


**RADIO SCHILLER den 5.
december 2016:**

**Nu har Italien sagt "Nej":
Den globale transformation
fortsætter**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg


**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 stjalne 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. 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.

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 Silkevejspolitik's 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.

Præsidentvalg Frankrig 2017: Jacques Cheminades kampagne fortæller Sputnik, hvorfor Fillon og Le Pen betyder blod og tårer for Frankrig

Paris, 29. nov., 2016 (Nouvelle Solidarité) – I et interview til Sputnik formulerede chefredaktør for *Nouvelle Solidarité*, Christine Bierre, præsidentkandidat Jacques Cheminades synspunkter om François Fillons sejr i primærvalgene, som går forud for det franske præsidentvalg i 2017. Avisen *Nouvelle Solidarité* er tilknyttet det politiske parti Solidarité & Progrès, som Cheminade har stiftet.[1]

De gode nyheder er, at »François Fillons udenrigspolitik ville betyde et brud med François Hollandes udenrigspolitik, som, med få undtagelser, praktisk taget har været dikteret af Obama og hans britiske allierede. Fillon, der har været en fast deltager ved Valdai Klubbens møder, og som er favorabelt indstillet over for et sundt, næsten ukritisk samarbejde, med Vladimir Putin, har allerede meddelt, at han vil tage skridt til at ophæve sanktionerne mod Rusland og samarbejde med præsident Putin om at genoprette stabilitet i Syrien med præsident Bashar al-Assad og eliminere ISIS [Daesh]«, understregede Bierre.

De dårlige nyheder er det faktum, at, samtidig vil Fillons økonomiske politik »ikke gøre det nemt for ham at vinde«,

påpegede journalisten. Sagens kerne er, at Fillon, der af Storbritanniens *Daily Telegraph* er blevet omtalt som »højrefløjens første, ægte Thatcher-leder«, går frem med radikale, økonomiske reformer. »Fillon ønsker at fjerne 500.000 offentlige stillinger under sin embedstid! Det er ikke mindre end 10 % af alle offentligt ansatte. Han vil reducere de 'sociale' omkostninger, som selskaber betaler (som dækker omkostninger vedr. arbejdsløshed, pensionering, offentlig sundhedsforsikring og social bistand, osv.) med 50 mia. euro og skrotte skatten på store formuer og 75 % 's skat på indkomster, der overstiger 1 mio. euro, samt sætte pensionsalderen op til 65 år«, påpegede Bierre. Denne barske politik vil utvivlsomt fremprovokere en voldsom forøgelse af venstrefløjskræfterne og spille i hænderne på Socialistpartiet, bemærkede hun. »Om han vil være i stand til at samle et flertal i landet for denne ultra-liberale politik med sin nuværende politik, står hen i det uvisse ... «, sagde hun.

Hvad er Fillons og hans sandsynlige rivaler, partiet Front Nationals Marine Le Pens styrkeområder og svagheder? »Deres styrke ud fra standpunktet om verdenspolitik er, at de begge ønsker fred med Rusland og et Frankrig, der genvinder sin traditionelle uafhængighed af de vestlige magter«, understreger Bierre. »Deres svaghed er, at ingen af dem har en økonomisk politik, der kan bryde Frankrig fri af det vestlige oligarki, dvs., de finansielle topmagter, der opererer ud fra Wall Street og City of London, som definerer vestens politik, inklusive Vestens høgeattitude over for Rusland«, understregede hun.

Journalisten påpegede, at hverken Fillon eller Le Pen kræver en finansreform, der vil bringe en afslutning på den pumpning af billioner af euro ind i »for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned«-bankerne, siden krisen i 2008. »Deutsche Bank er i realiteten bankerot, og den italienske banksektor har, iflg. den italienske regering, dårlige lån for 200-400 mia. euro«,

påpegede journalisten og advarede om, at implosionen af Vestens finanssystem er lige rundt om hjørnet. »Så længe, dette ikke er løst, vil ingen nyvalgt præsident være i stand til at gøre noget som helst, fordi disse banker, ikke kan udlåne til investering og er totalt afhængige af likviditetsindsprøjtninger (kvantitativ lempelse) til milliarder af euro fra den Europæiske Centralbank (ECB), månedsvis eller på årlig basis, som de udelukkende bruger til spekulation for at overleve.«

