Det samme gælder for Frankrig og andre steder i hele Europa.

Det, der er brug for, er et helt nyt kreditsystem, der er baseret på de områder i verden – først og fremmest Eurasien – hvor regulær vækst i produktiviteten finder sted. En sådan global reorganisering er den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan redde hele nationer, der nu er ved at dø. Nøglespørgsmålet er: Hvordan vil betydningsfulde magter, især Kina, Rusland og USA, tilpasse sig til det, der nu er muligt med de omstændigheder, der vokser frem efter Obama? Se det i øjnene: Obama er politisk gift, og jo før, han forsvinder fra den politiske scene, desto tidligere kan de nødvendige ændringer lanceres.

Den umiddelbare genindførelse af Glass-Steagall er naturligvis det afgørende, første skridt, men man må indse, at, som et resultat af de seneste årtiers politik – især i de seneste 16 år med Bush og Obama – er der forrettet en hel del skade, og det bliver vanskeligt hurtigt at rette op på det.

Tyskland kan blive et centralt element i disse ændringer, men kansler Merkel må holde op med at beskytte den transatlantiske magts allerede døde system. Hun bør give den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin plads til at operere. Hvis Putin og Trump kan etablere direkte kontakt og udarbejde nogle løsninger, vil det fungere. Eurasien opererer allerede på en måde, der styrker reel produktivitet. En stor del af resten af verden lider imidlertid hungersnød. Putin forstår disse succeser i Eurasien – han ved, Asien er langt bedre faren end Europa. Trump har instinktet til den samme forståelse.

Den model, der må vedtages, er de handlinger, som præsident Franklin Roosevelt gennemførte i sine første 100 dage i embedet.[1] Dette vil kræve en del hårde spark fra enige verdensledere. Der er intet alternativ.

Dette var ligeledes et fremtrædende emne under det netop afsluttede APEC-topmøde for statsoverhoveder i Lima, Peru, hvor den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping også i sin rejse inkluderede statsbesøg i Ecuador, Peru og Chile, og hvor der er en mobilisering i gang for at bygge den trans-oceaniske jernbane, der forbinder Brasiliens atlantehavskyst med Perus stillehavskyst.

*(Fra Lyndon LaRouches medarbejderdiskussion, søndag, 20. nov. 2016)*

*Foto: Præsident Franklin D. Roosevelt underskriver Bankloven af 1933, Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingsloven, 16. juni, 1933.*

---

[1] Se: »Franklin D. Roosevelts første 100 dage – med hans egne ord« <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=7330>

---

# Lyndon LaRouche: Menneskeheden må ændre Universets adfærd som sådan

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 20. november, 2016* – Idet Lyndon LaRouche gjorde status over de betydningsfulde, strategiske fremskridt, der i den seneste periode er opnået over hele planeten, og over de fremskridt, der fortsat ikke er realiseret, sagde han i dag til sine medarbejdere, at »det, der finder sted nu, er i vid udstrækning fremskridt, men det er ikke endegyldigt ... vi gør fremskridt, men denne form for fremskridt lever ikke op til menneskehedens behov ... Spørgsmålet er, hvad menneskeheden kan gøre for at ændre universets adfærd som sådan«.

LaRouches dybtgående diskussion er afgørende for at imødegå de udfordringer, som menneskeheden nu konfronteres med.

Ugen sluttede med endnu et ødelæggende nederlag for Obama, denne gang et nederlag for hans frihandelspolitik ved APEC-topmødet i Lima, Peru, i takt med, at det globale tyngdepunkt skifter over til de succesrige initiativer, som Kina og Rusland tager. Dér, hvor vi nu står, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche til medarbejdere, er, at

*»Jeg mener, vi nu er vidne til en fortsættelse af det meget høje tempo i den dynamik, der har været den fremherskende i de seneste to en halv måned, eller lidt længere, begyndende med*



Vladivostok-mødet; integrationen af den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union (EAEU) og Ét bælte, én vej; fortsættelsen heraf ved G20-topmødet i Hangzhou; og dernæst ved ASEAN-mødet i Laos; efterfulgt af BRIKS-konferencen i Goa, Indien, i oktober måned; og nu, under APEC-mødet i Lima, Peru.

Det, der står helt klart, er, at tyngdepunktet og magtcentret fuldstændigt er skiftet over til denne dynamik, især med integrationen af Kinas og Ruslands politik. Og hvad der hermed følger er en fortsættende eksplosion af infrastruktur og andre udviklingsprojekter, som, hvis man tager dem samlet set, virkelig er en bjergtagende dynamik, der i løbet af de seneste tre år har fundet sted i et stadigt stigende tempo.

Dette er ganske afgjort verdens kraftcenter i øjeblikket, for det står ganske klart, at de transatlantiske etableringer er fuldstændigt ude af stand til at fatte, at deres model, med globalisering og neoliberal fordeling af rigdom, fra de fattige til de rige, har lidt totalt nederlag. Og de er hverken i stand til at forudsige udviklinger eller håndtere konsekvenserne af sådanne begivenheder som Brexit og valget af Trump.«

Men, den umiddelbart foreliggende udfordring – med at bruge den tidevandsbølge, der nu fejer ind over USA, som det kom til udtryk i præsidentvalget, til endelig at bringe USA med om bord i Verdenslandbroens Nye Paradigme – kræver, at vi erkender og vender vores opmærksomhed mod et langt dybere spørgsmål. I sin diskussion med medarbejdere udtalte LaRouche, i uddrag:

»Jeg ved, at det, vi nu gør, i virkeligheden ikke er så fremragende, selv om det ser strålende ud – For, hvis vi ikke ser disse overliggende overvejelser, som folk forsøger at overse – hvor de siger, 'det når vi til senere, det kommer vi til, lad være med at presse jer selv for meget' – det er det, der bekymrer mig.

Vi er kommet til noget i denne forandring, der nu finder sted, hvor vi sandsynligvis har fået en misforstået selvtillid. Det betyder ikke, at vi som sådan gør noget, der er dårligt, men det betyder, at vi ikke rigtig har fået fat i, hvad det er for et princip, på hvilket menneskeheden fremtid beror ...

Spørgsmålet drejer sig om menneskets iboende natur, som Einstein forstod i visse af sine videnskabelige arbejder. Det gjorde han! Og det er, hvad vi har mistet. Vi gik bort fra denne form for idé og besluttede at satse på en mere økonomisk fremgangsmåde ...

Vi har gjort nogle gode ting. Vi har forbedret kvaliteten af menneskeheden generelt, menneskeheden kvaliteter generelt, på basis af visse projekter, visse ting. Men, vi har mistet spørgsmålet om, hvad meningen med menneskets eksistens er. Det vil sige, af hvilken art er selve eksistensen, selve arten af det mulige menneske?

Det, vi gør, er godt, i vid udstrækning; i visse dele af verden og inden for visse af livets aspekter. Men, det er ikke det, menneskeheden rent faktisk har behov for. Mennesket må vide, hvad begrundelsen for mennesker, for menneskelige væsner, er, noget, der aldrig bliver forstået af blot og bart dødelige mennesker, der ser på sig selv i en sådan kategori ...

Hvad er betydningen, den iboende betydning, af et menneske? Af **ethvert** menneskes eksistens? Eller af alle mennesker?

Det, der nu finder sted, er i vid udstrækning fremskridt – men det er ikke endegyldigt ...

Det vi har med at gøre, er spørgsmålet: Hvad er skabelsens natur? Spørgsmålet er, hvad er den fundamentale mening med mennesket? Hvad er menneskeslægtens natur, som en universel ting? Universet er organiseret, og man må derfor tænke på et univers, der er iboende organiseret. Ikke praktisk organiseret, men iboende organiseret ...

*Folk ved ikke, hvad det er, der får universet til at fungere. Hvad er det, der er karakteristisk for menneskeheden, og som gør den overlegen i forhold til alt, hvad vi ved om alle former for dyr ...?*

*Vi gør fremskridt; men denne form for fremskridt er ikke tilstrækkelig til at opfylde det, der kræves af menneskeheden. Der er noget i universet, der kontrollerer og bestemmer universets betydning, som en mission.*

*Hvad er det, der får universet til at gøre, hvad det gør for menneskehedens funktion som sådan? Spørgsmålet er, hvad menneskeheden kan gøre for at ændre universets adfærd, som sådan?»*

*Foto: Mennesket og Universet – Universet, og mennesket.*

---

**Vores rolle må være den,  
at forme USA's  
regeringsinstitution,  
fra allerhøjeste niveau.**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 18. november, 2016; International Webcast – Det står nu helt klart, at hele det tidligere regeringssystem, det gamle system, brat og endegyldigt har nået slutningen. Men spørgsmålet lyder stadig: Hvad skal erstatte det? Og dette er langt fra konkret eller afklaret på nuværende tidspunkt. Det lederskab, som LaRouchePAC har ydet, og fortsat yder, udgør den afgørende faktor i dette spørgsmål – både på den nationale og den internationale scene. Det er meget tydeligt, at dynamikken nu er skiftet over mod det, Xi*

Jinping har anført med den Nye Silkevej og med samarbejdet med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin omkring skabelsen af en ny, strategisk og økonomisk, international orden; og det er bestemmende for verdensbegivenhederne i øjeblikket, og som går langt ud over noget, der finder sted på den hjemlige front, internt i USA. Spørgsmålet er, hvordan responderer vi til det?

LaRouchePAC fortsætter med at lede; og, som vi diskuterede i mandags, så var dette en meget vigtig uge. Kongressen samledes igen – selv om det kun var for nogle få dage; men, på stedet dér, for at byde medlemmerne af USA's Kongres velkommen, så snart de vendte tilbage til Washington, var nogle af vore førende aktivister fra Larouche Political Action Committee (LPAC). Vi havde en dag med aktioner på stedet ved Capitol Hill onsdag; og vi mødte ganske afgjort en totalt rystet og langt mere åben situation, end vi har set i de seneste måske 16 år i Washington, D.C. Både det Republikanske lederskab og absolut det Demokratiske lederskab har fået alvorlige tæsk; og de mest mentalt sunde aspekter i begge partier er ved at indse, at tiden er inde til at forlige sig med det. Hvor skal de se hen for lederskab? Til LaRouche Political Action Committee.

Vi vil nu afspille et kort uddrag af en diskussion, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche anførte. Dette er bemærkninger, som hun gav til aktivisterne som en slags marchordre, før de tog til Washington. Hun giver en meget klar gennemgang af præcis den situation, vi er i, og det ansvar, vi har. Efter dette korte klip fortsætter vi diskussionen med nogle meget mere uddybende synspunkter om det, vi nu har været i stand til at opnå, og hvilke udfordringer, vi har foran os.

*(For en dansk oversættelse af hele Helgas indslag, se <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=16093>)*

# Friday LaRouche PAC Webcast November 18, 2016

OUR ROLE MUST BE TO SHAPE THE INSTITUTION OF GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE VERY HIGHEST LEVEL.

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's November 18, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly webcast from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). I'm joined in the studio by Benjamin Deniston, and via video by members of our Policy Committee: Diane Sare, joining us from New York City; and Kesha Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We had the opportunity just now to have a discussion with both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, and I think Mr. LaRouche's point is very clear. It is decisively determined that the entire reigning former system, the old system, has abruptly and decisively come to an end. But the question still remains: What will replace it? And that is far from concrete or finalized at this point. The leadership that the LaRouche PAC has delivered and continues to deliver, is the deciding factor in that – both nationally and on the international stage. It's very clear that the dynamic is now shifted towards what Xi Jinping has led in China with the New Silk Road and in collaboration with Russian President Vladimir Putin in creating a new strategic and economic

international order; and that is what is determining world events right now, far beyond anything that's happening domestically from within the borders of the United States. The question is, how do we respond to that?

The LaRouche PAC continues to lead; and as we discussed on Monday with the Policy Committee, this was a very important week.

Congress came back into session – albeit for just a couple of days; but there to greet the members of the United States Congress as soon as they returned to Washington were some of the leading activists of the LaRouche Political Action Committee.

We had a day of action on the ground on Capitol Hill on Wednesday;

and we definitely met a completely shaken up and much more open

situation than we have faced in perhaps the last 16 years in Washington, DC. Both the Republican leadership and absolutely the Democratic leadership have received a severe drubbing; and the most sane aspects of both parties are realizing that now is

the time to come to terms with that. Where else can they turn for leadership? The LaRouche Political Action Committee.

So, what we're going to do right now is play a short excerpt

from a discussion that was led by Helga Zepp-LaRouche. These are

remarks that she delivered to those activists as sort of marching

orders before they went to Washington, DC. I think she gives a

very clear overview of exactly the situation we find ourselves

in, and the responsibilities that we have. Coming out of that short audio clip, we will continue the discussion with some much more elaborated views of what we have now been able to accomplish, and what the challenges still are ahead of us. So, let me play that clip for you right now:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE : OK. So, first of all, I want to say hello to you. Obviously, this is a very important intervention because the election results in the United States, which many people did not anticipate, is really part of a global process. It's not something which is accountable in all the explanations given by the US media; for the most part, the cover-up or some phony explanation like it was the FBI who cost Hillary the election and so forth and so on. What really is going on strategically is that the masses of the population of the trans-Atlantic sector in particular – also in some other parts of the world, but in Europe and the United States in particular – have really had it with an establishment which has consistently acted against their interests. People in those states which are not represented by the anti-establishment, they know that; because for them, the working and living conditions in the last decades one can say, but in particular in the last 15 years, have become worse and worse. People have to work more jobs; they still can't make ends meet. They have many cases where their sons and sometimes even daughters have gone to Iraq for five times in a row, to come home to be completely broken. So, people have experienced that life is just getting worse

for them; and they do not have any hope in the Washington-New York establishment. You had the same phenomenon leading to the Brexit vote in Great Britain in June; which also was not just the refugees and most of the obvious issues – even though they did play a certain catalyzing role; but it was the same fundamental sense of injustice. That there is simply no more government which takes care of the common good. Whatever explanations they now come up with, this will not go away until the situation is remedied, and good government is being re-established in the United States, in Europe, and in other parts of the world.

One immediate next point where the same kind of resentment probably will show is with the referendum in Italy where on the 4th of December – that is, in 2.5 weeks from now – they will have a referendum about a change in the constitution which as the sentiment now goes, will be also a vote against the Renzi government. Even so, he promised he would resign; now, he doesn't want to resign. But in any case, this type of a process will continue until a remedy has been put in.

Now, obviously, the situation is that the Trump victory is an open question. It's not yet clear what this Presidency will become; but as Lyndon LaRouche has emphasized emphatically almost every day since the vote, this is not a local US affair. This is a global issue; it's a global international question because one major reason why Trump won the election is because especially



in

the last period, he had emphasized that Hillary Clinton would mean World War III because of her policy concerning Syria. She

demanded the no-fly zone and was proposing a head-on confrontation with Russia. That was absolutely to the point, because we were on an absolutely very dangerous road to a confrontation with Russia and with China.

Trump in the election campaign had said repeatedly that he

would have a different attitude towards Russia; and he said something more kinetic[?] things against China. But since he has

been elected, he has been on the phone with Putin and Xi Jinping;

and in both cases, said that he would work to improve the relations between the United States and Russia or respectively with China. Now that is obviously extremely important; and the

other extremely important question is will he carry through with

his promise on Glass-Steagall? Especially in his speech in Charlotte, he had reiterated that he would immediately implement

Glass-Steagall. Obviously this is the key, because only if one

stops and terminates the casino economy which is really the cause

for the war, can the situation be brought in shape. Obviously,

all the progressives – Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren; even Pelosi said that they would already cooperate with Trump if he would go for this infrastructure job creation Glass-Steagall economic program.

So, we should give the benefit of the doubt that he really

means it; but we should also be aware that naturally, the

entire

Wall Street crowd, the neo-cons in the Republican Party will do

everything possible to not have that. So therefore, we have to

have this intervention to really educate the Congress and the Senate on what is really at stake. The world is now really looking, holding their breath; will there be a change in American

policy for the better? Which hopefully it will; but it requires

these measures: Glass-Steagall as an absolute precondition without which nothing else will work. But that is not enough, because you are not just talking about banking reform; you are talking about a completely new paradigm in the economic system.

That has been defined by the Four Laws of Lyn, which everybody should really make sure that they completely understand when you

are doing this kind of lobbying work. Lyn has been stressing in

the last couple of days, that the key thing is to increase the productivity of the labor force; and because of neo-liberal policies of monetarist policies of the last one can really say decades, this productivity has gone down in the trans-Atlantic sector below the break-even point. This is why we need a national bank in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton; we need a

credit policy; we need an international credit system, a new Bretton Woods system. And you obviously need a "win-win" cooperation of all nations building the New Silk Road. Also, in

the United States, building the Silk Road to become a World Land-Bridge.

Now, extremely important is the fourth of the Four Laws,

which basically says that we cannot get an increase in the

productivity of the economy unless you go for a crash program of fusion power, and you go for a crash program of international cooperation for space research. Only if you do these kinds of avant-garde leaps in the productivity – like fusion technology brings you in a completely economic platform with the fusion torch. You will have energy security for the whole planet; you will have raw materials security because you can use any waste and differentiate out the different isotopes and reconstitute new raw materials by putting the isotopes together in the way required. So, it's a gigantic technological leap; and the same thing goes for space technology. It will have exactly the same impact as during the Apollo program when every investment in space technology, in rockets and other new materials, brought 14 cents back from each cent of investment. Everything from computer chips to Teflon cooking ware to all kinds of benefits occurred as a byproduct from space research. To get the world economy out of this present condition – especially in the trans-Atlantic sector – you need that kind of reorientation towards the scientific and technological progress, increases in energy flux density. All of this Green ideology which is really no development ideology has to be replaced; and the world has to go back in a direction where the real physical laws of the physical universe are the criteria for truth, and not some ideology."