Forskellen med Cheminade

I modsætning til Fillon og Le Pen, kræver Jacques Cheminade, partiet Solidarité & Progrès' præsidentkandidat, »en streng opdeling mellem nyttige banker (indsud og kredit til økonomien) og investeringsbanker (spekulation)«, understreger hun og trækker en parallel mellem Cheminades koncept og USA's Glass/Steagall-lov. »I kølvandet på en sådan reorganisation vil vi få et presserende behov for en politik for genindustrialisering for at genstarte økonomien«, siger Cheminade, som Bierre citerer. Fillon på sin side »ønsker at ændre ECB's kurs fra sin nuværende funktion – som består i kun at bekæmpe inflation – og til at blive en bank, der fremmer investering i produktive aktiviteter. Dette er nogenlunde det samme som at forsøge at koge ny suppe på gamle ingredienser«, forklarer hun. »Hr. Fillon siger det ikke, men alt dette kræver en total revidering af diverse traktater helt tilbage til 'Maastrichttraktaten' (1992), som etablerede ECB som en autonom bank med ét eneste ansvarsområde: at sikre valutaens stabilitet«, fortsatte den franske journalist. »ECB's statutter forbyder den udtrykkeligt at udstede lån til regeringer til investering i infrastruktur eller andre fornødenheder.«

I mellemtiden lovede Marine Le Pen, at hun vil arrangere en folkeafstemning om, hvorvidt Frankrig skal forblive i EU. »Hendes forslag til en opfølgning mangler imidlertid fuldstændigt underbygning«, mener Bierre. »[Le Pens]

økonomiske og finansielle plan for præsidentvalget i 2012, som stadig gælder, foreslog at gå tilbage til den franske frank og krævede, at Banque de France udstedte, hvad der svarer til 100 mia. frank lån om året, hvoraf 90 % skulle gå til afdrag på hele den franske gæld, og kun 10 % til nye investeringsprojekter!« bemærkede den franske journalist. »I denne periode ville den samme politik med 'budgetstrenghed', som vi nu har, blive anvendt over for de franske borgere«, advarer Bierre.

Cheminade på sin side foreslår at genetablere Europas oprindelige centralbanker og vende tilbage til disses oprindelige valutaer, alt imens euroen bevares som en fællesvaluta. Han kræver, at »man forlader euroen og EU-traktaten (1992-2017) og genopbygger Europa omkring de kernestationer, der grundlagde Europa«, understregede journalisten og satte således fokus på betydningen af, at de europæiske nationer overtager kontrollen med deres monetære politik. »For at befri sig fra de vestlige, rovgriske finanscentres greb, bør Frankrig og Europa, siger hr. Cheminade, orientere sig mod BRIKS og støtte den stærke dynamik, som især Kina og Rusland har skabt i løbet af de seneste år, hvor de har skabt en ny, økonomisk verdensordens kreditinstitutioner (AIIB, Nye Udviklingsbank, Silkevejsfonden, osv.)«, understregede Bierre. »Hans fremgangsmåde er, hvis man foretager en sammenligning med russiske økonomers, baseret 'på udstedelse af statskredit til forskning og industriel udvikling, af samme art, som den [russiske økonom] Sergei Glazjev promoverer'«, understregede den franske journalist.

[1] Partiet er en søsterorganisation til LaRouche-bevægelsen.

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 opvågnen 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 irecttesætter 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)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
november 2016:
Ny dansk regering//Forsøg på
at underminere Trump//
Kinesisk og russisk
teknologisk samarbejde med
udviklingslande**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg


Lyd:

**Tysklands fremtid ligger i
den Nye Silkevej!**

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Tyskland må forpligte sig til denne politik for fred i det 21. århundrede, et totalt nyt paradigme, der erstatter geopolitik med menneskehedens fælles interesse, og Tyskland må aktivt blive en del af et reelt »fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«, som Xi Jinping udtrykker det.

Tyskland må også yde et vigtigt bidrag til en dialog mellem kulturer, der må ledsage denne nye, økonomiske verdensorden, hvis vore bestræbelser skal krones med held. Vi har i Tyskland en rig arv af humanistisk filosofi og klassisk kultur, som på forunderlig vis finder genklang i andre kulturers højdepunkter. Kun, hvis vi genopliver alle nationers bedste, kulturelle udtryk og bringer hinanden ind i en levende dialog, vil vi være i stand til at overvinde den nuværende civilisationskrise.