OGDEN: Now, Helga LaRouche also delivered an equally inspiring, but much more extensive speech at a very important conference this week that occurred in Peru. This was the 23rd National Congress of the Association of Economists of Peru,

that  
was held in conjunction with the APEC meeting which is  
occurring  
over this weekend in Lima, Peru. The title of the conference  
was  
"The Peru-Brazil Bi-Oceanic Train; the Impact on the Economy  
of  
the Amazon Region and the Country". So, this is Peru-Brazil  
transcontinental railroad. Helga LaRouche's presentation was  
the  
keynote address; and she delivered it at the opening session.  
It  
was titled, "The New Silk Road Concept; Facing the Collapse of  
the World Financial System". This APEC summit which will be  
occurring this weekend, will be hosting world leaders  
including  
Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping. There has been a major surge  
in  
interest and engagement between China and these countries of  
South America, around the idea of expanding the New Silk Road  
into South America. That would also obviously have to include  
North America. This is the vision that Helga LaRouche has  
been  
emphasizing, and what she laid out in a very inspiring way in  
this speech in Peru; the idea of the New Silk Road Becomes the  
World Land-Bridge. The organizers of that conference – this  
national congress of economists, the economists' association  
in  
Peru – drafted their own copy of a 60-page pamphlet that they  
distributed to all the participants of this conference, that  
was  
based on excerpts from this report by {EIR} – "The New Silk  
Road  
Becomes the World Land-Bridge". It also included a printing  
of  
Lyndon LaRouche's Four New Laws concept. So, this is  
obviously a

very significant event; and the fact that it's happening in conjunction with the APEC summit at this moment in history, is very important. We hope to make the proceedings of that conference available to viewers of this website.

But what I can say is, we have now set the agenda. What's happening now is that the world is being forced to respond to the agenda that has been set over decades – but really in the last few months – by the LaRouche Movement internationally. You can see this by the flurry of coverage of Glass-Steagall inside the United States, and the fact that there's open discussion including from the new leadership of the Democratic Party: Warren, Sanders, Keith Ellison, and others. Now is the time to put Glass-Steagall on the table and get out in front of this. But the other element of this is the discussion of so-called "infrastructure". Now infrastructure can mean a lot of different things, and I'm sure that people watched the victory speech by President-elect Trump where he talked about building rail, building bridges, building airports, and so forth.

The latest development in that discussion is an article that is featured on the front page of the {New York Times} today, called "Trump-size Idea for a New President; Build Something Inspiring". Good headline, and the article starts off pretty inspiringly; it says the only way that you're going to be able to unify a bitterly divided America, is by building great infrastructure projects. Not just painting rusty bridges, or laying a few miles of asphalt, but "Build something awe-inspiring. Something Americans can be proud of. Something that will repay its investment many times over for generations

to  
come. Build the modern-day equivalent of the Golden Gate  
Bridge,  
the Hoover Dam, the Lincoln Tunnel " All of which were built  
by  
Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal administration. Then the  
article does also say, "Can anybody remember anything that  
came  
out of Obama's \$800 billion [stimulus package]? I don't  
think  
so." So, this article usefully cites what Franklin Roosevelt  
did  
with the PWA, the WPA: 700 miles of airport runways; 650,000  
miles or rail; 78,000 bridges; 125,000 military and civilian  
buildings, [including] 40,000 schools. This is massive. The  
article also usefully says the idea that any infrastructure  
project today could pay for itself through user fees is a  
ridiculous prospect. But the alternative that this article  
poses  
is just as bad; saying, the way to do it is for government to  
borrow most of the money from investors.

So, I think this demonstrates that we have a lot of  
work to  
do with putting the full concept of Lyndon LaRouche's Four  
Laws  
on the table. Now, this article cites a few useful  
infrastructure projects: a new rail tunnel under the Hudson  
River; California high-speed rail; a Northeast mag-lev  
corridor;  
a Miami sea wall; so forth and so on. But if you look at the  
vision that's presented in this pamphlet – "The United States  
Joins the New Silk Road: a Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic  
Renaissance" – with the Bering Strait tunnel rail project to  
connect Eurasia with the North and South American mega-  
continent.  
If you look at the amount of high-speed rail, if you look at  
the

water management programs; and most of all, if you look at what

China has been able to accomplish in just the last few years, you'll see that everything that is cited in this article absolutely pales in comparison.

And, there are some much deeper scientific points that have got to be addressed. 1. The understanding of what Alexander Hamilton actually did; and 2. What Lyndon LaRouche's science of economics defines as real productivity from the standpoint of increases in energy flux density. So, I think that sets up the discussion that we can have here right now. Ben, Diane, Kesha, and I think we should maybe expand from there.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think it's very important that Mr. LaRouche, increasingly in the last couple of months, has said over and over again, "Productivity; productivity; productivity." We have to start thinking about not just providing jobs, not just providing needed infrastructure projects. I think it's worth making a distinction between on the one side things that are just needed to maintain what we have. We have a massive deficit just to maintain the standard – I think the appropriate term is "platform" as Mr. LaRouche had introduced a couple of years back – about how to think about infrastructure and the real development of a national territory in a scientific way. You have a certain platform of activity, a standard of activity level that maintains a specific level of existence for your society;

directly connected to the potential relative population density of your society. We should always be looking to push to higher and higher platforms; higher levels of activity. Our current platform is degraded; much of the infrastructure we live upon was built largely under Franklin Roosevelt and a few spurts of activity following him on that. So on the hand, yeah, we need to rebuild some of these things. Our existing dam systems, transport systems, even soft infrastructure like health care systems are in need of repair. But we also need to push to a higher level; we need to go to a new platform which has higher degrees of productivity per capita. Higher degrees of ability to support a larger population in new area, new territories of the country; increase the productivity of existing territories, and that begins to create real growth. You're not going to get real growth just by rebuilding what you have; although you need to do that, because we've been letting this decay for decades now.

But you also need to create real economic value, real economic growth. And that goes to this issue of, are you increasing the productive powers of your labor force? Are you increasing the ability of your productive sector to produce the physical goods needed to support society more efficiently and at higher qualities with less physical input per capita, you could say? Can you measure those kinds of steps of growth? Are you taking that metric into account? That's critical right now; and



it's worth recognizing that we've been living in a post-industrial policy for many years now. This whole idea of the services economy, that somehow we can support ourselves by creating jobs in services; where we take turns washing each other's laundry. I make you a cup of coffee; you make me a hamburger. That doesn't actually create qualitative changes in

the ability of society to sustain more people at higher living standards. You're just trading service work back and forth.

So in all of this, we need to have a serious re-focussing on

what are the essential principles of human economic growth?

And

that's why Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws in totality is so crucial. That's why I thought it was very good in Mrs. LaRouche's orientation into our deployment into DC, she made a very clear point on Mr. LaRouche's fourth law – this fusion driver program.

These are the kinds of things that you might employ a relatively

small part of the population even in that specific endeavor; but

you're pushing the frontiers of engineering capabilities, scientific capabilities. That actually has the most important radiating effect on the entirety of the economy, the entirety of

the productive capabilities of the labor force.

You absolutely need this science driver, this high-technology, high capital-intensity driver program to really

push the whole program forward. The depth of the crisis that we've gone into just makes it that much more important that we have that element up there, front and center. Since Mr. LaRouche

put out this Four Laws document, he has also obviously been increasingly focussed on the role of space in that focus, in that

goal. That is another absolutely critical element of this. It was not an incomprehensible or miraculous thing that John F Kennedy's Apollo program had such a massive spin-off effect in terms of payback to the US economy from the investments that were made. The studies not that long after the project finished, were already showing a 14-1 payback in terms of the totality of increases of productivity of industries that were not part of the space program; but acquired technologies. Precision engineering capabilities; high-precision control systems for production; various things that were created out of necessity to make this super-advanced Moon mission work. But that increased the ability of mankind generally to be more productive in his production capabilities. That was then able to be applied throughout the economy generally.