Leder fra BüSo, 26. nov., 2016 – Heinrich Heines berømte  overvejelse springer i erindring: 'Når jeg tænker på Tyskland om natten ... ' I sandhed, hvilken retning har kursen i Tyskland, eller rettere sagt: Hvor er Tyskland ved at drive hen? Det faktum, at Angela Merkel stiller op til en fjerde embedsperiode, er ikke betryggende. I modsætning til det indtryk, hun forsøger at skabe, er yderligere fire år med en Merkel-regering ikke et løfte om stabilitet, men om det modsatte.

Både Brexit i Storbritannien og valget af Donald Trump i USA er udtryk for en afvisning af hele paradigmet med neoliberal »globalisering«, der blot er et synonym for det anglo-amerikanske imperium. Denne 'globalisering' har ført til forarmelse af voksende dele af befolkningen til fordel for finansoligarkiet, i alle lande, der har været underkastet reglerne for neoliberal monetarisme. Denne 'globalisering' – dvs., City of Londons og Wall Streets krav om unipolær overhøjhed over verden – er ansvarlig for en hel række krige,

baseret på løgne, fra Afghanistan til Irak, Libyen, Syrien og Yemen, og som har forårsaget flygtningekatastrofen. 'Globalisering' betyder også farvede revolutioner, som er en politik for regimeskift mod demokratisk valgte regeringer, såsom i Ukraine; det betyder en NATO- og EU-politik for udvidelse mod øst og inddæmning, og det ville sandsynligvis, snarere før end siden, have bragt os ind i en global konfrontation med Rusland og Kina under en Hillary Clinton-administration.

Kansler Merkel og den chokerede [forsvarsminister] Ursula von der Leyen repræsenterer dette taber-paradigme, og tanken om endnu fire år – uden en ny politik og absolut uden nogen som helst vision for fremtiden – betyder ikke stabilitet, men derimod voksende politisk splittelse i Tyskland og disintegrationen af et EU i oprør. Med den næste, finansielle krise, der med sikkerhed vil komme, vil Merkel-Schäuble-regeringen med sikkerhed atter engang påtvinge borgerne omkostningerne herfor, og, ved at gøre dette, risikere kaos. Skrøbeligheden i den afskyelige flygtningeaftale med Tyrkiets Erdogan og diverse regeringer i Afrika er et løfte om, at det kun er et spørgsmål om tid, før denne krise atter eksploderer.

Merkel repræsenterer dette paradigme, der uafvendeligt er i færd med at synke. Præcis ligesom 304 medlemmer af det Europæiske Parlament, som netop har vedtaget en resolution, der anklager Rusland for at føre massiv anti-europæisk propaganda, så støtter hun en EU- og NATO-politik, som gør netop det, de anklager Rusland for at gøre. Vi må én gang for alle sætte en stopper for den Kolde Krigs tankegang.

Den næste amerikanske præsident har allerede sagt, at han ønsker at forbedre relationerne med Rusland og Kina og har i denne hensigt allerede ført samtaler med den russiske præsident Putin og den kinesiske præsident Xi. Trump har endda signaleret, at USA gerne vil være med i AIIB og samarbejde med Kinas Silkevejspolitik.

I løbet af kun tre år er Kinas Silkevejsinitiativ blevet historiens største program for infrastruktur og økonomisk vækst, tolv gange så stort som Marshallplanen, hvis man måler i nutidige dollars. Halvfjerds nationer samarbejder om det, samt flere end 30 internationale institutioner. Kina har alene 1,4 bio. euro i investeringer; 4.4 mia. mennesker har allerede fordel af en utroligt mangefacetteret vifte af dem – højhastighedsjernbaner, skabelse og distribuering af energi, vandstyringsprojekter, nye videnskabsbyer, grundforskning, innovation, fælles rumforskning osv. Xi Jinping har tilbudt samarbejde med den Nye Silkevej til alle lande på Jorden på basis af »win-win«-samarbejde. Flere og flere lande svinger over i dette nye paradigme, der, i stedet for et nulsumsspil, er med til at overvinde fattigdom og underudvikling, til alles fælles fordel.