So, those are the kinds of things that we absolutely need right now; not just repairing our existing degraded infrastructure. We're going to have to do that, sure; but how do you create the growth where you can afford to do that, and afford to make completely new investments? Part of this infrastructure discussion should be opening up new territories of the country. A major part of this pamphlet that we put out, and a huge part of Mrs. LaRouche's focus, has been new cities. You've got huge territories in the United States that are not developed. Let's develop the nation; let's expand new territories; let's create

huge areas of new growth. That's the kind of stuff that's going to drive the whole process forward. We're in a real need for some precise, clear, authoritative leadership on these issues, because these things are not understood. We're not just going into this in a vacuum; we have a completely broken down system; not just in the financial sector, but in the physical economy, too. So we need clear, precise, immediate action. We don't have years for somebody to figure this thing out over time; people's lives are on the line right now in terms of what's needed to turn the US economy around.

DIANE SARE: Well, I'd like to just put this in a context; because we're not having a discussion here in the abstract. And I want to go back to what Mr. LaRouche did in the 1970s with the creation of the Fusion Energy Foundation, and his role in being brought into a team to create a Presidency. I want to be very clear with the people watching this that what we are doing is not an academic discussion of nice things that we, sitting in a little corner, want to do. Mr. LaRouche – as you heard from what Ben laid out – had a very clear conception of the necessity of fusion energy at that time. Also, people remember the Jimmy Carter Presidency; small is beautiful. I think we were talking about global cooling back then, and now it's global warming. [One sentence paraphrase because of bad audio] What we needed

to  
do, in collaboration with Edward Teller, was to take the  
Mutually  
Assured Destruction doctrine off the table. The only  
deterrent  
to a nuclear war between the US and the Soviet Union was who  
could blow up the world more times over. What happened was,  
in  
the process of this, Ronald Reagan as a candidate and then as  
President, was recruited to this idea; and I think we've been  
told there a number of things which Mr. LaRouche was working  
on  
with the Reagan administration. Not the least of which was  
the  
SDI, which the Soviets rejected and Reagan announced, which  
led  
in a not-so-indirect way to the Berlin Wall coming down.  
Also,  
there was discussion of a meeting between President Reagan and  
Indira Gandhi, former prime minister of India who had been  
leader  
of the Non-Aligned Movement. Reagan, as people recall, was  
shot  
in '82; Indira Gandhi was assassinated; Mr. LaRouche was put  
in  
prison. I'm not saying that to say that we're worried about  
it;  
there's all kinds of questions of security and safety. But my  
point is that LaRouche personally has played a major,  
important  
role in shaping the institution of the Presidency; and his  
incarceration was timed for when we had earlier another such  
great opportunity, which was when the Soviet system collapsed  
economically as he warned it would. He was in prison, and his  
wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche put on the table with him the  
Productive  
Triangle and so on. We know what happened; that was sabotaged

by

a series of wars. The Balkans; the first Iraq War; we later had 9/11 and so on.

What we are doing today is to shape the American [nation] in participation with what is a New Paradigm; which LaRouche and his wife personally have been very much involved in creating. Two years ago, Mr. LaRouche announced that we should move the center of our American operations to New York City; which was done. In the last three or four months, we have begun circulation of a newspaper appropriately titled {The Hamiltonian}. I'll just say I found it ironic that the {New York Times} today has these headlines about infrastructure. They also have articles about how school children in Estonia and Latvia were terrified that Hillary Clinton was going to drag them into the middle ground of a war between NATO and Russia. It's very interesting.

The big title on {The Hamiltonian} this week is "We Are Facing a New Epoch for Mankind"; the subtitle is "The New York Times Has Become Irrelevant". So, they may be scrambling to make themselves relevant. But what you also see, is we have printed now, four weeks in a row, Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws. They have no excuse to be so idiotic on their proposals; both for how you fund this, and how they're thinking about it, which is all domestic.

The world now, what Mrs. LaRouche described in her speech in Peru, was that Xi Jinping made his announcement of this in

September of 2013. In those three years, he travelled to 37 nations; he made bilateral agreements with 56 nations; 39 new cargo routes have been opened. These are major international transportation corridors; 98 airports. The magnitude of this completely boggles the mind. It really is in keeping with what Hamilton would have envisioned; what you saw with Henry Carey, or John Quincy Adams in terms of their role in the United States. And I would say geographically, if you could step away, if you could get on a space ship and look at the Earth from a distance; or just take out a globe and look at what the United States is, where we are between the Atlantic and the Pacific. What North America is, and South America now getting involved, we have a great opportunity before us to play an absolutely strategic role in this. Our intent is to bring this about, which is why it's so crucial that everybody watching this, makes it a point to master the principles in Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws. Particularly the fourth principle, and also particularly the principle of credit; which is in a sense tied to the increase of productivity. We're not going to fund so-called infrastructure by tolls; we're not going to build a new bridge, a tunnel under the Hudson and charge people a toll and that's going to pay for it. No, if your population is able to produce orders of magnitude more than it is currently producing, that is a net increase in the wealth of the nation. It has nothing to do with tolls, or tickets for public

transportation; which are all sort of a form of tax farming and looting.

I do want to underscore: 1. The role of Lyndon LaRouche in shaping the Presidency; 2. That this is going to occur from Manhattan; the entire transition seems to be being organized from Trump Towers on Fifth Avenue in New York City. It is incumbent on all of us to raise this to the appropriate level of discussion and to not tolerate anything smaller.

KESHA ROGERS: Just to follow up on that, another important aspect of the fight waged by Mr. LaRouche and his wife Helga, going back to the 1970s around the fight that you just mentioned, Diane, of the Fusion Energy Foundation, was the fight against this apparatus of a zero-growth or no-growth culture. He was very instrumental with Mrs. LaRouche and also their collaboration with space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke – who we've mentioned a lot – on taking on this degeneracy of the attack on population reduction that was being promoted and continues to be promoted to this day. Many people may remember that there was a book put out in the 1970s by two men, Dennis Meadows and Jay Forrester. Jay Forrester just died recently at 98 years old. He was instrumental in putting out the computer models which indicated that there was a certain relationship between the limited resources on Earth and the production of food to how many

people

you can sustain on Earth and so forth. This is something that Mr. LaRouche has taken directly in terms of this is an attack on

the human identity, an attack on the real productivity based on

the creative potential of the human mind and LaRouche's model has

been brought up on the increasing of the energy flux density of

your economy per capita, and per land area.

I think it's really important right now to look at the fact

that Mr. LaRouche sees this fight as a complete shift in the global direction of mankind; unifying mankind on a level that nations have never been unified on before. I thought it was important that yesterday, we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche

– Ben, myself, and others from the leadership team; and one thing that he brought up was the integration of the space program

and the development of space research, space science, and the exploration of space to Classical music – which we're really defining in the development of our Manhattan Project, which is really shaping our organization across the country and internationally. You have seen a culture which is completely degenerated under the Bush-Obama Presidencies. You take the inspiration, the culture which shaped the identity of the fight

and the vision that led President John F Kennedy to implement the

space program in the way he did. The fact that he brought in people like Pablo Casals into the White House; that this classical identity and classical culture was very instrumental throughout the space program, by people such as space pioneer [Werner] von Braun and various others working with him. Some of



these scientists who came with von Braun, like Krafft Ehrlicke and others, from Germany; who helped to shape the US space program.

It's interesting; you compare that to what you've seen under Bush. Who did he bring into the White House during his inauguration? I think it was Ozzy Osbourne; rock music, heavy metal. Then you had Obama bringing in Beyoncé, not to mention the other very degenerate cultural figures that he has brought in. So, I think what Mr. LaRouche is saying around this is extremely important.

I think it's also important to look at the space program and the integration of the classical culture as the expression of a higher identity of what it means to be human, and the inspiration and optimism that's been missing from the population. There's a few more things we can say on this; I think it's also important to recognize the importance internationally of what China is doing. We can say more on this later, but the fact that when you talk about inspiration and optimism, we have now the Shenzhou 11 space crew, the crew in China who just docked 33 days ago to the Tiangong 2, the space lab for China. They're doing experiments that are quite phenomenal; but what they're really expressing — they're going to continue doing these experiments in space. One of the things we saw back in 2013, when you had the astronauts docking the first space lab for China, videoing this and beaming

it back to Earth; and 60 million children watching it. They're going to do something similar for this space experiment. This is something that we have to go back to right now; the space program is not just some abstract thing on the side for gurus who like it. We have to make it part of the culture; we have to make it something that inspires and uplifts the population again, but is instrumental in the development of the increases of the productivity of society and increases in the platform. So that means that the population has to come to a higher level of understanding of their identity; and the way to do that is really an integration of culture, as Mr. LaRouche has made clear.

OGDEN: One thing you brought up, and I thought it was good to go back to; the conjunction of Kennedy's space program, the kind of inspiration and culture needed. This was something very conscious to the Kennedy administration; not only did they bring Pablo Casals to the White House, but this was part of a broader discussion between John F Kennedy, Jackie Kennedy, and Pierre Salinger, who was the Press Secretary. But before he became Kennedy's Press Secretary, had been a child prodigy; had been a concert pianist, a composer. He had discussions with Jackie Kennedy which he records in his book, where Jackie Kennedy said the role of the White House should be to set a tone for the arts

which will encourage great culture, classical culture around the country. And we should exhibit the finest of culture, of art; we should set the standard which everybody else can then rise to that level.

It is good that you brought up, Kesha, in conjunction has happened politically, where New York City has definitely become the center of gravity of the political universe of the United States. It's not just Trump; Clinton was also New York City. It was a strategic decision to center a very active organization in New York; but that entire process has also happened in parallel with what Diane has been leading there with this revival of Classical music and culture. That's very important, even from the standpoint of what is our idea of man; and the dignity of human beings. Yes, granted, there were dark tones during this Presidential campaign which is not acceptable. But the idea of the dignity of man, and the creativity of the entire human species is what is embodied in the greatest of Classical music. It's one thing to point actually, Diane; that first Messiah concert which launched the New York City renaissance project, happened in the context of this racial tension that was heating up in New York at that time. So, this still is a very important aspect of addressing that.

SARE: I just wanted to add one quick thing on that note; which is a musical question actually, if you think about a

symphony orchestra or a chorus and the role that individuals play as part of that body; where the whole is definitely greater than the sum of its parts. Were we to launch a transformation of society along the lines of what Mrs. LaRouche outlined in Peru; that is, the US to become integrated in part of the Belt and Road program, then I think we would quickly discover that we actually don't have enough people in this country. So that all the things that people are afraid about, about who's going to be excluded, who's going to be deported, etc.; you will find yourself looking at your fellow human beings with new eyes because of the creative potential of each individual which will be necessary to transform the nation and the world in the immediate future.

OGDEN: Ben was just referencing some of Mr. LaRouche's early writings on economics which really get to the question of how do you measure productivity. This is not just raw labor power; this is not just the number of jobs. But it is the question of generation upon generation, can you produce more than is consumed? But can you do it in a way where the power of the human species actually is transformed almost as a species characteristic, step by step? I've found it very inspiring that during those opening remarks that we played by Helga, she went

back to the discussion of what we used to call the isotope economy. What power can mankind wield if we penetrate not just to the molecular level, but to the very atomic level? Fission power is breaking apart the atom; fusion is an entirely different matter, where you actually have the ability to create new elements. You have the ability to create new isotopes of any given elements, which have very differing characteristics. It's the promise of Promethean fire, which mankind has been working towards over millennia; but we have not yet achieved. This is an inspiring subject, but the ability of mankind to wield power at the very basic level of the fabric of matter; that's an entirely new power.

DENISTON: Yeah, and it's a huge subject that could be probably taken up in much more detail. It really goes to the question of what is a resource? What do we consider as a resource; and how that continually changes as mankind develops. Once you go to this level of an isotope conception of resources, we don't use up isotopes. When you use petroleum or wood, anything you use – unless you're actually doing fission and fusion, when the total amount of matter you're working with is very small – you're not actually destroying the elements themselves. You might be acting on a state of organization that's been created. We might be looking for certain states of organization to utilize the properties of that as a resource at a certain point. But I think this goes right to the issue of the

isotope economy, the intimate connection with energy flux density where we could begin to create those states of organization ourselves; or work with lower states of quality of concentrations of ores and various things. Where things that were not economical before to do, or not even possible to do before; if you get a higher energy flux density, a higher energy throughput, you can begin to manage in a completely new way. Separating the quality of resource elements that we want; organizing them in new ways.

Helga mentioned this very exciting prospect that's been talked about to some degree for years of this fusion torch idea. That you could take stuff that now is just trash, trash is fundamentally everything we use; that's why it's our trash. It was something that we were using that was useful to us. Now, we might have degraded it in some way and put it in a landfill; but the fundamental constituents of what made it useful are still there. So, it's not inconceivable to think of mankind progressing to a point where we could reprocess even these landfills. That might be a little ways away; there will be some steps along the way to get there. But those are the kinds of complete transformations in what mankind can do to recreate the cycles of productivity that support, again, larger populations at higher living standards; and really going in the opposite direction than we've been going in for decades.

Right now, a family needs to work three or four jobs just to not get by month-to-month, and not be able to afford health care, not be able to afford education. We need a society where one job can sustain a significantly sized family and provide these kinds of benefits – higher education, health care, and have free time for arts, for recreation, for developing the cultural mental powers of your family and yourself. How you're going to get to that point is going at these issues we're talking about here, of actually increasing the productivity of the labor force as a whole; the productive powers of the labor force as a whole. Pushing these kinds of science driver, technology driver programs, that make these kinds of breakthroughs.

Mr. LaRouche's point on this as a new focus, that he's put on this in the recent period, is really critical. We got to raise this discussion to not just jobs, but productivity. What's your ability to produce things? If we're serious about turning the economy around. It's kind of been referenced here and there, but we have allies in doing that. It's not just going to be completely on our own shoulders. We have to decide to do it, but China has said, "Hey, United States! If you want to quit this geopolitical, 19th Century crazy game and get to some serious discussion about creating a future for mankind, that's what we're doing. So, if you want to work with us, we'd be happy to

cooperate with you in a serious, honest investment and development for our nations." Many other nations are rallying around China in their effort to do that; so that's there as a critical support point, if the United States makes this shift. These are the critical issues that we've got to put on the table and fight out.

And again, Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws, as he said, is a central organizing document around that whole perspective.

ROGERS: Yeah, it's also important to note that as Mr. LaRouche said, in the calling for the implementation and enactment of the Four Laws that he's put on the table as an urgent necessity, Glass-Steagall being the first and urgently needed measure, is not an option or a compromise with the Wall Street bankers. He indicated that it has to be the Franklin Roosevelt; and it can't be a watered-down Dodd-Frank compromise or anything of that nature. There's only one way you're going to wipe out this casino economy, Wall Street speculation; and I think that goes the same for the measures needed with the development of the types of density and increase in energy source and fusion economy as Mr. LaRouche is calling for. There's a lot of compromise out there about that, too. "Fusion is a long way away; it's never going to happen. The politicians aren't going to let it happen." All of this stuff.

I attended a space conference this week; and one of the things that was being promoted in terms of deep space exploration was solar-electric power. "Yes, we agree; nuclear, increase in



fusion sources is most important, but it's not practical. So, we're going to go with this." Or, "We're going to push this, because it's probably something we can get through Congress." That's the most insane thing you can think of. When they talked about to carry cargo into space would be 2-3 years, is that real productivity? How are you going to advance mankind's exploration into space and the ability to actually go out to a Moon mission as a base? And a Mars mission? Also, just increasing what Ben was just discussing in terms of our ability to increase our resources here on Earth. The mining of Helium-3 on the Moon and various other resources, that we've talked about.

Once again, the point was, a lot of people want to compromise on these things. There cannot be compromise because there is a global shift underway; and that global shift is requiring an increase in the highest levels of scientific development that has to be implemented immediately. This is why Mr. LaRouche's fourth law in terms of fusion driver program, is something that – just like Glass-Steagall – cannot be compromised on; and is absolutely fundamental for pushing forth the breakthroughs which are necessary.

OGDEN: Well, that was Helga LaRouche's point during the opening segment that we played today; that it is incumbent on all the activists, all the viewers of this broadcast, to master the

contents of Mr. LaRouche's Four Laws document. This might seem like a short document, but it's a very dense document; and a lot of the subjects that Ben has brought up here today in terms of the definition of economic productivity and what the nature of mankind is. Kesha, what you were saying; there really are no limits to growth. This is not some kind of thing, where when we reach our carrying capacity, that will be it. It's mankind transforming its own species; transforming the universe, and transforming our relationship to the universe. That's what's addressed in this policy document by Lyndon LaRouche. You have to set the bar that high; it cannot be any lower than that level from which you're going to effect the kind of revolution in policy that's necessary for the entire planet at this time.

So, we have a lot of work to do. The Congress was only in session for a day and a half this week. But what that means, is that they are back in their districts; and I'm telling you, it's not going to be like business as usual. This is not what the conditions were before this election. It's all the more important to think from the standpoint of what Diane was mentioning in the beginning of the show: Our role is – and has always been – to shape the institution of government of the United States from the very highest level. This is not coming in from the outside; this is not a voice calling in the darkness. This is working with the leadership of the nations of the planet and creating the dynamic that you now see taking over. This has

been decades in the making; but I can guarantee you, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played a role that has been central to this reality now coming into being. I'm talking about the New Silk Road; I'm talking about this trilateral relationship between Russia, China, and India, creating a new dynamic on the Eurasian continent. Everything that's happening in South America right now is something that Lyndon LaRouche was personally involved in over decades; and now South America coming into the New Silk Road and joining this new World Land-Bridge is something that is very real.

Nothing is determined; but our role is to continue that fight inside the United States, and to make this a reality – "The United States {Joins} the New Silk Road". We put it in the present tense for a reason.