Slut jer til mig i denne kamp

I mere end 25 år har jeg ført kampagne for programmet med at bygge den Nye Silkevej, et program, som jeg sammen med min mand Lyndon LaRouche for første gang foreslog som respons på [Berlin]Murens fald og Sovjetunionens opløsning. Vi har fremlagt dette koncept på hundreder af konferencer og seminarer i hele verden siden da, og nu er det flertallet af menneskehedens politik. Med jeres hjælp kan vi nu sætte dette program på Tysklands dagsorden – et program, der især ville komme *Mittelstand* (små og mellemstore virksomheder) til gode, og på basis af hvilket mange produktive jobs ville blive skabt.

For at skabe et reelt perspektiv og alternativ for Tyskland, har vi ikke brug for et AfD (partiet Alternativ for Tyskland), som ikke har nogen løsninger at tilbyde; men sammen med mig kan man sætte samarbejde med USA, Rusland og Kina på dagsordenen, et samarbejde omkring byggeriet af den Nye Silkevej. Kun gennem et sådant samarbejde kan vi udvikle Mellemøsten og Afrika med en Ny Silkevejs-Marshallplan, og

således løse flygtningekrisen på en human måde. Desuden er det netop, hvad general Michael Flynn, Trumps nye nationale sikkerhedsrådgiver, allerede i april, 2015, krævede.

Tyskland må forpligte sig til denne politik for fred i det 21. århundrede, et totalt nyt paradigme, der erstatter geopolitik med menneskehedens fælles interesse, og Tyskland må aktivt blive en del af et reelt »fællesskab for en fælles skæbne«, som Xi Jinping udtrykker det.

Tyskland må også yde et vigtigt bidrag til en dialog mellem kulturer, der må ledsage denne nye, økonomiske verdensorden, hvis vore bestræbelser skal krones med held. Vi har i Tyskland en rig arv af humanistisk filosofi og klassisk kultur, som på forunderlig vis finder genklang i andre kulturers højdepunkter. Kun, hvis vi genopliver alle nationers bedste, kulturelle udtryk og bringer hinanden ind i en levende dialog, vil vi være i stand til at overvinde den nuværende civilisationskrise.

Slut jer til mig i kampen for at sikre, at denne ekstraordinære chance gribes i Tyskland, og til fordel for Tyskland – en chance for at samarbejde med den nye, samarbejdsparate administration i USA, og med det økonomiske alternativ, der ligger i dynamikken med den Nye Silkevej. Hvis I gør dette med beslutsomhed, kan Tyskland atter blive 'en nation af digtere, tænkere og opfindere', og de fremtidige generationer vil atter opleve fremgang.

* * *

Jeg støtter denne appel: »Tysklands fremtid ligger i den Nye Silkevej!« med min nedenstående underskrift, og jeg vil hjælpe med at cirkulere den.

Foto: Den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping (i midten) besøger havnen i Duisburg, Tyskland, 29. maj, 2014. [Photo/Xinhua]

»Ideen om den Nye Silkevej imod det globale finanssystems sammenbrud« Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Hovedtale ved 23. nationalkongres for Sammenslutningen af Økonomer i Peru, 17. november, 2016.

Friedrich Schiller, der er en vidunderlig digter, som Schiller Instituttet er navngivet efter, havde den opfattelse, at der ikke kan være nogen modsigelse mellem at være en patriot, og så at være en verdensborger. Jeg mener, at det er muligt at opnå denne idé i vores tid, for, hvis vi giver hvert barn, hver nyfødt på denne planet, en generel uddannelse, der ikke alene formidler generel historie, geologi, musik, videnskab og de skønne kunster, men også en viden om og kærlighed til de andre kulturers højeste udtryk, den tyske klassik, konfucianisme, Gupta-perioden, Cervantes, Goya, hver eneste kulturs guldalder; så ville disse børn være i stand til at udvikle hele det potentiale, som de hver især kan udfolde, og som kun nogle ganske få undtagelser tidligere kunne udfolde.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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 promovning 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 billioner 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 Jatruss 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 or 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  **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 Krafft 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.

POLITISK ORIENTERING

den 24. november 2016:

Drop paradigmet for krig og kaos og gå med Rusland og Kina, som Trump er på vej til

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

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.

NYHEDSORIENTERING november 2016: Donald Trump og det nye paradigme

Etablisementet i både USA og Europa er rystet over Donald Trumps valgsejr, men rystelserne ender ikke der. I lighed med Reagan efter valget i 1980 vil han indtage Det Hvide Hus med sit helt eget team og egne nye rådgivere. Derfor er en helt ny politik mulig, hvor USA finder sin naturlige plads i et samarbejde med Rusland og Kina – og forhåbentlig dropper Bush/Cheneys og Obamas krigs- og konfrontationspolitik. Danmark og Europa skal dermed også finde en helt ny udenrigspolitik frem. Samtidig kommer Trump så til at skulle slås med et finanskrak større end i 2008, men hvis han lytter til Lyndon LaRouche, som Reagan delvist gjorde det i 1981, så er der med LaRouches Fire Love en vej ud af moradset. Dette er en redigeret udgave af en tale, Tom Gillesberg, Schiller Instituttets formand, holdt den 21. november 2016, og som kan høres på www.schillerinstitut.dk.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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 fortaler 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 atlanterhavskyst 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>

**RADIO SCHILLER den 21.
november 2016:**

**Den gamle verdensorden kommer
ikke tilbage//**

**Silkevejen er nået til Syd-
og Mellemamerika**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**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. Der, 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 menneskehedens 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, menneskehedens 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.

Friedrich Schiller: »Favnet være millioner! Søg op over stjerners hær!«

En af de ting, som Friedrich Schiller skriver i sine Breve om Menneskets Æstetiske Opdragelse, er, at man bør indgive i verden kursen mod det gode, og han fremfører, at, selv om vi lever i vort århundrede, så bør vi ikke være skabninger af vort århundrede – at det, vi må give til menneskeheden, er det, menneskeheden har brug for, og ikke det, menneskeheden lovpriser. Jeg mener, at dette i særlig grad er passende for de omstændigheder, vi i dag konfronteres med, hvor der er en mulighed for at forme fremtiden; men det er en mulighed, som vi meget hurtigt må gribe, og den eneste måde, hvorpå vi kan gribe fremtiden, er ved at operere på et meget højere plan, end de fleste mennesker gør.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

De 'lamme ænders' revolte i Berlin: Historiens musik spiller andetsteds.

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

19. november, 2016 – De store bølger af hysteri i die-hard pro-atlantiske kredse og i massemedierne, som allerede kom rullende før det amerikanske valg, har nu nået hidtil usete højder, siden Donald Trump blev valgt, og giver os en klinisk indsigt i disse menneskers mentale tilstand og opfattelse af demokrati. De foretrækker tydeligvis en præsident Hillary Clinton og en Tredje Verdenskrig som følge af hendes erklærede politik for Syrien, end de vil have en potentiel forbedring af de russisk-amerikanske relationer, som er uundværlig for etableringen af verdensfred og for opnåelse af positive løsninger for Syrien og Ukraine.

Det er i sandhed bemærkelsesværdigt: Efter at det lykkedes den forstødte præsident Obama at finde tre dage til at bo på Berlins Hotel Adlon og dinere og tale med sin veninde Angela Merkel, og dernæst afholde et minitopmøde mellem de selvudnævnte europæiske »Seks«, besluttede de to af dem – sammen med de andre statsoverhoveder – at forlænge sanktionerne mod Rusland i endnu et år. Disse ikke-så-sikre andre var den franske præsident François Hollande (popularitetsscore 7 %), den italienske premierminister Matteo Renzi (den sandsynlige taber i den italienske folkeafstemning den 4. dec.), den spanske premierminister Mariano Rajoy (midlertidigt statsoverhoved for en minoritetsregering), samt den ulykkelige britiske premierminister Theresa May. Det er tvivlsomt, om de, med dette træk for at gøre sig selv til et bogstaveligt direktorat for Den europæiske Union, og dernæst dekretere en politik, som halvdelen af EU-medlemslandene er imod, vil bidrage til sammenhæng i EU.