So, I'd invite Diane, Kesha, if there's anything concluding that you'd like to say before we close out the show?

SARE: I think one great benefit of launching this recovery and increasing the productivity is all the states which just voted to legalize marijuana, will have second thoughts about that.

DENISTON: We want high productivity, and it doesn't mean that.

OGDEN: You'll turn out like Gary Johnson and have an "Aleppo moment".

OK. We'll take that as a concluding point here. Please stay tuned. We will make the full speech that Helga delivered in Peru available. The audio at least, or maybe the video. There was also a very productive dialogue that occurred with the participants of that meeting with Helga, following her keynote speech. So, that's an important thing to stay tuned for. Also, we will be producing a feature video – about 10 or 15 minutes in length – on the content of the Four New Laws. That fleshes out some of the Hamiltonian aspect of that; and it's an educational tool to teach yourself and to teach everybody else real economics. So stay tuned for that; that will be coming to the website soon.

Thank you for watching; please subscribe to our YouTube channel and our daily email updates. All of the information is available in the description of this video available below the video in the YouTube player. Thank you and we'll talk to you soon. Stay tuned.

---

**Rumforskning og klassisk kultur**  
**– vi må genoprette den**

# degeneration hos det amerikanske folk, der har fundet sted under Bush og Obama


*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 17. november, 2016* – I hele nationen, og i hele verden, træder ledende personer nu frem for at fastslå det potentiale, der nu præsenteres for USA og verden, for at gøre en ende på den død og ødelæggelse, der er blevet gennemtvunget under administrationerne Bush og Obama. General Harald Kujat, tidligere stabschef for det tyske Bundeswehr, har påpeget de drastisk forbedrede relationer mellem USA og Rusland, som Trump og Putin har sat i gang som grundlaget – og det eneste grundlag – for at løse de uhyrlige kriser i Ukraine og Syrien. Tidligere amerikanske ambassadør Chas Freeman, der også tidligere har været viceforsvarsminister, sagde i et interview med Ron Paul, at Trump »bør erindre sig, at han grundlæggende set har anført en revolution – han anførte en flok mennesker, som Hillary Clinton kaldte ynkelige, til at komme ud til stemmeurnerne og markere deres afvisning af 'politik som hidtil' i Washington, og til den rent ud sagt degenererede atmosfære i vores politiske kultur«. Han roste Trumps stærke insistensen på, at USA må gå sammen med Rusland og fokusere på at knuse ISIS i Syrien snarere end at vælte Assad for regimeskift i Syrien og tilføjede, at det var »rent ud sagt vanvittigt, at USA prætenderer, at vi har absolut fortrinsret i havene ud for Kina på ubestemt tid«

Fremkaldt af valgchokket er en politisk følsomhed ved at overvinde den amerikanske befolknings og de europæiske befolkningers accept af ledere, der sanseløst dræber hundreder af tusinder af mennesker og ødelægger hele nationer samtidig med, at de fordriver millioner fra deres hjem som flygtninge.

Men, hvad er da årsagen til denne tidligere blinde accept af sådan ondskab? Den må fastslås som værende lokaliseret i befolkningernes degenererede intellekt, i ødelæggelsen af de menneskelige, skabende evner hos folk, der i to årtier har været underkastet et kulturelt forfald. Når troen på menneskets videnskabelige evne til at »underlægge sig hele naturen«, både på Jorden og i Universet, fordømmes af 'de grønne' som en ødelæggelse af Moder Jord, og underholdning reduceres til narkotika, vold og perversiteter; når skøn musik erstattes af pulserende støj – da er det muligt at overbevise folkeslagene om at lukke deres øjne for den rædsel, der begås i deres navn.

Nu er disse sind ved at blive vækket, både gennem den økonomiske ødelæggelse af deres liv, og gennem den revolutionerende ændring via valget, der giver et glimt af håb.

Som Lyndon LaRouche har sagt i mere end fyrre år, så er det i et sådant skæbnesvangert øjeblik i historien, at den optimistiske tro på menneskehedens potentiale for fremskridt kan og må genoprettes og sikre en fremtid for alle mænd og kvinder på vores planet, gennem videnskabelige fremskridt, der løfter vort blik mod stjernerne, og gennem skønheden i klassisk kunst og musik, »ved hvilken man kommer til frihed«, som Friedrich Schiller sagde.

Frihed, fra City of Londons og Wall Streets destruktive magt over de vestlige regeringer, er nu inden for rækkevidde i takt med, at parlamentarikere, slagte af forbløffelse, i Europa og USA konfronteres med det eneste alternativ til det bankerotte, vestlige finanssystems ukontrollable kollaps: en  Glass/Steagall-reform for at lukke de for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned-spillebuler på Wall Street ned, og med en kreditpolitik i Hamiltons tradition, med princippet om national, dvs. statslig, bankpraksis til genrejsning af økonomien, rumprogrammet, videnskabelig forskning og internationalt samarbejde omkring nationsopbygning i hele

verden, hvor den Nye Silkevej bringes til hele menneskeheden.  
(LaRouches Fire Økonomiske Love til USA's – og verdens –  
omgående redning.)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oYvdB5j1Flk>

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche diskuterer strategi med aktivister fra LaRouchePAC, der er på vej til Washington, D.C., hvor hun understreger, at Trumps sejr og Clintons nederlag må ses som en del af et internationalt kursskifte. Det er nu op til os at sætte dagsordenen, begyndende med LaRouches Fire Love i traditionen efter Hamilton.*

*»Først og fremmest vil jeg gerne sige hej til jer. Dette er selvfølgelig en meget vigtig intervention, for valgresultatet i USA, som mange mennesker ikke så komme, er i realiteten en del af en global udvikling. Alle forklaringerne, som de amerikanske medier kommer med, er for det meste røgslør, eller en eller anden forloren forklaring, som f.eks., at det var FBI, der kostede Hillary valget, osv., osv.*

*Det, der i virkeligheden finder sted rent strategisk, er, at befolkningsmasserne i den transatlantiske sektor – i Europa, og i USA i særdeleshed – nu virkelig har fået nok af et Establishment, der vedvarende har handlet imod deres interesser. Det, de kalder »overløberstaterne« – menneskene i disse stater er ikke repræsenteret af det transatlantiske etablissement. Dette ved de, fordi, for dem, er livs- og arbejdsvilkårene i løbet af det seneste årti, kan man sige, men i realiteten i løbet af de seneste 50 år, kun blevet værre og værre. Folk er nødt til at have flere jobs samtidig for at få økonomien til at hænge sammen. Der har været mange tilfælde, hvor deres sønner, og undertiden endda deres døtre, er blevet udsendt til Irak fem gange i træk og er kommet hjem, totalt nedbrudte. Så folk har oplevet, at livet bare bliver værre for dem, og at de med Washington/New York-etablissementet intet håb har.*

Man så det samme fænomen med Brexit-folkeafstemningen i Storbritannien i juni måned; som også her ikke bare handlede om flygtningene, og ikke bare handlede om de mere åbenlyse spørgsmål, selv om disse spiller en vis katalyserende rolle; men, det var den samme, fundamentale følelse af uretfærdighed, og at der simpelt hen ikke længere findes en regering, der tager sig af det almene vel. Og uanset, hvilke forklaringer, de hoster op med, så vil dette ikke forsvinde, før situationen er forbedret, og god regering er genetableret i USA og Europa, og i andre dele af verden.

Det umiddelbart næste punkt, hvor den samme vrede med al sandsynlighed vil vise sig, er ved den forestående folkeafstemning i Italien – hvor man den 4. december vil have en folkeafstemning om en forfatningsændring og, som stemningen i øjeblikket er, som også vil blive en afstemning imod Renzi-regeringen. Renzi lovede først at træde tilbage; nu siger han, at han ikke vil træde tilbage: Under alle omstændigheder, så vil denne udvikling fortsætte, indtil man indsætter en forbedring.

Trumps valgsejr er selvsagt et åbent spørgsmål, for det står endnu ikke klart, hvad hans præsidentskab vil blive for ét; men, som Lyndon LaRouche har understreget næsten hver dag siden valget, så er dette ikke et lokalt, amerikansk anliggende. Dette er et globalt anliggende; det er et internationalt spørgsmål.

En af de væsentligste grunde til, at Trump vandt valget, er, at han, især i den seneste fase, havde understreget, at Hillary Clinton ville betyde Tredje Verdenskrig pga. hendes politik for Syrien, fordi hun ... foreslog en frontal konfrontation med Rusland. Det var præcist at ramme hovedet på sømmet, for vi befinder os på en meget, meget farlig kurs for konfrontation med Rusland og Kina.

Under valgkampagnen har Trump gentagne gange sagt, at han ville have en anden holdning over for Rusland. Og siden han



blev valgt, har han talt i telefon med både Putin og Xi Jinping og i begge tilfælde sagt, at han vil arbejde for at forbedre relationerne mellem USA og så Rusland og Kina, hhv. Dette er selvsagt ekstremt vigtigt; og det andet, ekstremt vigtige spørgsmål er: Vil han følge op på sit løfte om Glass-Steagall, hvor han især i byen Charlotte atter sagde, at han ville gennemføre Glass-Steagall?

Dette er virkelig hovedspørgsmålet. For kun, hvis man gør en ende på kasinoøkonomien, som er den virkelige årsag til krig, kan situationen i realiteten bringes tilbage på ret køl. Alle de progressive – Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren og selv [Nancy] Pelosi – har allerede sagt, at de vil samarbejde med Trump, hvis han vil satse på dette økonomiske program med infrastruktur/jobskabelse/Glass-Steagall.

Vi bør lade tvivlen komme ham til gode; men, vi bør også være klar over, at hele Wall Street-slænget og de neokonservative i det Republikanske Parti vil gøre alt for ikke at få dette. Derfor må vi have denne intervention for virkelig at opdrage Kongressen og Senatet mht. det, der virkelig står på spil. Hele verden holder nu øje med – holder så at sige vejret – spørgsmålet, om der kommer en ændring til det bedre i amerikansk politik?

Det gør der forhåbentligt. Men det vil kræve alle forholdsreglerne. Glass-Steagall som den absolutte forudsætning, uden hvilken intet andet vil fungere; men det er ikke nok. For, vi taler ikke bare om en bankreform. Vi taler om et totalt nyt paradigme i det økonomiske system. Og dette nye paradigme må defineres af LaRouches Fire Love, som alle må sikre sig, at de forstår, når de skal udføre denne form for lobbyvirksomhed.

For, Lyndon LaRouche har understreget, at nøglen er at øge arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Som følge af de seneste årtiers neoliberale, eller monetaristiske, politik, er denne produktivitet i den transatlantiske sektor faldet under

punktet for break-even, hvor det går lige op. Dette er grunden til, at vi må have en nationalbank i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton; vi må have en politik for statskredit; vi må have et internationalt kreditsystem, et nyt Bretton Woods-system; og vi må selvsagt have et 'win-win'-samarbejde mellem alle nationer omkring opbygningen af den Nye Silkevej – også internt i USA – så den bliver til en verdenslandbro.

Af ekstraordinær betydning er den fjerde af de Fire Love, der siger, at man ikke kan få en forøgelse af økonomiens produktivitet, med mindre man satser på et forceret program for at opnå fusionskraft; samt et internationalt program for udforskning af rummet. For kun, hvis man foretager denne form for avantgarde-spring i produktiviteten – fusionsteknologi vil bringe os en helt anden, økonomisk platform. Med fusionsfaklen vil vi blive i stand til at få sikkerhed i energiforsyningen til hele planeten; man vil få nye råmaterialer, fordi man vil blive i stand til at bruge ethvert affaldsprodukt, hvor man udskiller diverse isotoper og genskaber nye råmaterialer ved at sammensplejse isotoperne, som det skal gøres.

Så det repræsenterer et gigantisk, teknologisk spring. Det samme gælder for rumfartsteknologi, for det vil få samme virkning som under Apolloprogrammet, hvor hver investering i rumteknologi, i raketter, i andre nye materialer, gav 14 cents tilbage for hver cent, der blev investeret. Og alt fra computerchips til Teflon-køkkengrej, og alle mulige gavnlige resultater, opstod som biprodukter af rumforskning.

Og for at få verdensøkonomien ud af den nuværende tilstand, især i den transatlantiske sektor, må man have denne form for kursomlægning i retning af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt og en forøgelse af **energigennemstrømningstætheden**. Og hele denne Grønne ideologi – som i virkeligheden er en ikke-udviklingsideologi – må erstattes; og verden må komme tilbage til den kurs, hvor det fysiske univers' virkelige, fysiske love er kriteriet for sandheden, og ikke en eller anden ideologi.«


*Foto: Besætningen fra ekspedition 49, Shane Kimbrough, NASA-astronaut, sammen med Roscosmos-kosmonauterne Sergej Ryzhikov og Andrej Borisenko, og som alle i øjeblikket befinder sig om bord på den Internationale Rumstation, hvor de har arbejdet sammen i over fire måneder i kredsløb. [foto: NASA]*

---

## **Trump og Putin kan, og må, knuse terrorisme i Syrien – og globalt**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 16. november, 2016 – I kølvandet på Trumps produktive diskussioner over telefon med Vladimir Putin og Xi Jinping i denne uge, og den politiske bortgang af Obamas (og Hillarys) krigsplaner, er der intet til hinder for, at disse tre, store nationer kan samarbejde om at knuse den britisk/saudisk-sponsorerede terrormaskine internationalt, med begyndelse i ISIS og al-Nusra i Syrien. »Der er ingen anden måde at gøre det på«, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag. »Putin står i centrum for dette. Enhver hæmning af dette må forhindres.«*

Den amerikanske befolkning er hastigt i færd med at indse, at det lange mareridt med økonomisk forfald, epidemien med narkotika og selvmord, evindelige krige og den ærefrygtindgydende trussel om atomkrig, endelig kunne være forbi. Otte år med Bush og Obama er ved at være slut. Det er stadig uklart, om Donald Trump vil lægge sin populisme til side til fordel for at gennemføre Glas-Steagall og knuse Wall Streets magt over USA's regering og økonomi – som han har lovet, han ville gøre. Det vil afhænge af, om det amerikanske folk mobiliserer sig selv til støtte for en løsning – og ikke

blot en afvisning af de seneste otte års ondskab. Denne  løsning ligger nu foran dem, i form af **LaRouches Fire Love: Glass-Steagall**; en genindførelse af nationalbankvirksomhed; en afslutning af monetarisme til fordel for et kreditsystem i Hamiltons tradition, til finansiering af infrastruktur inden for landbrug og industri, uddannelse og sundhedssektoren; og en genindførelse af videnskabelig udvikling, begyndende med et genoplivet NASA-rumprogram og stærkt udvidet forskning inden for fusionskraft.

I dag ankom hold af aktivister fra New York, Baltimore og Virginia til Kongressen med krav om ikke at vente til Trumps indsættelse, men derimod handle i denne 'lame duck'-overgangsperiode for at gennemføre Glass-Steagall og de Fire Love. Det Demokratiske Parti er i oprør efter de tæsk, de fik i valgene til præsidentskabet og Kongressen, men meldinger fra LaRouche-aktivister i hele landet lyder på, at mange demokrater langt om længe ser den kendsgerning i øjnene, at Obama og Hillary Clinton havde tilsluttet sig de republikanske neokonservative, der ikke tjener den amerikanske befolkning, men Wall Street og krigsmaskinen. Trumps afvisning af både Obama og de republikanske neokonservative, med samt deres krigsplaner, under sin kampagne, skabte et tilflugtssted for demokrater, der så onskaben med Obamas drabsmaskine.

De neokonservatives »unipolære« verden – med Obamas udtryk, »vi sætter reglerne« – har beviseligt skabt USA's og dets EU-allieredes totale isolation internationalt. I Europa går valgene, efter Brexit, imod EU-diktaturet og for en genopretning af bånd til Rusland, som det ses i Bulgarien og Moldova. Tyrkiets udenrigsminister sagde i dag, at hans land føler en sådan lede over de europæiske ledere, der truer med at smide det ud af NATO eller afslår dets anmodning om optagelse i EU, at de planlægger en folkeafstemning om nationens forhold til EU – en »Tyrkxit«.

Et alternativ viser sig klart. Med sit »Nye Paradigme« centreret omkring politikken for den Nye Silkevej, rejste Xi

Jinping i dag til Sydamerika, hvor Ecuador, Peru og Chile vil være vært for statsbesøg, og hvor han også vil deltage i APEC-topmødet i Peru. Ecuadors præsident Correa lovpriste Kinas rolle i at transformere hans lands fysiske økonomi i løbet af det seneste årti og beskrev det aktuelle besøg som »det vigtigste besøg af noget statsoverhoved i Ecuadors historie«.

✘ Den samme entusiasme for et nyt paradigme ses i hele Afrika og Asien, og i stigende grad også i Øst- og Vesteuropa. Overalt grunder folk på en fremtid, hvor USA ikke længere truer med krige og undergravning gennem »farvede revolutioner«, men som i stedet går med i BRIKS, AIIB og den Nye Silkevej om opbygning af en fremtid for hele menneskeheden. Dette potentiale må realiseres, især i selve USA. Et vindue mod muligheder åbner sig for os, men det kunne være kortvarigt, og med utænkelige konsekvenser, hvis vi mislykkes.