Disse selvudnævnte »Seks« har tydeligvis endnu ikke fattet, at deres variant af neoliberal politik, baseret på konfrontation med Rusland og Kina, blev stemt ud i Brexit-afstemningen i juni og i det nylige, amerikanske præsidentvalg. De har ikke forstået, at en situation har udviklet sig i den

transatlantiske verden, der påkaldes i den Amerikanske Uafhængighedserklæring: nemlig, at, hvis regeringerne er blevet »ødelæggere« »af formålet« med deres mandat – mere specifikt det, at garantere de umistelige rettigheder til liv, frihed og stræben efter lykke – da er det folkets ret, ja, faktisk »dets pligt«, at ændre eller ophæve en sådan regering. Det »lange tog af overgreb og ulovlige tilegnelser (af magt)«, som uddybende forklares i Uafhængighedserklæringen, svarer præcis til det, som de mennesker, Hillary Clinton så foragteligt har kaldt »kurven af ynkværdige«, har måttet udstå under Obamas politik – overgreb og ulovlig tilegnelse af magt, som de ikke ønskede, skulle fortsætte under en Hillary Clinton.

De selvudnævnte Seks, og frem for alt, de totalt gale medlemmer af medierne, der selv ikke viger tilbage for at udstede trusler mod Trump, forklædt som humor, er så fængslede i deres egen ideologi, at de ikke kan fatte denne revolutions dimension af naturlig lov.

Alligevel skriver *New York Times* den 18. nov. i en artikel på avisens forside med overskriften, »Idé i Trump-skala for en ny præsident: Byg noget inspirerende«. *Times* erklærer korrekt, at Trump kun kan forene landet, hvis han sætter gang i store infrastrukturprojekter, hvis lige er blevet totalt ignoreret i de seneste årtier. Han må bygge moderne versioner af Franklin D. Roosevelts Golden Gate Bro, Hoover-dæmning og Lincoln-tunnel. Dernæst opremsede »rekordernes avis« Roosevelts mest betydningsfulde projekter. Men artiklen er selvfølgelig langt bag efter Lyndon LaRouches program, hvor han i 2015 offentliggjorde et forslag om at bygge den Nye Silkevej i USA – et program for storstilet infrastrukturbyggeri og genindustrialisering – som ville integrere USA i Verdenslandbroen.

APEC-topmødet

I mellemtiden går »win-win-samarbejdet« for udviklingen af den

Nye Silkevej fremad med syvmileskridt. Det er *det* fremherskende emne for topmødet i Asiatisk Stillehavsområdets Økonomiske Samarbejde (APEC) i Lima, Perus hovedstad, den 19.-20. nov., hvor den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, så vel som også den japanske premierminister Shinzo Abe, vil deltage, og hvor de også vil holde bilaterale møder. Abe havde på forhånd holdt et møde med nyvalgte præsident Trump og havde givet udtryk for dennes fremragende lederskabsevner.

Præsident Xi havde aflagt statsbesøg i Ecuador og Chile forud for APEC-topmødet, og har et statsbesøg i Peru på dagsordenen efter topmødet. Præsident Xi og Ecuadors præsident Rafael Correa aftalte et »Omfattende Strategisk Partnerskab« mellem deres to nationer, og som omfatter fast, vidtrækkende udveksling og samarbejde inden for en bred vifte af områder. Blandt disse er en styrkelse af produktiv investering, udviklingen af relationer inden for økonomi og handel, økonomisk samarbejde og samarbejde inden for videnskab og teknologi. Kina har allerede leveret generøs hjælp til genopbygning af bygninger og steder, der blev ødelagt i det alvorlige jordskælv i april i år.

Præsident Correa gav veltalende udtryk for sin tak til Kina, hvor han understregede, at de to lande tænkte ens. Kina ønsker at bygge sin økonomi på et fundament af innovation; Ecuador søger at gå frem fra at være eksportør af varer og til at blive en vidensbaseret økonomi. Uden kinesisk finansiering og overførsel af teknologi ville dette ikke være muligt. I en fælles erklæring aflagde de løfte om at samarbejde om virkeliggørelsen af store projekter inden for områderne olie, gas, minedrift, infrastruktur, vandforsyning, omdirigering af vand, kommunikation, finanssektoren, landbrug, petrokemisk produktion, skibsbyggeri, metallurgi, papirfremstilling og opførelse af en ny videnskabs-by. I sin tale understregede præsident Correa, at præsident Xis statsbesøg var den vigtigste begivenhed i Ecuadors historie. Kan man forestille

sig kansler Merkel rejse på statsbesøg til Grækenland med et sådant program? Sandsynligvis ikke. Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble bliver rød i ansigtet, når en journalist spørger om delvis gældftergivelse – som han gjorde det ved en konference for bankierer i Frankfurt – og dernæst dekretter, at grækerne har levet over evne. Dette i lyset af den kendsgerning, at Trojkaens nedskæringspolitik har drevet 45 procent af grækerne ned under fattigdomsgrænsen. Den transatlantiske sektors politik er ikke »win-win«, men derimod »tab-tab« – med mindre, selvfølgelig, man er bankier eller selskabsdirektør. Nu, hvor Obamas frihandelsaftale for Asien, TPP, er lige så død som TTIP-aftalen for det atlantiske område, er det det kinesisk udarbejdede, inkluderende Frihandelsområde for det Asiatiske Stillehavsområde (FTAAP) og det Regionale Omfattende Partnerskab (RCEP), som er på dagsordenen.

Som svar på uansvarlige medieartikler om disse handelsaftaler har officielle russiske og kinesiske talsmænd understreget, at de på ingen måde tilsigter at udelukke eller isolere USA. *Xinhua* citerede det Kinesiske Udenrigsministeriums talsmand, Geng Shuang, for at sige, at Kina ikke vil tage en ledende rolle i hverken FTAAP eller RCEP, og at handelsaftalerne er foreslået for samarbejde, og ikke for at modarbejde hinanden. Kontrasten til Obamas »USA sætter reglerne« kunne ikke være tydeligere.

Et andet vigtigt spørgsmål, som vil blive diskuteret på APEC-konferencen, er byggeriet af den bi-oceaniske jernbane fra Brasilien til Peru, fra Atlanterhavet til Stillehavet, som også vil blive bygget med hjælp fra Kina, og hvis opførelse er et vigtigt skridt i det latinamerikanske kontinents infrastrukturudvikling.

Kontrasten mellem de to paradigmer, mellem den Nye Silkevejs »win-win«-perspektiv versus Obamas og Merkels »vestlige værdifællesskab«, kunne ikke stå skarpere over for hinanden. Med førstnævnte paradigme arbejder nationer for deres fælles

udviklings gensidige gavn. Med sidstnævnte er der megen snak om demokrati, frihed og menneskerettigheder, men en øredøvende tavshed omkring droneangreb, regimeskift mod legitime regeringer med hjælp fra terrorgrupper, total overvågning og livsforkortende nedskæringspolitik.

Som Abraham Lincoln engang sagde: »Man kan narre en del af folket hele tiden, og hele folket noget af tiden; men man kan ikke narre hele folket hele tiden.«

Det er på høje tid, at Tyskland befrier sig fra imperiedominansens fantasigreb, det være sig under diktat fra Washington og London, eller under afledningen med »mere Europa«. Menneskehedens fremtid kan udelukkende kun ligge i et totalt nyt paradigme, der tjener én menneskeheds interesser og respekterer international lov – et paradigme, med hvilket hvert eneste menneske på denne planet kan udvikle sit potentiale. Og dét er præcis grunden til, at vi må samarbejde omkring den Nye Silkevej.

To af 'de lamme, transatlantiske ænder', Obama og Merkel, under førstnævntes besøg i Berlin.

**Helga Zepp-Larouche:
Vi må handle nu for at gribe
den
chance, dette valg har skabt!**

Heldigvis er frihandelsaftalerne, TPP og TTIP, totalt døde; og det er en god ting, for frihandel gør absolut intet for at forøge arbejdskraftens produktivitet. Det er baseret på det

monetaristiske koncept om at købe billigt og sælge dyrt; det er baseret på at outsource billig arbejdskraft til markeder for slavearbejdskraft, og det er netop det, der kvæler forøgelsen af produktivitet ved at cementere betingelserne med maksimal profit på bekostning af arbejdskraften. På den anden side, hvis man ser på de økonomiske modeller, der altid har dannet grundlag for en forøgelse af befolkningens rigdom – det, som Friedrich List, den tyske økonom, karakteriserede som Det amerikanske, økonomiske System, som han satte op som modsætning til Det britiske, økonomiske System – så er den, i øvrigt korrekte, antagelse den, at den eneste kilde til velstand er befolkningens kreativitet. Denne kreativitet, der tager form af videnskabelige og teknologiske opdagelser, transformeres til teknologiske fremskridt, der, hvis de anvendes i produktionsprocessen, dernæst fører til en forøgelse af produktiviteten i både arbejdskraftens og i industriens kapacitet. Dette er den eneste, sande kilde til rigdom.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**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. 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-LAROUICHE : 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 of 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 refocussing 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.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche kaster en politisk håndgranat i Peru