*Foto: Gipsmodellen af Frihedsstatuen (Statue of Freedom), bronzestatuen på toppen af Capitols kuppel, står i Capitols Emancipation Hall.*

---

## **Nej, det var ikke FBI's værk: Dette er et globalt paradigmeskift**

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 15. november, 2016 – I kølvandet på diskussionerne om fundamentalt nye amerikansk-russiske og amerikansk-kinesiske relationer mellem valgte præsident Donald Trump og den russiske og kinesiske præsident, hhv., vil vi, på Asia-Pacific Economic Conference (APEC) i Peru i denne uge, muligvis få en erstatning for Obamas fejlslagne TPP*

»handelsaftale« at se, og i stedet få en ny handelsaftale, der er initieret af Kina, med 19 andre lande, inkl. Trumps USA. Den støtte opbygning af et nyt, økonomisk paradigme omkring den Nye Silkevejs store, »win-win« infrastrukturprojekter, vil tage endnu et stort skridt fremad. Dette er, hvad USA må tilslutte sig, med en ny, statslig kreditinstitution, og med en ny Glass/Steagall-lov, der vil nedkæmpe Wall Street.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som vil tale for Sammenslutningen af Peruvianske Økonomers nationale konference aftenen før APEC-konferencen, sendte dette budskab til aktivister fra New York State, der har kurs mod Washington, D.C., for at kræve Glass-Steagall:

*»Først og fremmest vil jeg gerne sige hej til jer. Dette er selvfølgelig en meget vigtig intervention, for valgresultatet i USA, som mange mennesker ikke så komme, er i realiteten en del af en global udvikling. Alle forklaringerne, som de amerikanske medier kommer med, er for det meste røgslør, eller en eller anden forløren forklaring, som f.eks., at det var FBI, der kostede Hillary valget, osv., osv.*

*Det, der i virkeligheden finder sted rent strategisk, er, at befolkningsmasserne i den transatlantiske sektor – i Europa, og i USA i særdeleshed – nu virkelig har fået nok af et Establishment, der vedvarende har handlet imod deres interesser. Det, de kalder »overløberstaterne« – menneskene i disse stater er ikke repræsenteret af det transatlantiske etablissement. Dette ved de, fordi, for dem, er livs- og arbejdsvilkårene i løbet af det seneste årti, kan man sige, men i realiteten i løbet af de seneste 50 år, kun blevet værre og værre. Folk er nødt til at have flere jobs samtidig for at få økonomien til at hænge sammen. Der har været mange tilfælde, hvor deres sønner, og undertiden endda deres døtre, er blevet udsendt til Irak fem gange i træk og er kommet hjem, totalt nedbrudte. Så folk har oplevet, at livet bare bliver værre for dem, og at de med Washington/New York-etablissementet intet håb har.*

Man så det samme fænomen med Brexit-folkeafstemningen i Storbritannien i juni måned; som også her ikke bare handlede om flygtningene, og ikke bare handlede om de mere åbenlyse spørgsmål, selv om disse spiller en vis katalyserende rolle; men, det var den samme, fundamentale følelse af uretfærdighed, og at der simpelt hen ikke længere findes en regering, der tager sig af det almene vel. Og uanset, hvilke forklaringer, de hoster op med, så vil dette ikke forsvinde, før situationen er forbedret, og god regering er genetableret i USA og Europa, og i andre dele af verden.

Det umiddelbart næste punkt, hvor den samme vrede med al sandsynlighed vil vise sig, er ved den forestående folkeafstemning i Italien – hvor man den 4. december vil have en folkeafstemning om en forfatningsændring og, som stemningen i øjeblikket er, som også vil blive en afstemning imod Renzi-regeringen. Renzi lovede først at træde tilbage; nu siger han, at han ikke vil træde tilbage: Under alle omstændigheder, så vil denne udvikling fortsætte, indtil man indsætter en forbedring.

Trumps valgsejr er selvsagt et åbent spørgsmål, for det står endnu ikke klart, hvad hans præsidentskab vil blive for ét; men, som Lyndon LaRouche har understreget næsten hver dag siden valget, så er dette ikke et lokalt, amerikansk anliggende. Dette er et globalt anliggende; det er et internationalt spørgsmål.

En af de væsentligste grunde til, at Trump vandt valget, er, at han, især i den seneste fase, havde understreget, at Hillary Clinton ville betyde Tredje Verdenskrig pga. hendes politik for Syrien, fordi hun ... foreslog en frontal konfrontation med Rusland. Det var præcist at ramme hovedet på sømmet, for vi befinder os på en meget, meget farlig kurs for konfrontation med Rusland og Kina.

Under valgkampagnen har Trump gentagne gange sagt, at han ville have en anden holdning over for Rusland. Og siden han

blev valgt, har han talt i telefon med både Putin og Xi Jinping og i begge tilfælde sagt, at han vil arbejde for at forbedre relationerne mellem USA og så Rusland og Kina, hhv. Dette er selvsagt ekstremt vigtigt; og det andet, ekstremt vigtige spørgsmål er: Vil han følge op på sit løfte om Glass-Steagall, hvor han især i byen Charlotte atter sagde, at han ville gennemføre Glass-Steagall?

Dette er virkelig hovedspørgsmålet. For kun, hvis man gør en ende på kasinoøkonomien, som er den virkelige årsag til krig, kan situationen i realiteten bringes tilbage på ret køl. Alle de progressive – Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren og selv [Nancy] Pelosi – har allerede sagt, at de vil samarbejde med Trump, hvis han vil satse på dette økonomiske program med infrastruktur/jobskabelse/Glass-Steagall.

Vi bør lade tvivlen komme ham til gode; men, vi bør også være klar over, at hele Wall Street-slænget og de neokonservative i det Republikanske Parti vil gøre alt for ikke at få dette. Derfor må vi have denne intervention for virkelig at opdrage Kongressen og Senatet mht. det, der virkelig står på spil. Hele verden holder nu øje med – holder så at sige vejret – spørgsmålet, om der kommer en ændring til det bedre i amerikansk politik?

Det gør der forhåbentligt. Men det vil kræve alle forholdsreglerne. Glass-Steagall som den absolutte forudsætning, uden hvilken intet andet vil fungere; men det er ikke nok. For, vi taler ikke bare om en bankreform. Vi taler om et totalt nyt paradigme i det økonomiske system. Og dette nye paradigme må defineres af **LaRouches Fire Love**, som alle må sikre sig, at de forstår, når de skal udføre denne form for lobbyvirksomhed.

For, Lyndon LaRouche har understreget, at nøglen er at øge arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Som følge af de seneste årtiers neoliberale, eller monetaristiske, politik, er denne produktivitet i den transatlantiske sektor faldet under



punktet for break-even, hvor det går lige op. Dette er grunden til, at vi må have en nationalbank i traditionen efter Alexander Hamilton; vi må have en politik for statskredit; vi må have et internationalt kreditsystem, et nyt Bretton Woods-system; og vi må selvsagt have et 'win-win'-samarbejde mellem alle nationer omkring opbygningen af den Nye Silkevej – også internt i USA – så den bliver til en verdenslandbro.

Af ekstraordinær betydning er den fjerde af de Fire Love, der siger, at man ikke kan få en forøgelse af økonomiens produktivitet, med mindre man satser på et forceret program for at opnå fusionskraft; samt et internationalt program for udforskning af rummet. For kun, hvis man foretager denne form for avantgarde-spring i produktiviteten – fusionsteknologi vil bringe os en helt anden, økonomisk platform. Med fusionsfaklen vil vi blive i stand til at få sikkerhed i energiforsyningen til hele planeten; man vil få nye råmaterialer, fordi man vil blive i stand til at bruge ethvert affaldsprodukt, hvor man udskiller diverse isotoper og genskaber nye råmaterialer ved at sammensplejse isotoperne, som det skal gøres.

Så det repræsenterer et gigantisk, teknologisk spring. Det samme gælder for rumfartsteknologi, for det vil få samme virkning som under Apolloprogrammet, hvor hver investering i rumteknologi, i raketter, i andre nye materialer, gav 14 cents tilbage for hver cent, der blev investeret. Og alt fra computerchips til Teflon-køkkengrej, og alle mulige gavnlige resultater, opstod som biprodukter af rumforskning.

Og for at få verdensøkonomien ud af den nuværende tilstand, især i den transatlantiske sektor, må man have denne form for kursomlægning i retning af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt og en forøgelse af **energigennemstrømningstætheden**. Og hele denne Grønne ideologi – som i virkeligheden er en ikke-udviklingsideologi – må erstattes; og verden må komme tilbage til den kurs, hvor det fysiske univers' virkelige, fysiske love er kriteriet for sandheden, og ikke en eller anden ideologi.«

*Foto: USA's Capitol-bygning efter den første, omfattende restaurering i mere end et halvt århundrede. (Foto: USCapitol Flickr)*