17. nov., 2016 – Stifter og præsident for Schiller Instituttet, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, kastede en håndgranat af en

politisk erklæring i Peru i dag, mens verdens ledere gør sig klar til at ankomme til nationens hovedstad, Lima, for at deltage i APEC-topmødet i kommende weekend. I dag holdt Zepp-LaRouche hovedtalen på den XXIII Kongres for den Peruvianske Sammenslutning af Økonomer, der fandt sted i Amazonasbyen Pucallpa, i Ucayali-distriktet i det østlige Peru, med en generel gennemgang af det forbløffende potentiale for et Nyt Paradigme for hele menneskeheden (en oversættelse af hele hendes tale vil senere blive udgivet her på hjemmesiden, - red.). Den tre dage lange kongres er arrangeret omkring emnet, »Den peruviansk-brasilianske bi-oceaniske jernbane: Virkning på Amazon-området og landets økonomi.«

Zepp-LaRouches gennemgang med titlen, »Det Nye Silkevejskoncept, konfronteret med kollapset af verdens finanssystem«, blev præsenteret via en 50 min. lang video, optaget på forhånd, der efterfulgtes af 20 min. live Q&A med de omkring 200 mennesker, der var til stede i Pucallpa. Hendes åbningsvideo blev også sendt online af landets Sammenslutning af Økonomer, til økonomiske fakulteter på universiteter i hele landet.

Hendes tale vakte så stor interesse blandt deltagerne, med mange, der bad om en kopi, at Sammenslutningen af Økonomer vil lave en DVD til alle. Allerede som en forberedelse til kongressen havde Sammenslutningen trykt 2.000 kopier af en 60 sider lang pamflet til deltagere og andre, og som indeholdt uddrag af *EIR's Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen*, Lyndon LaRouches erklæring om en politisk strategi fra 2014, »De Fire Love«, samt en introduktion af Helga om udviklingerne i den Nye Silkevej, siden *EIR's* specialrapport blev udgivet i 2014, alt sammen med det formål at skabe materiale med dybdegående idéindhold for folk at studere. De tre spørgsmål, der blev stillet under Q&A-sessionen, var alle seriøse og lød i store træk som følger:

1. Hvilken form for kreditsystem ville blive skabt til den finansielle platform for opbygning af regional

- infrastruktur, såsom den bi-oceaniske jernbanekorridor?
2. Hvordan kan ændringer i Kinas økonomiske mentalitet transformere verden? Hvordan kan det være med til at løse problemer, der er opstået under den eksisterende økonomiske model?
 3. Fr. Zepp-LaRouche, De er kendt som 'Silkevejs-ladyen'. Hvilke principper baserer De Dem på til udviklingen af dette koncept for en global model?

Betydelige sidste-øjeblikke, logistiske udfordringer måtte overvindes for at gøre det muligt for Zepp-LaRouche at tale for Sammenslutningen af Økonomers nationale kongres. Aftenen før kongressen åbnede meddeltes det, at Ucayali Universitetet, hvor kongressen skulle holdes, var blevet lukket af en strejke, som en del af en lærerstrejke mod nedskæringer i uddannelsesbudgettet, der blev gennemført på flere statslige universiteter i hele nationen. Kongressens arrangører, der var urokkeligt engageret for at skabe de nødvendige betingelser for en politik, således, at denne sydamerikanske transkontinentale jernbanekorridor kan bringe udvikling til deres folk, måtte med kort varsel flytte hele konferencen, og det lykkedes dem at træffe særlige foranstaltninger for, at internetadgang skulle være tilgængelig således, at Zepp-LaRouche kunne tale til dem live.

Foto: Pucallpa Plaza med San Martin springvand.